



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 1995

No. 112

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. QUINN].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 12, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable JACK QUINN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

We pray, O gracious God, for the gift of vision—a vision that will allow us to see beyond where we stand and to glimpse the values and the goals and directions that tell us where we should be. Let us never be content with an insight that is limited to the affairs of the day or to the important actions of the hour, but seek Your word that inspires us, that lifts up higher, that heals and helps, that unites and holds true, now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that it will receive ten 1-minute speeches per side this morning.

WHO IS HURTING THE POOR ON MEDICARE?

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is going bankrupt. That is not my opinion, that is a fact. We can act responsibly and search for a solution, or we act like Congress has for the last 40 years and make decisions based on politics, not on principle. I am proud that my party has chosen to act responsibly. I wish I could say the same about the other party.

Under the Republican proposal to save Medicare, per person Medicare spending will increase from \$4,800 today to \$6,700 in 2002. Boy, that does not sound like a cut to me. And my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have *no* plan. None. Nada. Zippo.

Mr. Speaker, if we do nothing, Medicare would not just be in financial trouble, it would not exist. So, when hearing the liberal Democrats talk about how Republican spending increases will destroy Medicare, ask yourself a question that is based on facts: Who is hurting the poor, the party acting to save Medicare—the Republicans—or the party defending the status quo and allowing Medicare to go bankrupt—the Democrats? It is kind of

like asking, "Who's buried in 'Grant's Tomb.'"

HOW WILL HERB GET BY?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, here in Congress when we debate Medicare we talk in terms of hundreds of billions of dollars.

When my constituent Herb McCullough looks at Medicare cuts he thinks in terms of hundreds of dollars.

Herb lives on \$640 a month from Social Security and a union pension.

His Medicare and Medigap expenses are more than \$80 a month.

Thanks to subsidized housing, rent is \$164 a month.

After other expenses—food, clothing, phone—Herb will be lucky to have \$87 left each month.

Recently Herb had to buy two new hearing aids. He took \$500 from his pension but still has to pay \$100 a month.

How would Herb get by if he had a prescription drug bill like his neighbor—\$164 a month?

I urge my colleagues to think of people like Herb when voting to raise Medicare copayments to \$110 a month.

THE FIGURES DON'T LIE

(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, with all due respect to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] and his constituent, it is precisely because we are thinking of people like Herb and people like my 91-year-old granddaddy who is happy to have Medicare, that the new majority is pleased to say we

□ 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

H6835

will be raising benefits for Medicare recipients over the years from \$4,800 in 1995 to \$6,700 in 2002.

I say to my colleagues, Look closely. The figures don't lie. The math is here. Believe the real math and not the new math of alleged school lunch cuts and all the other politics of fear being propagated by the guardians of the old order who always play upon the politics of envy instead of having the vision for the future this American nation needs.

WHY TAKE IT OUT ON SENIORS?

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues why we have been arguing so vehemently against Speaker GINGRICH's stacking votes on the Committee on Ways and Means. The reason is that committee is precisely where the most egregious assault on the living standards of elderly Americans is taking place. It is on that committee where legislation to cut Medicare benefits and Medicaid benefits for people in nursing homes will be drafted to provide tax breaks for the privileged few. In fact, \$245 billion in breaks to the well heeled while cutting the lifeline for Medicare and Social Security recipients.

Mr. Speaker, I favor balancing the budget, but why take it out on seniors? Why not cut costs first by reining in the insurance companies? the hospitals? the pharmaceutical companies responsible for rising costs? Why does the majority party want to balance the budget on the backs of our grandmothers and grandfathers while they pander to the rich and powerful friends they hold in high places?

INFLUENCE FOR SALE

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

Mr. HEFLEY. We all know, Mr. Speaker, what it is that Bill Clinton does best. Unfortunately for the American people it is not foreign policy, it is not solving Medicare problems, and it certainly is not balancing the budget. No, it is not governing that Bill Clinton does best, so he is going to use the White House to do what he does best, to campaign. He is going to use the people's house to raise money for his campaign.

But from the President who claims to "feel your pain" he is not going to pay a visit to the average Americans that tour the White House on a daily basis. Instead he is selling himself to a privileged few for up to \$100,000 per person.

Now our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle would be going nuts if this was a Republican President doing this. I wonder where those voices of righteous indignation are today. Unfortunately it is too bad that the Presi-

dent cares more about money for his reelection than earning the people's trust.

DO THE REPUBLICANS REALLY WANT TO SAVE MEDICARE?

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say they want to save Medicare. And I wish I could believe them.

But then I recall that 10 years ago, the majority leader based his first campaign on abolishing Social Security.

Three weeks ago, he published a book that calls for Medicare to be replaced.

And 2 days ago, he told reporters that Medicare was "a program he would have no part of in a free world."

Not only that—last January the Speaker himself proposed abolishing Medicare and replacing it with a private system.

To top it all off, just 3 months ago, the Republicans took \$87 billion out of the Medicare trust fund to pay for their tax breaks for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare is a trust fund, not a slush fund.

When all is said and done, seniors and their families know who is on their side.

WHEN I'M 65 I'D LIKE TO BE FREE TO CHOOSE MY HEALTH CARE DESTINY

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

Mr. ARMEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, there they go again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feigning moral outrage about something they think they might have imagined they read accurately reported in the paper. The outrage of the week apparently is the fact that I had the temerity to admit publicly that, if I lived in a free world, I would have a world in which I would be free to choose personally and individually that I, as an individual American citizen, would have the freedom to decide for myself whether or not I would enroll myself in a Government-provided benefits program.

Now I do not have the freedom today to decline from paying my FICA taxes to fund that program for those that are enrolled in it today, and I accept that I pay my taxes. I just made the observation yesterday that, when I am 65, I would like to be free to choose not to become, in any extent, a ward of the state. I would like to choose, if I dare make the choice for myself, to not have the Government decide any part of my health care destiny. I do not think it is unreasonable in America that we might dare to believe that we could write legislation that said to individual American citizens at an age of maturity, when they are probably, probably capable of tending to their own affairs, having done so throughout

most of their life, that, "You, Mr. and Mrs. America, are free to choose."

Now, if that is an outrage to my colleagues on the left, so be it. It only reflects their inability to understand who we are.

THE REPUBLICAN PLAN FOR CUTTING MEDICARE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. My colleagues, I want to focus now on all of the details that the Republicans have given to us today and every other day in the course of this debate about the future of Medicare. Here it is. Here is the plan as they have described it here on the floor, a complete and total blank, and I would challenge the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas, or any other member of the Republican majority, to have the courage to come and fill in this blank page, because the media has already done it by investigating their secret task forces, and they have told the people of America that what this plan calls for is more copayments, more in higher deductibles, more in higher premiums that will come right out of the pocket of America's seniors.

The majority leader has just tried to amplify on his remarks. What else did he say on Tuesday according to the Houston Chronicle? "I resent the fact that I'm 65 and must enroll in Medicare, but I'm not dumb enough to think I'm going to go out there and lay out a plan."

That is why we have a blank. They do not want the American people to know what they are doing in cutting Medicare.

REPUBLICANS, UNLIKE DEMOCRATS, WILL PROTECT MEDICARE

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, liberal Democrats are fond of taking to the floor to whine about Medicare cuts. Why, just the other day, the minority leader himself was here talking about the "deep, deep" cuts in Medicare.

I have here a chart that shows what Republicans will be spending on Medicare through the year 2002. There is no cut. There is not even a "deep, deep" cut.

In fact, spending increases. In 1995, Medicare beneficiaries will receive \$4,816. In 2002, they will receive \$6,734. The spending increases. Where is the cut?

Mr. Speaker, the liberal Democrats in this Chamber have offered no real, substantive plan to protect Medicare. All they offer—in fact, all they really stand for any more—is paranoia.

This is no way to govern. This is no way to lead. The American people expect and deserve more than just fear

tactics. Republicans, unlike Democrats, will protect Medicare and preserve it for future generations.

ARE THEY GOING TO DESTROY MEDICARE IN ORDER TO SAVE IT?

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

Mr. KLINK. To the previous speaker, you know I had a friend that said he made \$100 back in 1960 if he made \$125 now. That is not an increase; such a thing is inflation. With Medicare there are additional people called baby boomers that are going into the system, and, if you go into my district in Pennsylvania, in fact if you go across the State of Pennsylvania, talk to Republicans, independents, and Democrats who happen to run the hospitals, they will tell you that statewide the Republican Medicare/Medicaid cuts are going to mean 40,000 health care workers are going to be unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, in my district alone over 1,000 people are going to be unemployed because of the Medicare and Medicaid cuts that the Republicans are going to make when we include inflation, when we include the fact of the increased costs and more people going into the system.

Now I am reminded when I look at the plan on Medicare and Medicaid of the comments made by the military spokesman during the Vietnam war. He said we had to destroy the village to save it. They are going to destroy health care, they are going to destroy Medicaid, in order to save it. They are going to destroy Medicare in order to save it.

I may be a casualty of this war; I may even become a POW, but one thing, my colleagues, I will not be, and that is missing in action.

INFLATION IS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN THE REPUBLICAN MEDICARE PROPOSAL

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

(Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman previously speaking brought up some of these points because it absolutely makes the point that we have been trying to make on this side of the aisle: \$4,816 per year in 1995, \$6,734 per year in 2002; takes into account the additions in individuals who will be in Medicare, takes into account an obvious raising, it takes into account inflation.

What is going on with inflation right now in the private sector? Inflation in the private sector with respect to health care is about 4.4 percent. In 1993 it was less than that. We have actually seen in the private sector health care costs have dramatically been reduced. Why is that? Because corporations, individuals, institutions have all said enough is enough; 13 to 14 percent compounded inflation is too much.

I say to my colleagues, we can't tolerate it, we won't tolerate it, but what is the plan on the other side of the aisle? Now we are going to continue to inflate Medicare, we are going to continue to inflate Medicaid. We are not going to try to do anything to try and solve that.

SPARE MEDICARE

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the majority intends to cut Medicare by \$270 million. They have not yet told us what they will cut and how they will cut it, to reach that goal. And, they may not tell us until they have to tell us, just before this fiscal year ends in September. But, in a recent article in the Washington Times, we did learn what some in the majority are thinking—they want to privatize Medicare.

If Medicare is privatized, the cost to senior citizens will be out of control. The majority apparently insists upon giving to the wealthy and taking from the old. It is clear that if the majority would not push for a tax break for wealthy Americans, they would not have to push for a Medicare cut for our senior citizens. I suppose when you have the votes to win, you can give them and you can take them away. But, power and justice are not synonymous. Let us seek justice. Let us spare Medicare.

CUT SPENDING FIRST

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are continuing to cut Government bureaucracy and waste today as we finish consideration of the energy and water appropriations bill. Keeping our promise to balance the budget by the year 2002, we have cut \$1.6 billion from the 1995 funding level, which is \$2 billion below the President's request.

We have eliminated scores of Federal programs focusing on energy and water research which are more suited for the private sector, while at the same time preserving the basic scientific research programs that will allow our Nation to remain universally competitive.

We have not forgotten what the people sent us here to do—cut spending first—that was their mandate back in November. Through this bill and others, we make the Government smaller, less costly, more efficient, and more accountable to the American people.

DEMOCRATS CARE ABOUT MEDICARE

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as the 30th anniversary of the creation of the

Medicare Program approaches, I am outraged that the Republicans are trying to force the American public to swallow devastating cuts to the Medicare Program, cuts that will completely gut the Medicare Program.

□ 1020

Every Medicare beneficiary who receives part B Medicare coverage now pays a monthly premium of \$46.10. But under the Republican plan, the part B premium will go to \$110 per month. That is how they get more money into the Medicare system—they make you pay more.

The proposed cuts to the Medicare Program go beyond higher premiums for Medicare recipients, those whose modest household budgets and Social Security checks are already stretched to the breaking point. As a direct result of the cuts to the Medicare Program, reimbursement rates will drop, so doctors and hospitals will have to absorb a greater share of the health care costs. These costs will then be passed on to the Medicare recipients. In addition, fewer health care services will be offered to senior citizens and working families. Some doctors will not be able to accept patients, and some hospitals in rural areas will have to close their doors completely. The bottom line is these Republican cuts to Medicare will drive senior citizens and low income families into a second-class health care system.

STOP SCARE CAMPAIGN ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton Democrats on the other side of the aisle have tried their hardest to engage in a scare campaign aimed at our senior citizens. The Clinton Democrats think they are scoring political points by scaring seniors into thinking Republicans are trying to rip Medicare out from under them.

But I wonder what the Clinton Democrats tell their constituents who are 58 years old. You see, this is the age group that's going to be affected most by the Democrats' plan of maintaining the status quo. This is the age group that will have no Medicare benefits period when they turn 65. This is the age group that will suffer the most.

We cannot sit back and do nothing while Medicare continues on its downward slide toward bankruptcy. Republicans want to preserve, protect, and improve Medicare for this and future generations. I ask the Democrats to stop their petty scare campaigns. Work with us to fix Medicare.

DANGEROUS CAMPAIGN RHETORIC

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a special congressional panel heard stories of growing threats and attacks against public officials, law enforcement officers, environmentalists, and women advocates by extremist right-wing groups and militia in this country.

This week the Nation was shocked by extremist campaign material produced by the National Republican Congressional Committee in the name of Speaker GINGRICH that suggested Democratic Members of the House are wanted criminals just for disagreeing with the Republican Contract for America.

That extremist rhetoric endangers democracy and encourages a lunatic fringe of this Nation. As a Nation we have learned that when you preach hate; you get hate, when you preach violence, you get violence.

Thirty-two years ago another wanted poster was distributed in Dallas, TX, on November 22, 1963, accusing President Kennedy of selling out America to the United Nations and being anti-Christian. This wanted poster ended in a tragedy.

We should understand that we cannot have the leading politicians of this Nation preaching hatred, preaching the suggestion that politicians who disagree are somehow criminals. Speaker GINGRICH should repudiate this poster and withdraw this campaign rhetoric from the public.

AMERICORPS PROGRAM A WASTE OF MONEY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last night, NBC News did an expose on AmeriCorps that proved what a lot of us have suspected for some time—the program is way over budget and wasting taxpayers' money at a phenomenal rate.

AmeriCorps may have worthy goals, but it has lousy execution. According to a report by the General Accounting Office, the Clinton administration projected AmeriCorps to cost \$6.43 per hour for each so-called volunteer. The actual cost: \$15.65 per hour. Annually, the program was supposed to cost no more than \$18,000 per participant. The final tab: \$27,000 per participant.

Mr. Speaker, these are large sums of money. Most of the citizens in my district, who work full-time jobs to support their whole families, don't earn this kind of money. Why does it cost \$27,000 to support just one AmeriCorps participant?

On Monday night, the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee cut all funding for President Clinton's so-called national service program.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the answer is that it won't anymore. I applaud my col-

leagues on the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee for stopping this new entitlement program.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF DOW CORNING NEEDED

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about Medicare, Medicaid, and SSI, because the taxpayers for those programs will be paying for the sins of Dow Corning—Dow Corning, that told hundreds of thousands of American women that silicone breast implants were safe.

The Harvard Nurses Study just came out and said there are no health risks. By the way, that was paid for by Dow Corning.

Mr. Speaker, is there any justice left? If there is, ask Grace Nero's family in my district. Grace passed away on Independence Day after complications from surgery from breast implants, a blood clot.

Dow Corning manipulated Federal bankruptcy laws to avoid a \$4 billion settlement. Dow Corning in fact lied to the American people, and I am asking U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno to investigate possible criminal charges.

Dow Corning lied to Congress. Does Congress care anymore? Anybody just comes up here and lies to you? Do we really govern around here? To me, this is unbelievable. Congress should support an investigation of Dow Corning.

KEEP TWO ROCK COAST GUARD TRAINING FACILITY OPEN

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, for some reason that's beyond me, the U.S. Coast Guard is considering closing its only west coast training facility—the training base at Two Rock, CA.

No doubt about it, the Coast Guard needs to get rid of some dead weight. It will be missing the boat, however, if it shuts down this important base.

Any old coastie can tell you Mr. Speaker, that it makes sense to consolidate one of the four east coast training centers at the Two Rock Base.

It makes sense because of Two Rock's expansion capacity, good climate, available housing, and, above all, the fact that taxpayers recently invested \$22 million to make the base's computer and radar training facilities state-of-the-art.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to heed this SOS, and join the entire California delegation in ensuring that the Coast Guard can fulfill its mission by having training facilities on both of our coasts by keeping Two Rock open.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will take one additional 1-minute speech from each side.

THE TRUTH ABOUT MEDICARE CUTS

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a program that gives security to our Nation's elderly and hard-working families. I rise in support of Medicare.

We beat you to death to keep someone else from killing you. The Republicans say that they are cutting Medicare to save Medicare. But it is time to be honest with the American people. These cuts will not help Medicare. These cuts pay for tax breaks for Americans earning over \$200,000 a year.

And, at the same time, the average senior citizen will pay \$1,000 more for health care.

We must help the Medicare Program, and I have supported efforts to do so. But we should not and must not take away the security of health care insurance for our elderly.

These cuts to Medicare are not reform. I know it, You know it, It's time the American people know it.

Don't support Medicare cuts to pay for tax breaks for the rich. That is not right. That is not fair.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 171 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1905.

□ 1028

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. OXLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 11, 1995, the bill had been read through page 24, line 18, and title III was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, numbered 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: On page 16, on line 1, insert "(less \$40,000,000)", before "to remain".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for a mutual agreement to limit the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, like we did similarly yesterday, to 40 minutes, with the time equally divided between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the third cutting amendment that I will have offered on this bill. Let me simply explain what it does. This amendment cuts \$40 million in the bill for the advanced light water reactor program.

What I would simply say is "Here we go again" as President Reagan used to say, with another example of corporate welfare for the nuclear industry. Essentially what these funds do is to help large corporations obtain design certification from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. This amounts to the Government funding a portion of the licensing costs of large corporations in order to comply with its own regulations.

The committee has heard volumes of testimony this year from organization after organization saying, "Let the marketplace determine what is commercially viable; the Government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers."

How many times have you heard that? Yet these remarks apparently have fallen on deaf ears, or, alternatively, the committee has determined these concepts do not apply to the nuclear industry.

Since 1974, the Federal Government has spent \$26 billion on nuclear fission programs. This has occurred despite the fact that not one American utility has successfully ordered a nuclear powerplant in all of that time. The House budget resolution, which was passed with so much fanfare, presumes to set criteria for Government science funding, emphasizing that long-term non-commercial R&D with the potential for scientific discovery ought to be funded. What should not be funded, according to that budget resolution, are programs whose economic feasibility and commercialization should be left to the marketplace.

Over and over we have heard those same themes, yet when it comes to actually cutting the corporate welfare out of appropriation bills, this House seems to back away again, and again, and again.

Now, the nuclear industry makes a number of arguments for their program, which I am sure we will hear today. I would simply respond to those arguments as follows:

First of all, nuclear energy supplies about 20 percent of our Nation's electricity; 72 percent of utility executives said in a recent poll conducted by the International Energy Group that their company would never consider ordering a nuclear powerplant. So the industry seems to have determined that the current mix is just fine as far as they are concerned.

Second, I would ask, since when does industry want the Government involved in things like product design? I guess the answer is only when there are Federal dollars available.

The NRC is charged with determining enhanced safety margins and regulatory acceptance of these designs. Their ultimate action on these proposals will be a determinant and will demonstrate to potential customers whether the U.S. Government considers them sound, not whether or not DOE is provided dollars to support industry design efforts.

I would also say, third, that we have received letters in all of our offices indicating that "Failure to meet commitments to the specified amount, \$100 million, jeopardizes DOE's ability to recoup the moneys already invested in the program."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I have been here for quite a while, and I cannot recall anything quite so brazen. I want to make it quite clear, despite that veiled threat, the nuclear industry is legally committed to repaying DOE. Their threat to renege, in my view, borders on the outrageous or the scandalous.

The fourth point I would simply make is that trying to convince somebody that the promotion of nuclear technology through the export of nuclear powerplants to foreign countries in Southeast Asia, that somehow promotes nonproliferation, is an argument I simply cannot swallow. Has anybody in the nuclear industry checked what is going on in North Korea lately?

So I would simply say, in conclusion, this amendment comes back to one central point: Are you for cutting corporate welfare, or do you want to exempt the nuclear industry? Are you for letting the marketplace pick winners and losers, or does the nuclear industry get a buy on the one too? Are you going to respond to the threats of the industry that they are not going to repay previous funding, despite a legal obligation, or are you going to buckle to those threats?

Last night, we met on the labor-health-education appropriation bill. That bill is being cut by \$9.5 billion below last year. We are wiping out assistance to senior citizens who make less than \$10,000 a year, so they do not have to choose between paying prescription drugs and keeping their houses warm in the winter. We cut

back almost \$700 million in student aid, not with my vote, but that is what the subcommittee did. We have seen huge reductions in job training, despite this House's vote for things like NAFTA and GATT. We are abandoning workers who desperately need help to be retrained.

So it just seems to me with all of these cuts, for us to say that we are going to continue to subsidize one of the wealthiest industries in this country with funding such as this represents a badly warped sense of priorities. I would urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the efforts of our ranking member, Mr. OBEY, in trying to reduce spending in our country. I share that concern, and I compare my record with just about anyone here, I think, on that cutting effort.

But often as I drive down the interstate highways, 4, 6, or 8 lanes wide, or travel through urban areas with elevated highways, I think where would we be today if Dwight Eisenhower, former President, had not had the vision, the farsightedness, to prepare for today's transportation requirements and needs. And as we approach amendments like this, I wonder, where will our children and grandchildren be a few years from now if we do not today be farsighted and visionary to prepare for the energy that they are going to require if we are to continue our standard of living and be competitive in world markets for industry.

I have children and grandchildren. I think of our two grandsons here, Justin and Austin. They are just little right now. But when they start looking for a job, there may not be jobs here. They may have to go overseas somewhere else.

Yesterday afternoon we struck \$20 million in a program to prepare for a reactor for the next century, a gas turbine modular helium cooled reactor, which would be very efficient and very safe in a nuclear reactor.

Now, today the only reactor we really have working and the only one we have in the future available to this committee is the light water reactor, and this is the fifth year of a 5-year program for the advanced light water reactor. To enhance that reactor, to build a reactor that would be competitive in world markets that would be as safe as could be for a light water reactor, now we want to stop the fifth year of a program that we are well down the road in the fourth year already?

The administration's request for this program for the advanced light water reactor was \$49.7 million. We cut that back to \$40 million. But this is industry coshared at this point. This year, when you look at the budget for the advanced light water reactor research

and safety, the U.S. Government would put in \$100 million and the industry would put in \$170 million.

The industry has been putting their money in, because the CEO's of large companies who are today generating electricity realize they have to be prepared for the next century, even though most of them will not be CEO's at that time. They will be retired. But they have their vision. They are putting their money up front. It would be a terrible mistake today for our government to renege on the commitment of the fifth year of a 5-year contract when we already have 4 years invested.

□ 1040

I urge a "no" vote on this well-intended amendment. It just does not fit with the needs of our society today.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 227, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]

AYES—191

Abercrombie	Flake	Lowey
Ackerman	Foglietta	Luther
Baessler	Ford	Maloney
Baldacci	Frank (MA)	Manton
Barcia	Franks (NJ)	Markey
Barrett (WI)	Furse	Martinez
Becerra	Ganske	Matsui
Beilenson	Gephardt	McCarthy
Berman	Gibbons	McDermott
Bilbray	Goodling	McHale
Blute	Graham	McInnis
Bonior	Gutierrez	McKinney
Borski	Hall (OH)	McNulty
Browder	Hamilton	Meehan
Brown (FL)	Hancock	Menendez
Camp	Harman	Metcalfe
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	Mfume
Chabot	Hefley	Miller (CA)
Chapman	Hilleary	Minge
Christensen	Hilliard	Mink
Chrysler	Hinchee	Moran
Clay	Hoekstra	Nadler
Coburn	Holden	Neal
Collins (GA)	Horn	Neumann
Collins (IL)	Hostettler	Oberstar
Condit	Jacobs	Obey
Conyers	Jefferson	Olver
Cooley	Johnson (SD)	Orton
Costello	Johnson, E.B.	Owens
Cunningham	Johnston	Pallone
Danner	Jones	Pastor
Deal	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)
DeFazio	Kaptur	Pelosi
Dellums	Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (FL)
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
Dicks	Kildee	Petri
Dingell	Kingston	Pomeroy
Dixon	Klecicka	Portman
Doggett	Klug	Poshard
Duncan	LaFalce	Rahall
Edwards	LaHood	Ramstad
Ensign	Lantos	Rangel
Eshoo	Levin	Reed
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Richardson
Farr	Lipinski	Rivers
Fattah	LoBiondo	Rose
Fields (LA)	Lofgren	Roth

Roukema	Smith (NJ)
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)
Royce	Souder
Rush	Stark
Sabo	Stenholm
Sanders	Studds
Sanford	Stump
Schroeder	Talent
Schumer	Tanner
Sensenbrenner	Tate
Serrano	Thompson
Shadegg	Thurman
Shays	Torkildsen
Sisisky	Torres
Skaggs	Tucker
Slaughter	Upton
Smith (MI)	Velazquez

NOES—227

Allard	Foley
Archer	Forbes
Army	Fowler
Bachus	Franks (CT)
Baker (CA)	Frelinghuysen
Baker (LA)	Frisa
Ballenger	Funderburk
Barr	Gallely
Barrett (NE)	Gejdenson
Bartlett	Gekas
Barton	Geren
Bass	Gilchrest
Bateman	Gillmor
Bentsen	Gilman
Bereuter	Gonzalez
Bevill	Goodlatte
Bilirakis	Gordon
Bliley	Goss
Boehlert	Green
Boehner	Greenwood
Bonilla	Gunderson
Bono	Gutknecht
Boucher	Hall (TX)
Brewster	Hansen
Brown (CA)	Hastert
Brownback	Hastings (WA)
Bryant (TN)	Hayes
Bryant (TX)	Hayworth
Bunn	Heineman
Bunning	Herger
Burr	Hobson
Burton	Hoke
Buyer	Houghton
Callahan	Hoyer
Calvert	Hunter
Canady	Hutchinson
Castle	Hyde
Chambliss	Inglis
Chenoweth	Istook
Clayton	Jackson-Lee
Clement	Johnson (CT)
Clinger	Johnson, Sam
Clyburn	Kasich
Coble	Kelly
Coleman	Kennelly
Combest	Kim
Cox	King
Coyne	Klink
Cramer	Knollenberg
Crane	Kolbe
Crapo	Largent
Creameans	Latham
Cubin	LaTourette
Davis	Laughlin
de la Garza	Lazio
DeLauro	Leach
DeLay	Lewis (CA)
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)
Dickey	Lightfoot
Dooley	Lincoln
Dornan	Linder
Doyle	Livingston
Dreier	Lucas
Dunn	Manzullo
Durbin	Martini
Ehlers	Mascara
Ehrlich	McCollum
Emerson	McCrery
English	McDade
Everett	McHugh
Ewing	McIntosh
Fawell	McKeon
Fazio	Meek
Fields (TX)	Meyers
Filner	Mica
Flanagan	Miller (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Brown (OH)	Doolittle
Bishop	Collins (MI)	Engel

Vento	Fox
Visclosky	Frost
Volkmer	Hefner
Wamp	Longley
Ward	
Waters	
Watt (NC)	
Watts (OK)	
Waxman	
Whitfield	
Wise	
Woolsey	
Wyden	
Wynn	
Yates	
Zimmer	

Moakley	Tauzin
Porter	Williams
Reynolds	
Stokes	

□ 1104

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Porter against.

Messrs. CANADY of Florida, LAZIO of New York, ROHRBACHER, and EVERETT, and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GEPHARDT, PETERSON of Florida, WATTS of Oklahoma, SHADEGG, HOLDEN, and MCHALE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair announces that there was a delay, apparently, in the bell system, so a little more leeway was allowed on the time for voting.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 14.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 16, line 2, insert before the period the following: : *Provided*, That, of such amount, \$44,772,000 shall be available to implement the provisions of section 1211 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13316).

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

Mr. KLUG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request was that the debate be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes on each side on this amendment and all amendments thereto. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] would control the 20 minutes on this side, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] would control the 20 minutes on the other side.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment in front of us simply does one thing today, which is to reaffirm this Congress' commitment and, frankly, the American public's commitment to renewable energy, both solar and wind power. This money does not increase the deficit. It simply forces the Committee on Appropriations and the conferees to decide where else to offset spending cuts in order to fund what we think is a very high priority for the American public.

Solar renewable energy programs were gutted from the current funding

level of \$388 million to \$221 million. That represents a 43-percent cut. This amendment increases solar renewable funding to \$266 million which we think, frankly, better illustrates the priorities of this Congress, but still I might add at the end of the day results in a 31-percent reduction. This ensures that the United States remains a strong player in energy markets and moves toward self-sufficiency and away from foreign oil imports.

As we all know, there is obviously a finite amount of fossil fuels. I think it is a mistake to continue in many ways to fund outdated post-mature technologies when we are beginning to veer away from wind and solar, which are beginning to show some promise. Fundamentally, what this does is reaffirm this Congress' commitment in basic research in these areas and not necessarily in applied technology.

Overwhelmingly, the American public supports renewable energy programs as an investment in our future.

There was an election last fall, as we know, and which this Congress has been attempting to execute its agenda which said downside and shrink governments. I think the American public understands there are some areas where we may want to spend still more money. According to a survey conducted by Vince Bregala, a pollster for Presidents Reagan and Bush, 85 percent agreed that the Federal Government should continue to support partnerships with American business to promote sales of renewable energy and energy-efficient technologies through research and development. Seventy-five percent agreed that with the overall reduction in the Department of Energy's budget, resources should be redirected toward renewable energy and energy-efficient technologies.

I stand here today to offer this amendment with a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER], who I point out chairs the Subcommittee on Energy and Power of the Committee on Commerce, the Gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it very clear to my colleagues that what this amendment fundamentally does is invest in America's future, a future clearly defined by the American public.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], former chairman of the subcommittee and longstanding Member.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and urge the Members to support the subcommittee. Throughout this bill we have had to take cuts on programs that are very popular. We realize that there are other ways that

we could go in different directions on these things, but the subcommittee has studied this, the full Committee on Appropriations has approved the bill, and actually, I just urge the Members to vote in support of the committee.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, a responsible energy policy requires that we focus our attention and research toward the infinite supply of renewable energy alternatives. As we begin to enter the 21st century, we must begin to shift our reliance away from our finite supply of fossil fuels.

The promotion of renewable energy sources is more important now than ever before. We should have learned by past oil crises that we can not continue to ignore our increasing dependence on imported oil. For the first time, we are now importing more than 50 percent of our oil. Oil accounts for a large part of our trade imbalance. The harsh reality is that the world's oil supply will one day run out. There is nothing that this Congress or our Government can do to change that.

To the extent that we foster the development and use of alternative renewable sources like solar technology, we can act responsibly to reduce our dependence on imported oil.

I am disturbed by the committee's slashing of the solar and renewable energy programs from their current funding level of \$338 to \$221 million, a 43-percent cut. This amendment would restore \$45 million, which still leaves these programs with 31 percent less than they got last year.

I am also concerned about the budget circumstances we must work within. This amendment does not exempt renewables from cuts, it merely seeks to distribute the deficit reduction burden more fairly.

The development of renewable energy technologies stimulates job creation, stimulates the economy, and helps American businesses become more competitive.

The University of Florida's Solar Energy and Energy Conservation Laboratory and the Florida Solar Energy Center have uniquely influenced the development of solar energy. Breakthroughs at these laboratories have helped foster a solar energy industry in Florida that has created high technology jobs. Current developments at these labs continue to create opportunities for U.S. entrepreneurs and industries.

Our investments in solar technologies are just beginning to yield returns in the form of energy security and a cleaner environment. We would be taking a giant step backward if we were to retreat from the successes that solar programs have made. This amendment will ensure that the United States remains a strong player in alternative energy markets of the 21st century.

During the 1970's, the United States was the recognized world leader in solar technology. During the last 20 years, the rest of the world, recognizing the enormous potential solar energy holds, has dramatically increased its commitment to funding solar energy research.

Now, as we stand on the brink of the 21st century, we find ourselves playing catch-up with nations who used to follow us. We should be leading the pack, not playing follow the leader. This amendment will not reverse a 20-year decline in the Federal Government's commitment to our energy future, but it will prevent us from falling even further behind.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a very valued member of this committee and a hard-working Member.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

I do rise in opposition to this amendment, Mr. Chairman. This is a basic question of priorities. To the solar industry's credit, solar technology is no longer at a basic research and development level. It is in fact a commercial technology, ready for use as an energy source in a variety of applications. It is ready, but in many ways, the public is not.

Frankly, I am skeptical that solar energy will ever be the prominent energy source, due to the expense of manufacturing solar panels and the limits in their energy-producing capabilities. I do expect that solar energy will continue as a secondary energy provider for specific energy needs, such as isolated structures which need a limited supply of energy. I am more optimistic about the future of other energy programs, like fusion, for example, which would be a substitute for the current dependence on fossil fuels.

I want to repeat what has been said by others, Mr. Chairman. We are not cutting the entire solar and renewable energy program. Current funding allows continued research into this area at the most basic research and development level. I believe the solar energy program and any other applied technology must prove itself in the marketplace.

I believe that only when the cost to obtain and process fossil fuels becomes increasingly more expensive will the time become right for alternative energy sources, including solar energy. This way they can compete in a free market. I believe the energy debate is more appropriately resolved by the consumer in that free market.

□ 1115

Let the consumer decide. Let the market work freely. Currently, the relatively low cost of fossil fuels in the form of petroleum, natural gas, and coal keeps these energy sources at the forefront.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a good bill. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has worked very carefully with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], the ranking member, and the rest of the subcommittee, to produce a fiscally responsible bill while maintaining a productive energy and water program.

We could debate the merits of increasing funds for every Federal program ad infinitum. If my colleagues are committed to balancing the Federal budget, then they should support the bill as it is and vote in opposition to this amendment. We only seem, in Congress, to try to nourish things that just will not grow in the marketplace. Now, there is a place for this, but frankly we did not cut funding out entirely. We reduced it at a level where we restored enough money to do the job. Let us give it time to work its will.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate and I feel very strongly that we ought to let the market set the pace for the investments in this country in our energy supply. The real question is whether or not all the amendments that have just been passed that provide tremendous subsidies to the nuclear industry, which have absolutely the single highest cost of electricity that is produced in this country.

It does not seem to me to make a lot of sense that we are going to not provide any research, real primary research, for renewables, but will provide for actual applied research for the nuclear industry. It makes no sense.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman makes a point, but this frankly is not research, what the gentleman is talking about.

All I am saying, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts agrees with me, is that we have not cut out the idea of considering renewables. They are not being cut away.

In fact, the basic research has been done. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is talking about applied research. I would say to my colleague that this is the money that this committee has found to be substantial enough to create what he needs to make his project work. Let the marketplace decide.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I point out to my colleagues that this is a bipartisan amendment and, hopefully, by the time we end debate, that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] from my side of the aisle will be here to help us out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr.

SCHAEFER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, who has been a key ally in this entire fight.

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Chairman, in 1992, the Congress passed the Energy Policy Act by a vote of 363 to 60, and it passed by a Democratic-controlled Congress and was signed into law by a Republican President.

This so-called EPACT 92 demonstrated that Congress could address pressing issues of a national energy policy in a very bipartisan way.

Now, in 1995, we stand at another historic juncture. In January, we passed the balanced budget amendment, which I sponsored, by overwhelming vote and I will continue to fight for a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while our country needs this balanced Federal budget, we also need uninterrupted reliable sources of energy. Such energy supplies will assure our continued economic growth in this country and our national security. Some of these sources of energy include nuclear, fossil fuels, and natural gas.

However, the country also needs to develop a robust capability in the critically important area of solar and renewable energies. And this is not only solar; it is also biomass, it is wind, it is every other type of energy that we can think of, because other type of energy that we can think of, because some day, the whole era of fossil fuels will be gone.

EPACT 92 created a 5-year plan authorizing funding to help demonstrate and commercialize new technologies such as biomass, geothermal, solar and wind energy. As we enter the third year of that 5-year plan, it would be irresponsible now to renege on our Government's commitment.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I urge my colleagues to support the Klug amendment earmarking \$44.8 million of the energy and water bill for the Solar Technology Transfer Program. Even with this amendment, we are talking about a reduction of 31 percent from last year's level.

It is not widely realized that by the beginning of 1994, renewable energy technologies provided over 8 percent of the Nation's domestic energy production, more than doubling the contributions since 1973.

Renewable energy technologies combined are now producing about 7 quads of energy annually. Roughly half is produced from biomass, over 40 percent from hydroelectric, and the balance from the mix of geothermal, wind, and solar resources.

Between 1973 and 1993, renewable electric capacity, including hydropower, grew by over 70 percent, from about 58 megawatts in 1973 to 100 megawatts in 1993. Of this, the renewable technologies that emerged during the late 1970's and 1980's, solar, geothermal, and biomass, grew from 500

megawatts in 1973 to over 10,000 megawatts today; the equivalency of 17 large coal-fired powerplants.

Clearly, renewable energy is becoming an increasingly important component of our national energy policy. I do not believe we should short-circuit this industry's growth by choking its funding.

Some people may ask, well, maybe this is because the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, or NREL, is located in my district, and, yes, it is. I have been out there and I know the work they are doing and it is very important and I think there is much progress being made in this particular area.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into the RECORD two news articles on behalf of this district. The first one details NREL's receipt of the U.S. Small Business Administration's Dwight D. Eisenhower Award for Excellence, while the other describes NREL's winning of the 1995 Federal Design Achievement Award from the National Endowment for the Arts.

I believe this material will help the Members get a better picture of NREL and I submit these articles as part of the RECORD, Mr. Chairman.

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

NATIONAL RENEWABLE ENERGY LABORATORY:
WE EMPOWER AMERICA WITH NEW ENERGY CHOICES

NREL is dedicated to putting clean, renewable energy to work for you.

Our research transforms wind and sunlight into abundant electricity for your home. We're finding ways to turn fast-growing plants into liquid transportation fuels and valuable chemicals. Better buildings, industrial processes, and recycling methods will help you save energy and reduce our nation's dependence on foreign oil.

But making sure that new energy technologies are both practical and affordable is an awesome challenge. At our 300-acre campus in Golden, Colorado, more than 480 scientists conduct research in fields ranging from bio-chemistry to solid-state physics. Many of our specialized laboratories are available for cost-shared research with U.S. companies as they develop new products and services at competitive prices.

We also work with electric utilities, regulatory bodies and state energy offices to make sure that new technologies reach their full potential as quickly as possible.

A national laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy, NREL's diverse research programs include:

Analytic studies—Studying the economic aspects, environmental effects, and policy issues related to energy use.

Biofuels—Finding better ways to turn trees, grasses and agricultural waste into cleaner-burning transportation fuels.

Buildings—Developing new materials and systems to reduce energy use in homes and offices.

Fuel use—Studying the use of alternative fuels in fleets of cars, vans and trucks.

Industrial processes—Finding ways to reduce waste and improve the efficiency of industrial processes.

Photovoltaics—Developing efficient solar cells and modules for converting sunlight to electricity.

Resource Assessment—Studying and measuring renewable resources such as sunlight and wind.

Solar thermal electricity—Developing economical systems for transforming the sun's heat to electricity.

Solar thermal industries—Exploring ways to use solar heat for manufacturing and other industrial processes.

Superconductivity—Pursuing practical, low-cost materials to conduct electricity without loss.

Waste management—Finding ways to recover landfill gas, recycle tires and plastic, and generate power using garbage destined for landfills.

RENEWABLE

Americans have made great strides in conserving energy since the oil embargoes of the 1970s. But our need for energy—especially electricity and transportation fuel—continues to grow by about 3% each year. Renewable resources can help meet this growing need without pollution or dependence on foreign oil.

There's no shortage of renewable resources. For example, the sunlight falling on the United States in just one day contains more than twice the energy Americans consume in an entire year. Strong, steady winds in North Dakota alone could supply about 35% of our nation's electricity needs. Fast-growing plants, geothermal energy and ocean energy are three other renewable resources awaiting the right technologies for harvesting.

We've made a good start. About 8% of our nation's energy now comes from renewable resources, primarily falling water (hydro-power). Continued research by NREL and its industry partners could help increase the contribution of renewables to 30% by the year 2030.

CLEAN

Imagine a world powered by clean energy technologies.

Rows of sleek solar panels gleam in the sun, using semiconductor materials to directly convert light into electricity. Wind turbines spin out power for large cities without the millions of tons of air pollutants emitted by an oil- or coal-fired power plant every year. Solar thermal systems capture the sun's abundant renewable energy to heat water or drive industrial processes.

These are only a few renewable energy technologies at work today. Many more are on the horizon. For example, NREL is exploring ways to use sunlight to clean up contaminated soil and groundwater. We're also developing methods for recycling plastic and making better use of garbage now dumped in landfills.

Our research preserves America's environmental heritage. It can also lead to a more sustainable energy future.

SECURE

Founded in 1977 in response to oil embargoes, NREL is diversifying U.S. energy options in many ways.

One of those ways is finding alternatives to gasoline, much of which is now made from imported petroleum. NREL is working with U.S. companies to squeeze more ethanol from corn kernels and the woody parts of other plants. We also collect data on the performance of alternatively fueled vehicles and share the results with automobile manufacturers.

In addition to fuels research, NREL is strengthening America's energy security with more efficient buildings. Our guidelines for passive solar homes are used by builders and architects throughout the nation to slash typical home energy costs by as much as 90%. We're also developing ways to rate the energy efficiency of buildings.

Renewable energy and energy efficiency not only lessen U.S. dependence on foreign oil—they strengthen the economy as well.

COMPETITIVE

About half of NREL's federal funding returns to the private sector through subcontracts and cost-shared research agreements.

Thanks to this support, U.S. companies now compete in international markets for wind turbines and blades. American-made solar panels are supplying electricity to thousands of Brazilians. And a leading U.S. ceramics producer may soon replace imported ceramic powders with ones made locally.

Wind energy is already cost-competitive in areas with good wind resources, and solar panels are finding hundreds of remote uses throughout the nation. Ultra-efficient appliances, more reliable electronic components, and better adhesives are just a few other products coming your way as the result of NREL's research.

The renewable energy technologies now being developed at NREL can fill every kind of energy need. They're a smart choice for America.

NREL RECEIVES NATIONAL SBA AWARD

GOLDEN, Colo., April 20/PRNewsire/—The Dwight D. Eisenhower Award for Excellence, the national award given annually by the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA), will be presented to the Department of Energy's National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) on May 4 during Small Business Week activities in Washington, D.C.

The Eisenhower award annually recognizes large federal prime contractors that excel in their support of small business. In 1994, NREL awarded more than \$85.5 million in purchases and subcontracts to small companies—about 77 percent of its total procurements. Of this amount, 25 percent went to businesses owned by women or minorities.

NREL Director Dr. Charles F. Gay said the award is especially significant because the laboratory also was named 1994 Corporation of the Year by Minority Enterprises Inc. "This award is a credit to the many outstanding NREL employees who are committed to the success of small businesses," Gay said.

The SBA award recognizes success in guiding entrepreneurs of diverse backgrounds through the complexities of government procurement.

"We are very active in our outreach and mentoring of small, minority and women-owned firms," said Ed Green, NREL's manager of procurement and small-business liaison. "Linking with small businesses is only half the job. The other part is supporting these firms during contract performance to assure mutual success."

In addition to economic support, NREL has spawned 27 spin-off companies. Laboratory facilities and expertise are available to small businesses, and NREL hosts seminars to help those businesses market their products and services.

To be eligible for the Eisenhower award, a federal prime contractor first must win an SBA Award of Distinction. NREL was one of two organizations in the six states of SBA's Region VIII to receive this award in 1993.

The SBA's Office of Government Contracting selected finalists in three categories this year: research and development, service and construction. NREL won the Eisenhower award in the research and development category.

NREL WINS U.S. DESIGN AWARD

[From Jefferson County Transcript, June 16, 1995]

One of the federal government's most energy-efficient buildings was honored with a 1995 Federal Design Achievement Award from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Golden Mayor Marv Kay was on hand for the ceremony that honored regional winners.

The Solar Energy Research Facility, part of the U.S. Department of Energy's National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Denver West Office Park, is one of 77 federal projects honored nationwide for superior architectural design. SERF and the other winners are now in contention for the nation's highest honor—the Presidential Design Award for Excellence, which will be awarded at the White House this fall.

SERF is a state-of-the-art laboratory facility used for advanced photovoltaic solar cell research.

SERF's unique design incorporates energy efficiency features that reduce energy consumption by 30% to 40%. This reduces annual heating, cooling and lighting costs by almost \$200,000. Energy-saving features include the use of daylight to illuminate office areas and corridors.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment of the Committee on Science.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to express my admiration for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG]. Many of the things that he does, I am totally supportive of. In this case I cannot be supportive. He is suggesting in this amendment that we earmark \$44.8 million for the innovative and renewable technologies transfer program.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric today about the importance of developing solar energy. This has nothing to do with the development of solar energy. Zero. In fact, this will hurt the development of solar energy. What we are doing here is we are talking about a transfer program. We are talking about promotion. We are talking about marketing. We are talking about commercialization. We are not talking about research and development. In fact, we are spending \$44 million, if this amendment succeeds, by taking it away from research and development. Some of that money may well come from research and development of solar energy.

Being the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this issue, I know how much money we have had to cut from the budgets of energy and environmental research in this country. The fact is we did everything we could to protect the fundamental research and what we had to do is cut programs that dealt with promotion and marketing and commercialization of which this is the perfect example.

We need to focus the Federal Government effort on research and development, fundamental research and development that cannot be done by the private sector. Fundamental research in solar was protected. In fact, because it is not coming from anywhere, it is just suggested it is going to be a general cut throughout our budget in this area, this could well come from solar energy research and development money. Certainly it is going to come from somewhere. It might come from fundamental research and development in other

type of energies that we need to do research and development on.

Mr. Chairman, what in essence we are doing is taking money away from a budget of research and development that has already been strained to the breaking point. We are taking money away from a budget that has already been strained to the breaking point and we are putting it into marketing and commercialization for specific interests that are involved with pushing these products overseas. I think this is green pork. What we are suggesting here by this amendment is green pork, taking the Federal Government away from its essential role on energy research and development and putting it into promotion.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the gentleman that his own committee is in conflict with the statement that the gentleman just made.

Looking at what has been authorized here, which this money will go toward, it is the Solar Thermal Program to determine the economic viability of dish/Stirling, power tower, and trough systems, it is the concentrated solar energy to break down toxic organic wastes, the development of technologically advanced, higher efficiency wind turbines, the integrated biomass feedstock production. These are all specific programs that were identified by the committee that will be put back in the budget.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, we specifically deauthorized the use of funds for solar technology transfer. What we tried to focus in on at the committee and subcommittee level was direct and solid research and development because that cannot be done by anybody else but the Federal Government.

This indeed is taking the money, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], \$44 million basically from across-the-board cuts to channel it into a program that is aimed at marketing and commercialization.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, the fact is that what we are talking about is what is in the authorization. What we are talking about is whether or not these industries need this kind of basic research in order to be successful.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. But we are not financing basic research. It is promotion. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I might point out one of the reasons we have had such strong bipartisan support on this amendment is we are talking about renewables across the board, including wind. So this amendment cannot be seen as simply a debate about solar technology. That is one reason that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOOR-

HEAD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO], both of whom had a great deal of success in California with wind power, so clearly understand.

Second, if I may make the point to my colleagues that if we are trying to figure out where we are going to get the money to pay for this, might I suggest we apply some of the \$20 million we eliminated yesterday from the nuclear program that 3 to 1 this House agreed was absolutely out of date.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me the time. I very much compliment him on the making of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is really to a very large extent the critical debate that we are going to have out here on the floor. Renewable energy now provides 10 percent of the energy in our country. But it is still in its nascent stage. Whether it be solar voltaic, which has dropped dramatically from upward of 26 cents a kilowatt hour down to 8 or 9 cents a kilowatt hour just over the past decade; wind, which has dropped from 30 cents a kilowatt hour down to 4 or 5 cents a kilowatt hour in the last 10 years, we are seeing dramatic changes in the way in which electricity and energy are generated in this country.

Unfortunately the bill as it is presently constructed still tilts dramatically toward the older technologies. There is \$236 million in this budget for fission technology. This is a 40-year-old technology that is already out in the marketplace with one of the wealthiest industries in the United States, the electric utility industry, perfectly capable of doing all additional research on that technology.

In addition, there is \$230 million in here for fusion technology. Money is here for coal research. Money is here for all kinds of research on the older technologies.

□ 1130

Now, I really would not mind if the committee cut out all the money for solar and all money for wind if they cut out all the money for fusion and fission. I really would not care. Then it would be a fair fight out in the marketplace. I would feel a lot better about it.

But if you are going to continue the subsidies for the mature industries, it is wrong to have a 43-percent cut for the nascent competitors of solar and wind and geothermal and conservation. That is what disturbs me most about this whole debate. It has either got to be one way or the other, an amendment to cut out all subsidies or an amendment to keep comparable subsidies for all the competing energy technologies.

There is a good reason for it. We are so overly dependent upon imported oil. Sixty percent of the oil is imported. If we are going to break our dependence on that, we have to have these domestic, indigenous sources of energy devel-

oped. Those are going to be the renewables. We need ways in which we are going to lower the cost of energy. Only by having competing technologies do we reduce the overall likelihood we are going to see increases in the traditional fossil fuel or nuclear power generated electricity.

We need to reduce the smog in order to reduce the global warming phenomenon, in order to reduce the acid rain problem. These are benign technologies that reduce our need to have more intrusive environmental laws which pass here on the floor of Congress.

So for all of those reasons, the Klug amendment takes us in the right direction.

The history, however, out here on the floor of the House is if it does not glow, it gets no dough. The nuclear budget continues to be enhanced.

The reason we need this is like the fax machine or telephone, while they may have a nascent discovery and application, it takes 20 and 30 years to finally get them to the marketplace. That is what we have found, and that is why I support the Klug amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close the debate please?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. KLUG. Second, Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has 11 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this very sensible amendment.

It is sensible because it does not assume that we will be forever able to draw on our current sources of energy. It is sensible because it would ensure that the Department of Energy has a balanced research portfolio that does not short-change important potential sources of energy. It is sensible because it backs programs in which business and government work together to achieve national goals that would be ignored without these programs. It is sensible because it funds programs that have had bipartisan support. It is sensible because it recognizes that every DOE program must share in budget cuts. And it is sensible because it accomplishes all this without increasing the bottom line of this bill.

Our Nation should not be ignoring renewable energy in the vain hope that fossil fuels will solve our problems forever. This amendment restores needed

funding for renewable energy research—funding for well managed programs that would still be cut by almost one-third if this amendment is passed.

Vote for this amendment and vote for a sensible approach to ensure that this Nation can meet its future energy needs.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who has been a strong champion of renewables and a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

I yield to no Member in my respect for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS]. I have served with them on this subcommittee for 16 years.

During that time, I have been a great advocate of renewable energy, but this bill is \$2 billion less than the President's budget. It is \$1.5 billion less than last year spent in this area of spending, and I understand, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] has indicated, that we are all going to have to absorb reductions. There is no question that all forms of energy research and development will have to take their fair share.

But I stand here today for the first time in opposition to my chairman and ranking member on this matter, because I believe we have taken an inordinately deep cut in renewable spending. A 43-percent cut simply is out of whack with all of the other proposals that have been made to reduce spending. We have simply asked too much of an area that is on the upturn. It is a growing area for exports, an important area of small business in this country.

These are proven performers, technological trend setters. We are not where we were 20 years ago where this is merely an ideological issue. Today renewable energy is part of the energy grid. Utilities across this country are adopting these as low cost alternatives.

We have an opportunity in this amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] to begin to restore some balance to our energy policy.

Now, I have really stood in opposition to all of the cuts in the nuclear fission program, because I truly believe we need a balanced energy policy. We have forgotten the lines at the gas stations. Maybe I have been here too long, folks, but I think many of us have forgotten in our desire to find areas to cut that there is a potential for an energy crisis again. It is out there ahead of us. We are almost at 60 percent reliance on imported fuel from the Middle East and other parts of the world.

This Congress has got to keep in mind that we are headed in the wrong direction, and this amendment makes a modest step back toward the right direction.

I ask for its support.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I think we have heard a lot of talk about how we are not supposed to pick winners and losers in the Congress of the United States.

This is a blatant attempt to pick a winner, and the winner is the nuclear industry. We are cutting 31 percent of the renewable energy budget in this bill.

This attempt by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and others is to attempt to put a few dollars back into a budget that has already gutted renewable energy supplies of this country. Why do we not recognize that it is the nuclear industry who has single-handedly raised the cost of electricity for the ordinary citizen of this country and we still have not taken into account how we are going to get rid of the nuclear waste?

This is an energy supply that is clean. It is an energy supply that is renewable. It will enable us to gain some independence from the foreign creditors that are breathing down our necks. Let us say to OPECers, let us say to the rest of the world that wants to continue our dependence on foreign oil that we are sick and tired of it, that we are going to develop our own independent energy sources, and if we need government assistance to develop those new sources, we are going to put the money in and break the dependence on the big nuclear industry and our foreign traders.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], who has a new idea now, a new thought.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to point out again we are hearing over and over again that this is in some way juxtaposing some new type of energy research with solar energy research. This debate has nothing to do with the research and development policies on solar energy or any other kind of energy except for the fact that it will take money from research and development programs across the board in energy, some of which are renewable, I might add, and take that research and development money and take and put it into a transfer program, a program that is totally designed for promotion, marketing, and commercialization.

I think our Members should also be aware that the prime beneficiary of the \$44 million that is being taken out of energy research and development and put into this promotion marketing commercialization effort, the prime beneficiary is not an American company but a German company, a German company, called Siemens Co., which is the leader, yes, in this type of technology, but we will be providing them funds to help them with the promotion of solar energy.

Now, this is not, again, this gentleman, by the way, took great pains

during the authorization process to see that solar energy research and development was protected.

I happen to believe that is a very probable and potential source, a good source, of energy in the future if it is developed. We, in fact, by the way, let me also add that we also made sure that there were major cuts in fusion and nuclear energy programs.

I have become the target of nuclear energy people across the country who are as mad as hell that I have cut, that DANA ROHRABACHER has cut their budget for research and development in the nuclear area.

The fact is we have tried to maintain a balanced research and development program.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The fact of the matter is there is a 43 percent cut in this bill by solar and renewable energies and a 13 percent in nuclear.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Not in research and development, only in promotion, which is what this bill deals with.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Klug amendment to restore funding for renewable energy programs in the Department of Energy.

Like my constituents in Connecticut, I believe that no Federal program should be spared from reductions. But fiscal responsibility doesn't mean cutting everything without regard to its value; it means making priorities for our scarce dollars.

Energy-efficient technology opens markets abroad and creates jobs at home, and it must be one of our highest priorities.

As a manufacturer of wind energy equipment in my State puts it, "Renewable energy is an investment into the economic and environmental future of the country."

I urge a "yes" vote on the Klug amendment.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I commend him for his efforts to shift the priorities in this bill in the right direction.

This is not about an increase. It is about choices. It is about energy independence, about sustainable economic growth.

Yes, the solar and renewable accounts do, to a great degree, go to applied research and even to technology transfer. Yes, private industry may not find it profitable enough, quick enough, to go it alone. But that is just another way of saying that the marketplace does not work perfectly. It does not account well for the external

costs of the current dominance of fossil fuel sources, and it does not account well for the external benefits in terms of energy independence, jobs, balance of payments, and the avoidance of environmental costs.

This is exactly the kind of situation, therefore, in which some modest government program of R&D assistance, to bridge the gap in a marketplace that is too preoccupied with an immediate payoff, is entirely appropriate.

I commend the gentleman for his amendment, and urge my colleagues' support.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me make several points in closing, if I could.

First of all, let me reiterate to my colleague what the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] said, that fundamentally we made a decision in this Congress just 3 years ago that we would make an important transition from an era of fossil fuel to an era that included Federal funding for new emerging renewable technologies. That was just 3 years ago.

And the choice now is as I think a number of my colleagues on the other side, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] have pointed out, here we find a situation where this bill continues to fund substantial amounts of money for coal research which we have been doing for 60 years, nuclear research which we have been doing for 40 years, and while it is true those programs are cut, they are not cut as dramatically as the renewable program under the markup we now find ourselves in from the committee.

Finally, again, if I could say this one more time, this is not a vote about solar. This is a vote about renewables. That includes wind. It includes other technologies as well as solar technology.

And finally, to primarily my Republican colleagues, let me assure them this does not add to the deficit. This is simply shifting money around and trying to reestablish a priority in this Congress that the American public overwhelmingly supports and this Congress overwhelmingly supported just 3 years ago.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has long been a supporter of the renewables, including solar, wind, geothermal, everything. We have long been a supporter.

But no item, no appropriation in this budget has increased as much as solar has. Solar alone, not all the other renewables, just solar, since 1991, in the last 5 years, this committee has increased the appropriations for solar research, including what we even cut out here this year, by 93 percent. Name any other item we have in our bill other

than waste management and environmental cleanup that we have increased that much. None have we increased as much as we have solar.

This committee this year heard a lot about corporate welfare and how often we heard it yesterday about the reactor, "Oh, this is corporate welfare. We are helping some utility some place or General Electric or Westinghouse build a reactor," for our country, hopefully, someday or someplace overseas that we might be able to sell one. Call that corporate welfare.

So our committee this year got to examining just where are the solar dollars going. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] hit it right on the head. We found that much of the solar research really was not going into research. It is not going into solar panels. It is not going into wind research for better windmills, even though we have a lot of windmills in California, farms of them out there. Some have been closed down; we even built several around the country we have had to close down because of the environment.

So this committee examined these very closely this year and realized we were not getting the bang for the taxpayers' buck in solar. We still support solar, but we have to draw the line.

It has been said here this morning that we are cutting research. We are not cutting research. What we took out of this bill is not as the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, making jobs for the United States. Making jobs for Germany is one example because what we took out, what we reduced this year, primarily we eliminate the solar international marketing program, solar international marketing program, solar technology transfer. We're paying some company this year to put up solar panels on the roof, technology transfer, or energy storage systems. We have been long trying to build a solar battery. We have been working on that for quite some time; not much success; maybe some day we will have it. We have not closed the door on it, but we just found this year that we had to make some choices. We found that 50 percent of the budget request is for cost-sharing arrangements with industry, 50 percent. We did not cut it 50 percent; we left some of it in, but we cut those big programs. The limited resources we have we decided should not be used in corporate welfare, but be directed toward basic science and research programs.

So, if you adopt this amendment, of \$44 million, almost \$45 million, it will reduce funding for all the other research that is being done around over the country, other research for renewables which are so vitally needed. What we are cutting out, what is unnecessary, is paying companies to try to use solar. This is all we are doing.

We are cutting out corporate welfare. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a "no" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 214, noes 208, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

AYES—214

Abercrombie	Green	Pallone
Ackerman	Gunderson	Pastor
Allard	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Baessler	Hall (OH)	Payne (VA)
Baldacci	Hamilton	Pelosi
Barcia	Hancock	Peterson (FL)
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett	Hastings (FL)	Petri
Becerra	Hefley	Pombo
Beilenson	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Bentsen	Hinchev	Portman
Bereuter	Hoekstra	Poshard
Berman	Horn	Rahall
Bilirakis	Houghton	Ramstad
Bishop	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Blute	Jacobs	Reed
Boehlert	Jefferson	Richardson
Bonior	Johnson (CT)	Rivers
Borski	Johnson (SD)	Roberts
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Brewster	Johnston	Roth
Browder	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brown (CA)	Kelly	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Bryant (TX)	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Camp	Kennelly	Sawyer
Cardin	Kildee	Schaefer
Clay	Kim	Schroeder
Clayton	Klecicka	Schumer
Clement	Klug	Scott
Clyburn	LaFalce	Sensenbrenner
Coleman	Lantos	Serrano
Collins (IL)	Leach	Shays
Condit	Levin	Skaggs
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Costello	Lincoln	Smith (NJ)
de la Garza	Lipinski	Spratt
Deal	Lowe	Stark
DeFazio	Luther	Stenholm
DeLauro	Maloney	Studds
Dellums	Manton	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	Markey	Tejeda
Dicks	Martinez	Thomas
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson
Dixon	McCarthy	Thornton
Doggett	McDermott	Thurman
Dooley	McHale	Torkildsen
Dunn	McKinney	Torres
Durbin	McNulty	Torricelli
Edwards	Meehan	Towns
Engel	Meek	Tucker
Ensign	Menendez	Upton
Eshoo	Metcalf	Velazquez
Evans	Meyers	Vento
Farr	Mfume	Volkmer
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Vucanovich
Fazio	Mineta	Waldholtz
Filner	Minge	Ward
Flake	Mink	Waters
Flanagan	Moorhead	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Moran	Watts (OK)
Ford	Morella	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Weldon (PA)
Franks (CT)	Neal	Williams
Furse	Neumann	Wise
Gejdenson	Nussle	Woolsey
Gephardt	Oberstar	Wyden
Geren	Obey	Wynn
Gillmor	Olver	Yates
Gilman	Ortiz	Zimmer
Goodling	Orton	
Gordon	Owens	

NOES—208

Archer	Bass	Bryant (TN)
Armey	Bateman	Bunn
Bachus	Bevill	Bunning
Baker (CA)	Bilbray	Burr
Baker (LA)	Bilely	Burton
Ballenger	Boehner	Buyer
Barr	Bonilla	Callahan
Barrett (NE)	Bono	Calvert
Barton	Brownback	Canady

Castle	Hastings (WA)	Packard
Chabot	Hayes	Parker
Chambliss	Hayworth	Paxon
Chapman	Heineman	Pickett
Chenoweth	Herger	Porter
Christensen	Hilleary	Pryce
Chrysler	Hobson	Quillen
Clinger	Hoke	Quinn
Coble	Holden	Radanovich
Coburn	Hostettler	Regula
Collins (GA)	Hoyer	Riggs
Combest	Hunter	Rogers
Cooley	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Cox	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Coyne	Inglis	Rose
Cramer	Istook	Roukema
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Crapo	Jones	Salmon
Cremeans	Kanjorski	Sanford
Cubin	Kasich	Saxton
Cunningham	King	Scarborough
Danner	Kingston	Schiff
Davis	Klink	Seastrand
DeLay	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Shaw
Dickey	LaHood	Shuster
Doolittle	Largent	Sisisky
Dornan	Latham	Skeen
Doyle	LaTourette	Skelton
Dreier	Laughlin	Smith (MI)
Duncan	Lazio	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Smith (WA)
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Emerson	Lightfoot	Souder
English	Linder	Spence
Everett	Livingston	Stearns
Ewing	LoBiondo	Stump
Fawell	Lofgren	Stupak
Fields (LA)	Lucas	Talent
Fields (TX)	Manzullo	Tanner
Foley	Martini	Tate
Forbes	Mascara	Taylor (NC)
Fowler	McCollum	Thornberry
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Tiahrt
Frelinghuysen	McDade	Trafficant
Frisa	McHugh	Visclosky
Funderburk	McInnis	Walker
Galleghy	McIntosh	Walsh
Ganske	McKeon	Wamp
Gekas	Mica	Weldon (FL)
Gibbons	Miller (FL)	Weller
Gilchrest	Molinari	White
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Whitfield
Goodlatte	Montgomery	Wicker
Goss	Murtha	Wilson
Graham	Myers	Wolf
Greenwood	Myrick	Young (AK)
Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Young (FL)
Hall (TX)	Ney	Zeliff
Hansen	Norwood	
Hastert	Oxley	

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews	Frost	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Hefner	Stockman
Collins (MI)	Longley	Stokes
Fox	Moakley	Tauzin

□ 1210

Messrs. CHRISTENSEN, COYNE, EWING, LIVINGSTON, HOLDEN, SOUDER, KINGSTON, HILLEARY, EHRLICH, SCHIFF, and PORTER, and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Messrs. THOMPSON, POMBO, RAHALL, SCHUMER, FATTAH, POMEROY, GENE GREEN of Texas, YATES, and KIM changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, numbered 38.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 18, strike lines 8 through 20.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree to some limitation on time?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I am going to be withdrawing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I will be withdrawing this amendment, which would reduce by \$3.2 billion in fiscal year 1996 funding for the nuclear weapons activities of the U.S. Department of Energy. Instead, I will be offering an amendment to the fiscal year 1996 defense appropriations bill, which in fact will take a bigger bite out of wasteful Federal spending for unneeded unclear weaponry.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is absurd for this country to keep producing and deploying huge amounts of nuclear weaponry, and ignore the fact that the cold war is over. This mindless spending costs the American taxpayer over \$30 billion a year.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this country has many, many problems. We have people sleeping out on the street; we have children who are hungry; we have elderly people who cannot afford their prescription drugs; we have millions of middle-class families who cannot afford to send their kids to college; we have 30 million people who cannot afford health insurance. We have many problems, but one problem we do not have is a lack of nuclear weaponry.

It may be of esoteric interest to some scientists as to how many times over we can destroy humanity, whether it is 100 times over or 50 times over, through the use of nuclear weapons. That may be of interest to some people, but it really is not one of the pressing problems that this country has right now.

The cold war is over. We should not be spending \$30 billion a year on nuclear weaponry, \$300 billion a year over a 10-year period.

□ 1215

Mr. Chairman, we have some 20,000 nuclear warheads in our Nation's arsenal. That seems to me to be enough.

Mr. Chairman, I am withdrawing this amendment today but will be bringing it back in a more appropriate fashion through the Department of Defense appropriation. I believe very strongly that we must get our priorities right. We do not need more money on nuclear weaponry when we are cutting program after program that tens of millions of middle-income and working-class Americans depend upon. I look forward to the support of my colleagues when this amendment resurfaces in the Department of Defense appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WARD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WARD: On Page 16, line 1, insert "(less \$1,000,000)" before "to remain".

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes equally divided.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman be willing to amend that to 12 minutes?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request is for 12 minutes, 6 minutes on each side, time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] will be recognized for 6 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 6 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

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

My amendment seeks to strike a special earmark in this bill for sonoluminescence. Sonoluminescence is the act of bombarding water with sound waves which excites air bubbles to flash light. This is a legitimate course of study. There is no question of that. But neither the Energy Department nor any of the energy labs in this country have requested money for this program. This is a special earmark.

I would hasten to point out, though, that the gentleman from California who has earmarked this money in the budget does not have this in his district. This is not something that the gentleman from California has done for someone in his district. The gentleman and I have talked about this. I want to hasten to make sure that there is no question in any Member's mind that this is a piece of pork in his district. This is not.

What it is is a reasonable disagreement about how we should be spending our science research dollars. I feel that we should not earmark \$1 million when the Department of Energy has not asked for the money, when the lab that is doing the work has not asked for the money, when, in fact, a former director of that lab has been quoted, and this is from Science Magazine, December of last year, the last 6 months, the former director of this lab was quoted as saying that it was highly improbable that

researchers can achieve the desired results from this money.

There was no evidence presented at any hearing with respect to this million dollars. There was report language added, but in the subcommittee on which I serve there was never a discussion, a public hearing back and forth on this issue.

What I feel we need to do today, my colleagues, is to strike \$1 million to show that we are not going to micromanage America's science programs by spending this earmarked \$1 million.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to talk about fundamental basic research, which is supposed to be the purpose of my subcommittee and the purpose of the Committee on Science. There are some things that cannot get done in the private sector and that is what we try to do in Government. The fact is that this is a program that has nothing to do with my district. In fact, it has nothing to do, I do not know anyone as an individual, there is no friend of mine on this project. It is something that came to my attention from other scientists who suggested it was a good idea, and it was something that was an example of how huge programs that we have, in fusion and all these other mega programs that we spend billions of dollars on, crowd out the small research programs that have a high potential but never get the money because they do not have lobbyists, they do not have any of the big guys behind them.

This program is aimed at achieving a modest amount of fusion energy from a very modest, a \$2 million investment over 2 years, research program. It is the first year of the program, so we are asking for \$1 million this year and, after 2 years, we will know whether or not this potential research program is viable. But this is exactly the kind of program the Federal Government should be doing.

It is pure research. It is not one of these mega bureaucracies where the money goes into administration. In fact, if the Ward amendment is successful and this money is then cut out from going to this program, the money will likely be channeled directly into one of these mega programs. It might be paying for the office of public relations for one of those programs instead of research and development.

This is scientific research, earmarked by the way. There is nothing wrong with an earmark in the sense that this is, if it is peer reviewed, and this is a peer-reviewed, competitive program, we are not asking for this money to be given to just any company or any laboratory. And the fact that it is an earmark does not make it wrong.

We had the debate in the subcommittee. In fact, this is very similar to the earmarking that is for coal research, which I know the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] is very in favor of.

So I would ask my colleagues to support this fundamental research program that deserves it. We have the support of many scientists: Dr. Seth Putterman of UCLA, Dr. Kenneth Suslick of the University of Illinois, and Dr. William Moss at Lawrence Livermore. These are men that are pre-eminent in their field. They think it is a worthwhile program. I think that these are just the type of things the Federal Government should do. I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK].

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage my distinguished colleague from California, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment.

This is a wonderful project. The gentleman knows it will go to Livermore, CA, and shooting light on these bubbles will cause a lot of wonderful things. Do you know what else they make in Livermore, CA?

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

Mr. STARK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Lawrence Livermore happens to be the laboratory that develops a lot of types of energy.

Mr. STARK. It is right in the center, reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, of the finest champagne country in the world. What this will do is irradiate that champagne that comes from California, much to the disadvantage of New York, where they do not make such very good champagne.

I understand that the gentleman, and Texas has a problem with it, too. The gentleman from Wisconsin supports this amendment because the bubbles in beer will be irradiated and that will put the gentleman from Missouri at a disadvantage. So that I want to say that if you want to waste \$1 million trying to make California champagne better, which you cannot do, then we welcome this money. But if you really think that there is a place for \$1 million and fewer bubbles or better beer, we could spend that money elsewhere.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I take it that this is tongue in cheek? I just would like my colleagues to know that.

Mr. STARK. This is bubbles in a bottle, shining a little light on the bubbles for California champagne is certainly worth \$1 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If it produces energy for the American people.

Mr. STARK. Enough energy to blow those corks right out on New Year's Eve.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK]. Of course, I would mention to him this is the first time I have risen to offer an amendment on the floor, and he should not scare me that way.

Two quick points, in response to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER]. The million dollars will go back to the treasury. It is being taken completely out of the budget of the Energy Department.

Second, if the Department of Energy feels that this research is important and they have in the past expended money on this research, in fact since 1934, there has been research going on in this field, they will have the opportunity and certainly have the wherewithal to make these kinds of expenditures.

Remember, this is the Department of Energy energy lab. I think that answers those points.

As I said, this is my first time standing to offer an amendment.

I will close by saying that we need to show that we can give \$1 million back to the treasury when it has been earmarked in a legislative committee without a hearing, without a public discussion, on the subcommittee on which I serve. We need to show that we are not going to micromanage every million dollars spent by the Department of Energy, and we need to do it today. Please support the Ward amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the committee appreciates the cooperation by the gentleman from Kentucky as a beginner. In Kentucky we do not call them "beginners," we call them "maidens."

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak nor did I know until the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] just informed me that this project was indeed to be done at one of the laboratories, whether it is Livermore or one of the defense laboratories. I have never heard so much smoke and mirrors, let alone bubbles on this debate.

First of all, this was in the bill. The bill had a hearing. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD] was there. But he did not bring this amendment up, nor did he discuss this project. So do not say this is some secret earmark that some scientist dreamed up to pork it up. And he was very kind in his remarks to exclude pork in this. But there is no reason to go after a basic science program, \$1 million, yet, when it has had a hearing and it went through the process and nobody said "bubble" during that hearing.

So now we use the word "earmark." Well, this is an earmark. If this is such

a tremendous earmark, why are not the lobbyists here saying, we have to have this; this is for fossil fuel? Or we have to have this; this is for wind?

This is basic research and we ought to be doing more of it and not less. This is also to improve and give us an alternative to the various fusion programs that everybody is taking pot shots at here on the floor.

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

Mr. BAKER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

□ 1230

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, on the point of this coming before the committee, it was as part of 60 pages of report language that I did not see prior to the time we sat down to discuss the bill.

Mr. BAKER of California. I will excuse the gentleman, then, but I think it is frivolous to bring it up on the floor, to say that out of the 60 pages, this is the one project that the gentleman would like to eliminate.

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

Mr. BAKER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, is this the same type of basic research as why the fly lands on the ceiling and not on the wall?

Mr. BAKER of California. This is the same kind of skepticism that says we cannot balance our budget. We can. This is good basic science. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 276, noes 141, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

AYES—276

Abercrombie	Browder	Conyers
Ackerman	Brown (CA)	Costello
Allard	Brown (FL)	Coyne
Archer	Bryant (TX)	Cramer
Baesler	Callahan	Creameans
Baker (LA)	Camp	Cunningham
Baldacci	Canady	Danner
Barcia	Cardin	de la Garza
Barrett (WI)	Chabot	DeFazio
Barton	Chapman	DeLauro
Bass	Christensen	Dellums
Becerra	Chrysler	Deutsch
Beilenson	Clay	Dickey
Bentsen	Clayton	Dicks
Berman	Clement	Dingell
Bevill	Clyburn	Dixon
Bishop	Coleman	Doggett
Blute	Collins (GA)	Dooley
Bonior	Collins (IL)	Doyle
Borski	Collins (MI)	Duncan
Brewster	Condit	Dunn

Durbin	Klink
Edwards	LaFalce
Ehrlich	LaHood
Engel	Lantos
English	Largent
Ensign	Latham
Eshoo	LaTourette
Evans	Leach
Farr	Levin
Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Fazio	Lincoln
Fields (LA)	Lipinski
Fields (TX)	LoBiondo
Filner	Lowey
Flake	Luther
Flanagan	Maloney
Foglietta	Manton
Foley	Manzullo
Ford	Markey
Fowler	Martinez
Frank (MA)	Martini
Franks (NJ)	Mascara
Furse	Matsui
Ganske	McCarthy
Gejdenson	McCrery
Gephardt	McDermott
Gerens	McHale
Gibbons	McInnis
Gilchrest	McIntosh
Gonzalez	McKinney
Goodlatte	McNulty
Goodling	Meehan
Gordon	Meek
Goss	Menendez
Green	Metcalf
Gunderson	Meyers
Gutierrez	Mfume
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)
Hamilton	Mineta
Hancock	Minge
Harman	Mink
Hastings (FL)	Montgomery
Hefley	Moran
Hilliard	Murtha
Hinchey	Myrick
Hobson	Nadler
Hoekstra	Neal
Holden	Neumann
Horn	Oberstar
Hoyer	Obey
Hutchinson	Olver
Hyde	Orton
Inglis	Owens
Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Jacobs	Parker
Jefferson	Pastor
Johnson (CT)	Payne (NJ)
Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Johnston	Peterson (FL)
Jones	Peterson (MN)
Kanjorski	Petri
Kaptur	Pickett
Kasich	Pomeroy
Kennedy (MA)	Porter
Kennedy (RI)	Portman
Kennelly	Poshard
Kildee	Rahall
Kingston	Ramstad
Kleckza	Rangel

NOES—141

Armedy	Chambliss
Bachus	Chenoweth
Baker (CA)	Clinger
Ballenger	Coble
Barr	Combest
Barrett (NE)	Cooley
Bartlett	Cox
Bateman	Crane
Bereuter	Crapo
Bilbray	Cubin
Bilirakis	Davis
Billey	Deal
Boehlert	DeLay
Boehner	Diaz-Balart
Bonilla	Doolittle
Bono	Dornan
Boucher	Dreier
Brownback	Ehlers
Bryant (TN)	Emerson
Bunn	Everett
Bunning	Ewing
Burr	Fawell
Burton	Forbes
Buyer	Franks (CT)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen
Castle	Frisa

Reed	Laughlin
Regula	Lazio
Richardson	Lewis (CA)
Riggs	Lewis (KY)
Rivers	Lightfoot
Roemer	Linder
Ros-Lehtinen	Livingston
Rose	Lofgren
Roukema	Lucas
Roybal-Allard	McCollum
Royce	McDade
Rush	McHugh
Sabo	Mica
Salmon	Molinari
Sanders	Mollohan
Sanford	Morella
Sawyer	Myers
Saxton	Nethercutt
Schroeder	Ney
Schumer	Norwood
Scott	Nussle
Sensenbrenner	
Serrano	
Shaw	
Shays	
Sisisky	
Skaggs	
Skelton	
Slaughter	
Smith (WA)	
Spratt	
Stark	
Stearns	
Stenholm	
Stokes	
Studds	
Stupak	
Tanner	
Tate	
Taylor (MS)	
Tejeda	
Thompson	
Thornton	
Thurman	
Torkildsen	
Torres	
Torricelli	
Towns	
Traficant	
Tucker	
Upton	
Velazquez	
Vento	
Visclosky	
Volkmeyer	
Waldholtz	
Ward	
Waters	
Watt (NC)	
Waxman	
White	
Whitfield	
Wilson	
Wise	
Wolf	
Woolsey	
Wyden	
Wynn	
Yates	
Young (FL)	
Zimmer	

Oxley	Solomon
Packard	Souder
Paxon	Spence
Pombo	Stump
Pryce	Talent
Quillen	Taylor (NC)
Quinn	Thomas
Radanovich	Thornberry
Roberts	Tiahrt
Rogers	Vucanovich
Roth	Walker
Scarborough	Walsh
Schaefer	Wamp
Schiff	Watts (OK)
Seastrand	Weldon (FL)
Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Shuster	Weller
Skeen	Wicker
Smith (MI)	Williams
Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Smith (TX)	Zeliff

NOT VOTING—17

Andrews	Hefner	Ortiz
Brown (OH)	Istook	Reynolds
Coburn	Longley	Rohrabacher
Fox	McKeon	Stockman
Frost	Moakley	Tauzin
Hayes	Moorhead	

□ 1250

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Frost for, with Mr. McKeon against.

Messrs. MICA, KIM, and WALSH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ALLARD, McDERMOTT, HOBSON, PORTER, CHRISTENSEN, HALL of Texas, CHRYSLER, CONDIT, COLLINS of Georgia, and JONES changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike that last word. I would like to take this opportunity to engage in a brief colloquy with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the chairman of the subcommittee, to clarify the intent of the subcommittee to appropriate \$150,000 to fund the Corps of Engineers' study for a 9.1-mile section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway in Palm Beach County, FL.

I am very pleased that the subcommittee made the decision to fund this study, but due to the unique circumstances regarding this project, I believe it is necessary to clarify the congressional intent on how the Corps should proceed with this study.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. The gentleman has accurately portrayed this. We put it in the report accompanying H.R. 1905 and it directs the Corps of Engineers to do a reconnaissance study as to the waterway.

Mr. SHAW. That is correct. However, the traditional definition of a reconnaissance study is not adequate to describe the focus that is needed by the Corps to study this portion of the Intracoastal Waterway.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further, no question about it. This thing has been studied to death. And there are a lot of projects like this. And the authorization goes

back to 1945. So we will be pushing, helping the gentleman clear this up.

Mr. SHAW. The chairman is absolutely correct. It was on March 2, 1945, that the Congress authorized the channel depth in this area of the Intra-coastal Waterway to be 12 feet deep; however, over the years it was only dredged to 10 feet.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. It is my understanding that because the project has already been authorized by the Corps, all that is necessary is a narrowly refocused reevaluation study to determine the economic viability at this time, and the \$150,000 appropriation can be used for this purpose.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman very much for allowing me to discuss this project with him to clarify that it is the congressional intent that this \$150,000 appropriation be used for a reevaluation study.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER: Page 16, Line 1 insert "(less \$8,000,000)" before "to remain".

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike \$8 million from the legislation, from the appropriation, in order to remove the funds for the conceptual design and for the spallation source conceptual design at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory proposed there for Oak Ridge.

After the cancellation of the advanced neutron source, which we canceled out, the Department proposed ANS-lite, the spallation source, to provide work at Oak Ridge for the scientists whom DOE had promised the ANS.

It appears to me, when we look at this program, even though there may be some worthwhile end results if the project is carried out, at this time when we have the budgetary restraints that we have, I think we need to review these types of projects before they actually get started and say, now, is this really where we want to put our money and how much is it going to eventually cost and where are we going to get the money from to fully fund it, all the way down the road to carry out this project?

I am sure that nobody wants to sit here and start a project and then 2 years from now or 3 years from now when you have gone down that road and spent so much money, find out, hey, it is going to cost too much. That is exactly what ANS is all about, the advanced neutron source. That is what we did.

Should we do it again? I say no. I would say that we should not do it again. I really do not believe that we should use taxpayers' money to keep

Federal employees, even though they may be real good scientists, some of them our best scientists, and other ancillary employees that assist them and work there, that we should be spending money to come up with scientific projects because their project which they thought they would be working on got canceled.

I believe that just like when we have base closings, just like when we cut back on USDA employees, everywhere else, that those Federal employees have to suffer like everybody else is going to have to suffer under these budgetary times.

The second thing I would like to point out is that it is projected that even though we may be just starting out with a design stage, \$8 million for design, that it is projected that the total cost of this by the time you get through with construction and everything is going to be around \$1 billion. It is \$1 billion out of this budget, out of this appropriation. That has to come from somewhere, folks. Is it going to come from other research projects? Is it going to come from renewable resources? We just had a vote on that. That committee has already cut back. They did not like that amendment. Does it mean further cuts in those projects, in those type of programs, in that type of research? It is going to mean cuts somewhere in order to have a research program that is questionable as to whether we actually have to do it.

The other thing that really concerned me about this, it is supposedly because the ANS project was being done at Oak Ridge, that Oak Ridge is going to end up with this, too, even though there is no question about it that Los Alamos is a lot better equipped to do this if you are going to do it.

Why did the DOE not decide to let the various laboratories bid on it just like they do other projects? Why did they not say, let's open it up, let's have a bid on it, and let the various laboratories decide which one would do it. Oh, no.

The reason is, and I will go back to it, the reason is, it is a jobs program. It is a \$1 billion jobs program from Oak Ridge, TN. They do not want their scientists to be unemployed.

I have a whole bunch of people out there, folks, that are not working. I have a whole bunch of them. If they are going to do this for scientists who make \$100, \$150,000, \$200,000, \$75,000—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VOLKMER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, if we are going to do this in order to keep these scientists on the payroll rather than telling them that, "Sorry, we're not going to do this, we're not going to expend this money to keep you on the payroll," we are going to keep them on

the payroll, why do we not say, "We're going to help the other poor people with school lunches, we're not going to cut back on Medicare for our senior citizens"?

No, no. No, no. It appears that right now they would much rather pay high-priced scientists to keep them on the payroll than it would be for other people in this country. I do not think that that is a very good idea. I never have.

□ 1300

I have said the same thing when it comes to military procurement; if we do not need a certain airplane or we do not need submarines or aircraft carriers anymore, I do not think we should keep shipyards in business. I do not think we should keep aircraft manufacturers in business just to keep people on the payroll.

But that is what this project does is keep people on the payroll down at Oak Ridge rather than say to them, "No, you are going to have to go find a job elsewhere."

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand the proper intent of our colleague and friend from Missouri to save money and try to help us with this patriotic challenge to balance the Federal budget.

I tell you, we are at a critical time right now with this issue on this floor of the U.S. House of Representatives as we move forward to not make dramatic mistakes in this country. We have got to separate good sense from nonsense, and I will tell you right now, to say that scientific investment in basic research that will not be accomplished by the private sector, we know that anyone that knows, and I am not a scientist but I understand, and I know a lot of real good scientists, and I do represent Oak Ridge, TN, and I am proud some of the finest scientists in the world Nobel Prize winners, like Dr. Cliff Shull, in neutron science, are in Oak Ridge, TN.

I take great disagreement with the gentleman from Missouri in what he called a jobs program. This is about research in the areas of pharmaceuticals electronic materials, metallurgy, ceramics, chemistry, biology, superconductivity, condensed matter, physics, and let me walk you through briefly where we have been on this issue.

The advanced neutron sources was a major project. It was what President Reagan would call throwing the ball deep on staying ahead of the rest of the world with respect to research and technology. It was too expensive, sir. Maybe \$3 billion, if it would have been built, a lot of money. It was also a nuclear-based, reactor-based project.

We had a nonproliferation problem that we were going to have to address with the reactor-based neutron project. This new project is an accelerator-based project, not a nuclear reactor-based project.

So you do not have the waste problem to deal with, and you have far less expense.

But here is the critical issue: We in the new Republican majority are trying to make statements about basic research versus applied technology, separating the role of the private sector from the critical need for the Federal Government of the United States of America to continue making basic investments so that we stay competitive globally, so we can, sir, save lives, and I mean that.

When you are talking neutron science, you are talking about potential cures for severe medical problems, major breakthroughs.

So, here, are we going to be just absolute libertarians that the Federal Government should even barely exist or not exist at all, or are we going to say in a very conservative budget balancing, stand firm in your conviction, so that the Federal Government has a legitimate role in certain key areas, and that is basic research? And this is at the most basic level, sir, a very good investment, and this is not particularly where this facility is going to be built. We have not selected where the neutron source is going to be built.

This is where the design is going to take place, and this is \$8 million. Last year's budget for the ANS was \$20 million. We are retreating from that because this is a time of belt tightening and budget restraint. We are doing that.

But we have got to continue the design in this direction so that we are prepared if this Congress makes the decision next year and the year after and the year after to go forward with the construction of this project to say this is where it should go.

I would respectfully disagree, strongly, that Los Alamos is the place for this project because we have been working on this project in Oak Ridge since the inception of neutron science.

Our national competitiveness is at stake. This project warrants our support. It is a small amount of money, and if we in this fever, and I am glad that the fever pitch is here, to balance the budget and cut spending, but this is where I will guarantee you this Congress is going too far if we just say let us just discontinue funding in all of our basic research efforts in science and technology in this country. We will live to regret this if we go forward with killing this initial design money.

The scientists and the technological community agree, including the leaders of the University of Missouri, where our sponsor of this bill hails, support this project.

I clearly believe we need to defeat the Volkmer amendment and stand up for the basic research that this Federal Government can do well.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very discouraging day in the House. I have

watched peer review science being just put aside by this House in almost a mindless cannibalism of basic science programs. That is a very, very disturbing kind of thing.

If this country is going to move in important ways into the next century, the thing we need is new discovery and new knowledge. This Congress, on this floor today, is putting aside our commitment to the new discovery and that new knowledge, and we are doing so in almost a gleeful way. It is almost fun; you know. "Here is a project that I do not understand the title of, so it cannot be worth anything. Let us just throw it away." And that is exactly what is happening out here today.

It is very discouraging because if this country is going to lead in the global economy, we had better be able to produce the new products of the future.

The gentleman from Missouri a few minutes ago talked about jobs. Where in the world does he think jobs are going to come from if we do not develop the new knowledge and new discoveries that make it possible to create those jobs? I mean maybe he thinks we can be a nation of hamburger flippers and so on that has no economic base to compete in the global economy. Maybe he thinks that is where we are going to find those jobs.

But this amendment, this amendment suggests we are going to go even further down the pike than we have gone before in terms of wiping out the commitment this Government and this Nation should have to basic science.

Now, I am the first to admit this is money we have spent in the name of science over the past years that has not been very good investment, and we ought to take care of that and we ought to make certain we prioritize science.

What we have said, as we prioritize, is that basic science ought to be our goal. This amendment goes after a core basic science program.

Let me tell you what the payoff could be in terms of jobs: Neutrons are an indispensable tool for research in nearly all areas of physics, chemistry, biology, health and materials. Much of the research using neutrons is important to fulfilling the scientific and technological missions of the Department of Energy and will have large technological and economic payoffs, particularly in fields like polymer technology, hydrogen-containing materials, high-temperature superconductors, and the structural studies of catalytic and biological materials. I cannot think of a thing more important in terms of this Nation in terms of developing products of the future and communication skills than to have high-temperature superconductors.

This is the underlying research we are talking about here to doing high-temperature superconductivity, and the gentleman wants to wipe it out, do away with it. I cannot imagine why that makes sense.

The fruits of neutron research will impact the development of new prod-

ucts such as high-tech plastics that are lighter and stronger, that are lighter and stronger than steel. It will allow us to build new generations of silicon chips for electronics. It means better computer disks and video tapes. It means better pharmaceuticals. It means high-performance magnets for motors, and transformers. Those are the things that are going to produce the jobs in the next century. In the knowledge economy of the next century, those are all the items where we are going to be the job generators of the future.

And we want to kill it on the floor today? We have killed off several other basic research programs that are going to take away from the future, and the gentleman from Missouri stands up and wants to kill off another one. It makes absolutely no sense. It is discouraging and disappointing.

If you really do believe that science has something to do with this Nation's ability to do the economy of the future, then, by golly, do not vote for this amendment, and stop voting for some of the rest of them that are out here that are mindless cannibalism of basic research.

It is time we stand up for the future, and this amendment is a regression into the past.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was just struck in listening to the gentleman who just spoke about his moral outrage at the cut of basic science.

Now, I share his concern that basic science can be a producer of jobs in the future, but to come on this floor and express the moral outrage that he expressed in this Congress' cutting basic science, I wish I could have heard him express the moral outrage when we cut in this House, based upon the Republican rescissions package, money for women and infants and childrens programs, money that goes to help pregnant women deliver healthy babies, and you are talking about making an investment in this country's future.

I will tell you where the Democrats make their investment. The Democrats make their investment in people, because we know in this country we are not going to be a strong country if we produce babies that are sick babies, who do not have the nutrition they need, but the Republicans did not express that moral outrage when it came to cutting the WIC program. The Republicans did not express the moral outrage when it came to cutting the Meals on Wheels Program or cutting the programs that help our senior citizens.

And this morning when we were in the well of the House speaking on the 1 minutes, I kept hearing how the Democrats refused to reform health care; the Republicans are stuck with cutting \$280 billion from Medicare over the next 7 years, and when I spoke, I

spoke about Herb McCollock in my district who is going to be spending on average 100—

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. No, I will not yield.

On average—

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman not yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman from Rhode Island has the floor. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island controls the time.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to carry on.

Like I said before in my presentation, there is no question about it, ANS was ended because ANS was going to cost too dang much money. We already had spent millions of dollars on it; throw it away, throw it away.

But we had people on the payroll down there. We have got to keep them working. But we do not worry about, like the gentleman from Rhode Island says, we do not worry about young women that are out here going to have babies; because they are poor, tough, you are not going to get any help. We do not worry about the senior citizens in my district who are going to have to pay over \$100 a month on Medicare part B in a few years under their program. We do not worry about them, because they are only getting \$300 or \$400 a month Social Security. You are going to take it and do that.

And you say, "No, we need basic research." Yes, we need basic research. But, like I said, we have got to establish priorities.

Theirs is they want the scientists. They want them to have the money. I, like the gentleman from Rhode Island, I want to take care of the people that are here today that are suffering, and under your programs, they are going to suffer a heck of a lot more.

I do not see that as a very good priority. To me that is the question here today: Whether you want to keep scientists who make over \$100,000 a year on the payroll or if you want to say "no" to them, and we are going to help other people out here, we are going to help that young mother that is going to have that baby, so that she has a healthy baby, so that she does not have to have an operation or something in order to have that baby, so that she does not have to worry about it, so that she can get just plain old milk and help, you know, for the baby.

Why are my senior citizens, you know, the gentleman, the chairman, you come from a State that has a little cold weather. I have cold weather. But LIPEAP is gone. LIHEAP is gone, lower-income energy assistance. I did not hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania yelling about that. I have got senior citizens out home this winter,

come this winter they are going to have a heck of a time. They are going to have to make a decision whether they want to eat or heat their house.

Yes, folks, they are going to have to make that decision. And yet you say let us pay today, let us pay \$100,000, \$150,000 to these scientists to keep them on the payroll. But you will not give me 1 penny, not 1 penny to help my low-income people pay heating bills this winter.

Well, folks, to me that also is a lot of what we are talking about here today. You can talk all you want about basic research. I am saying it is priorities.

I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island. He hit the nail on the head. We are interested in people.

□ 1315

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] for yielding because I think we have just gotten the perfect explanation of the difference between the Democrats and the Republicans, the difference between the minority and majority, and thank goodness the American people, in their wisdom, have helped us have a majority that is in the right direction.

The difference is, and the two gentlemen, one from Rhode Island and one from Missouri, have just described it:

The Republicans are for knowledge. We are for science and knowledge. The Democrats are for welfare. The Republicans want to put money into trying to get new knowledge for the future so that we can produce the jobs of the future. The Democrats want to increase and expand the number of welfare checks we pay in the future. The Democrats believe that the way in which you advance into the future is to grow welfare programs bigger, and bigger, and bigger so that more and more people are not working, but are simply getting a check from Government, while what we want to do is grow the science of the country so that everybody can work in the future and we will have no need for welfare checks.

That is a big difference. We have having it defined on the floor.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has just perfectly described his amendment. His amendment is in favor of cutting back on the development of new discovery and new knowledge in favor of welfare checks. He wants to make certain that we have enough money to continue to pay welfare checks even if it comes out of the hide of the science programs needed to produce the jobs in the future. The gentleman says right now we want to focus on spending the money on the people here right now. We have already accumulated massive debt for the people in future generations, and what we are

now saying is we want to continue to spend the money for all of that, continue to pile on the debt and hand them the bill in the future, and also hand them no new knowledge, no new discoveries, and, therefore no new jobs.

It is the perfect description of the difference between the two parties, the party of welfare and the party of knowledge.

Now I got to tell my colleague, "If you think the next century is going to be the century where we are going to develop the welfare economy, the Democrats are your party, and they just defined themselves. If you believe the next century is going to be the knowledge economy, that we are going to have the information economy, then you've heard them describe the situation. You ought to vote against this amendment and then vote for expanding new opportunities for knowledge and discovery."

This is the perfect prescription. I am glad we have had this debate. The gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Missouri have described it perfectly:

The Democrats, the party of welfare; the Republicans, the party of knowledge.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania another way of putting it is the old saying, "You can either give a man a fish and feed him for a day, or teach him how to fish, and he can feed himself for the rest of his life." That is the question of opportunities. Pure science will provide us with those jobs of tomorrow or teaching people how to fish. Clearly this amendment is to give them a fish to feed them for a day. We ought to defeat it and teach them how to fish so that the opportunity for jobs tomorrow will be there.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have not heard pure science. We have heard pure bunkum. Let me simply tell my colleagues what the real differences are between the parties as I see them.

Let me stipulate I think both political parties have had a fine tradition in this country. But I think there are some very distinct differences between our party today and theirs, and they do not have to do with who wants to write welfare checks.

I sat last night in the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and I saw that committee take a number of specific steps which cut the guts out of efforts to help middle-class working families, not welfare recipients, but people who work and sweat every day to make enough money to keep a decent living standard, take care of their grandparents, take care of their parents and worry about sending their kids to school at the same time. And I saw that subcommittee last night cut \$2 billion dollars out of, not welfare programs, but education programs to provide help to local school districts. The

next biggest whack came at the expense of low-income elderly, disabled and poor kids, a billion and a half dollars cut from programs such as Healthy Start and Head Start. Head Start has been demonstrated to produce less welfare dependency, fewer pregnancies, and less high school dropout tendencies than kids that have not gone to Head Start programs.

The next biggest cut came in programs to train people to get them off welfare.

We hear people in this place talk out of both sides of their mouth and do a duplicitous routine, pretending they are really going to go after welfare. But then, when it comes right down to it, what happened last night is that they gutted virtually every program to help take people off welfare and get them into training programs and working programs. Example: displaced worker program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues, how many of you voted for NAFTA? or GATT? I did not because that was an elitist rip-off of working American and working people, but what did they do? What did they do? They wind up, they wind up saying that for displaced workers—and these are not welfare cases—these are people who worked for 20 and 30 years, and now being put out of jobs and are asking after they paid taxes for a long, long time to finally get some of that money back in order to help retrain them for a decent job. And what did your party do last night in Labor-H? They cut the guts out of programs like that. Then what you have done, you have also attacked the NLRB. You made it easier for corporations to violate wage and hour restrictions. You made it easier for them to set up bogus pension systems. You made it easier for them to treat workers like cattle.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, you bet you there is a difference between the parties. What is happening in this country is we are ceasing to be a country with a large and growing middle class. Fewer and fewer people are getting tickets into that middle class, and a whole lot more people who used to live like middle-class workers are now thinking of themselves as being lower-class workers, poor workers. And what is happening is, you are taking actions which seriously damage the ability of this society to stay tied together regardless of income because of your attack on working people, your attack on the poor. And yet you stand here, and you have done it on a number of votes today and yesterday, you have defended corporate welfare, all if it's for the nuclear industry. If it is for Westinghouse, if it is for GE, oh, my God, shovel the money out the door. We can't spend it fast enough.

It just seems to me there is a big difference between the parties. We all have our faults, and frankly we deserved to lose the last election because we were lousy salesmen, we fought among ourselves, and we got diverted

on some issues we should not have been diverted on, and the public taught us a lesson. Frankly I think it was good for our party that they did, but my colleagues are misreading that election if they think that election produced a battle cry from the American people to cut working people, cut education, cut health care, cut Medicare, but oh, by all means, keep corporate welfare.

Baloney.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who spoke earlier that this money does not go to welfare if this amendment carries. The money stays unspent. It does not increase the deficit; it reduces the deficit. So, if the gentleman is really interested in balancing the budget, he would vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(On request of Mr. VOLKMER and by unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Got to remember we have got to borrow the money to spend this \$8 million to keep these scientists on the payroll. That is what we are going to have to do.

Now it is not only corporate welfare who benefits. We heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania talk about all the things that will naturally flow from this basic research.

Impossible. It is a possibility; it is not a necessary. It is not that it will happen. It is a problematical out there. In the meantime we are spending all this money, and we are making the cuts.

I would just like to point out, and the gentleman mentioned I did not know this, that in the retraining programs under NAFTA, Mr. Chairman, they have cut that money? I just had a plant close in my district in the last month. In a small town the largest employer is going to Mexico; they are going to Mexico. Now, if they have gone ahead and proposed to cut those funds, I do not know what those people are going to do. That was our last hope, the only hope. There is no other plant out there. This is a farming community. We do not have another plant for them to go to work at.

Mr. OBEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out just one other thing.

The Federal Reserve, not exactly a left-wing pinko, Democratic institution. They have just completed their second study of wealth in this country; and what that showed is that in the 1980's we saw the richest one-half of 1 percent of American families increase

their share of national wealth from 24 to 31 percent of the total national wealth. They increased their wealth by \$2 trillion, more than twice as much as the national debt went up during that same period. And yet they want to give them more. They want to cut back on programs for working people to give tax cuts to people who make \$200,000 a year, and then they want to defend themselves as defenders of the middle class?

What a joke.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. They also want to repeal the EITC, the earned income tax credit.

Mr. OBEY. Which raises taxes for lower-income people.

I say to my colleagues, you're real friends of the working folks; aren't you?

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

Mr. Chairman, somehow we strayed away from the intent of this particular amendment, and the program that the gentleman's committee put in here got away to why we are in such straits we are today. I guess I am not quite the oldest person here, but pretty close to it. This House has spent 40 years spending itself into prosperity that the gentleman talked about.

Now we ask for a small investment here in our future, that we might be competitive in the world. I can recall 40 years ago as a teenager working for an industry. That industry is not here any more, and I say to the gentleman, Mr. OBEY, I didn't vote for GATT, I didn't vote for NAFTA. I don't know where that puts me; in no man's land I guess. But I am still concerned about the future. I am concerned, and this committee is concerned, about children, healthy children, women, and infant children, in another appropriation bill providing for them. But, if we do not have jobs in this country, if we are exporting all the jobs, importing all the products that we now import that we once produced in this country because we do not have the technology today to be competitive in the world, how are we going to pay the taxes to do these things you are talking about?

So I remember years ago we were in business, a family business. My dad wanted to cut everything out. No investment; he did not want to take any chances. Yet the money coming in the front door, but do not invest anything and get more people coming in the front door. I remember my dad was a great businessman, better than I will ever be, but I tried to talk my dad into making some investment, and we finally did, and we did double the business.

So this is where we are today as a nation. Do we want to say we are going to save \$8 million here, a drop in the bucket? I know it is a lot of money, but

Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Weldon (PA)
Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Weller
Smith (WA)	Torkildsen	White
Solomon	Torrice	Whitfield
Souder	Traficant	Wicker
Spence	Upton	Williams
Stearns	Vucanovich	Wilson
Stockman	Waldholtz	Wise
Stump	Walker	Wolf
Talent	Walsh	Wynn
Tanner	Wamp	Young (AK)
Tate	Ward	Young (FL)
Taylor (NC)	Watts (OK)	Zeliff
Thomas	Weldon (FL)	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Hefner	Reynolds
Brown (OH)	Longley	Spratt
Fox	Moakley	Tauzin
Gutierrez	Ortiz	

□ 1352

Messrs. NEY, UPTON, SMITH of Michigan, COBURN, CUNNINGHAM, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, notwithstanding section 405 of said Act, and for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, \$142,000,000.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 100-456, section 1441, \$17,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms, official representation expenses (not to exceed \$20,000); reimbursements to the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft, \$468,300,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$11,000,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided*, That from this appropriation, transfer of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in

such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Commission for the cooperative nuclear safety research program, services rendered to foreign governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs, including criminal history checks under section 149 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, may be retained and used for salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$457,300,000 in fiscal year 1996 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 1996 from licensing fees, inspection services and other services and collections, excluding those moneys received for the cooperative nuclear safety research program, services rendered to foreign governments and international organizations, and the material and information access authorization programs, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation estimated at not more than \$11,000,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including services authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended; and in addition, an amount not to exceed 5 percent of this sum may be transferred from Salaries and Expenses, Nuclear Regulatory Commission: *Provided*, That notice of such transfers shall be given to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation, transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred by be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 1996 from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100-203, section 5051, \$2,531,000, to be transferred from the Nuclear Waste Fund and to remain available until expended.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C. ch. 12A), including purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase and hire of

passenger motor vehicles, \$103,339,000, to remain available until expended.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 25, line 6, strike "\$142,000,000" and insert "\$0".

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment that we have before us now, my colleagues, is an amendment offered by myself, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and also the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

I would like to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], and the hard work the committee did on making some very significant cuts already in the Appalachian Regional Commission. Established in 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission provides additional money to 13 States, which, as you might take from the title, run along the Appalachian mountain range, stretching from New York on the north, through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Now, keep that list in mind, if you would, Mr. Chairman, because I suspect most of the speakers we will hear from on the other side of this issue, as luck would have it, happen to fall from the 13 States which are directly affected by this money.

Since 1965, we have spent more than \$7 billion in the Appalachian region, trying to bolster economic growth in these 13 States. And I think to ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, what have we gotten for that \$7 billion of investment and why it is 30 years later we are still trying to fund the exact same programs?

What the Appalachian Regional Commission does is essentially allow 13 States in this country to double dip into infrastructure money, money to do economic development, and money also to do highway and water construction and projects like that.

I do not begrudge my colleagues for this additional help because clearly in 1965, when we first established ARC, there was a clear economic need that these States and many of these specific regions were disadvantaged compared to the rest of the country. But here we are again, 30 years later still spending millions of dollars trying to jumpstart the economy of 13 States.

I have to ask my colleagues from the Southeast, what is it that makes a community in Alabama or a community in Tennessee or a community from West Virginia or Virginia or New York that is poor different from a community in Wisconsin, or New Mexico, Oregon, or Idaho, or Utah, or whatever the case might be?

I think this was a well-intentioned program established in 1965. Frankly, it has long outlived its usefulness. While it was established in 1965, it did not take very long for President Nixon to put ARC on the radar screen, but the Nixon administration could not beat it. The Reagan administration tried as well, Mr. Chairman, back in the 1980's and found themselves equally unsuccessful. And I think this is the great challenge for this Congress.

As I was saying, there was an election last fall that I think challenged this Congress to a new mandate. The mandate was to make tough decisions about spending and to begin eliminating programs that could no longer be justified. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and I, Members of the Tennessee delegation, I think, will have a similar argument a short time on the Tennessee Valley Authority established back in the 1930's. And here we are with the Appalachian Commission established in 1965 to fund development money for these projects.

Now, listen to this, which, I think, is going to be interesting. There is little evidence that ARC has contributed to the long-term economic health of Appalachian. During the 1980's, there was strong economic growth in the Appalachian region. ARC's budget was cut by over 40 percent during the same period. And unbelievably, unemployment rates fell by 38 percent.

So there is clearly no correlation in ARC money with what is going on in those areas. It has to do with economic development and the growth of the country as a whole.

Now, let me point out some of the very important projects that we have managed to fund over the years with the Appalachian Regional Commission, beginning just back in February, when to develop the economic region of the country they paid—they did not pay; taxpayers paid—\$750,000 to help the Carolina Panthers build a new football facility. We had a little team up in Green Bay called the Green Bay Packers. I have to tell you, there is not one Federal dollar involved in Lambeau Field. The Packers have been around since 1920. Why is it that the Federal Government is building football stadiums?

Along the way, we have also helped build the Alabama Music Hall of Fame, a program to attract German travelers to West Virginia, build an access road to a Pennsylvania ski resort, helped do a limestone cave display in Georgia. Let us go back to the athletic theme for a minute.

□ 1400

There was \$1.2 million for the National Track and Field Hall of Fame and, of course, the NASCAR Hall of Fame, a study on the migration of the elderly, a grant to train workers for a BMW plant, and on and on the list goes.

So here we are, Mr. Chairman, \$750,000 for a football stadium, billions

of dollars for a region and hundreds of millions of dollars here in 1995. I would suggest to my colleagues in this House, although many of my colleagues from much of the Southeast may fundamentally disagree, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD], and I say it is time to put an end to the Appalachian Regional Commission.

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

Mr. Chairman, now we know why the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] is so opposed to the Appalachian Regional Commission. Is it the Carolina Panthers, in opposition to the Green Bay Packers, which motivates this gentleman to try to strike the entire Appalachian Regional Commission effort to end poverty in the most poverty stricken part of the country? Now we know the truth.

The real truth is the Appalachian Regional Commission works to end poverty in the most poverty stricken part of our Nation. Let me point out to the body that the poverty in Appalachia is intractable. Income in these areas is still 17 percent below the national average. The region's poverty rate is 16 percent higher than the national average. In areas like mine, the poverty rate is over 25 percent. Even with ARC funding, Appalachian counties receive 14 percent less in total Federal dollars than the rest of the counties of the State of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], even with Appalachian Regional Commission funding.

Many areas of the country have enjoyed the benefits of economic growth and expansion over many decades, but not Appalachia. Yes, on the edges there have been improvements over the years, and we are proud of that. That proves ARC works. However, there are still core counties in Appalachia that simply cannot make it without the work of the Appalachian Regional Commission. The ARC works the way I think the majority in this body would like for other programs to work. It is sort of like a block grant or Federal revenue sharing; local grassroots people involved in their problems getting their local officials involved first, then their Governor, then the Appalachian Regional Commission. All of the Governors support the ARC, Republican and Democrat, because it is the model for the future, a grassroots program with local, State, and Federal governmental involvement.

Mr. Chairman, the ARC funding in this bill has been cut in half. The chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], and ranking member, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], have done a superb job of reforming this agency. They cut the funding in half. Already ARC has been reformed.

No. 2, Mr. Chairman, the budget that passed this body contains \$40 million more than this bill does. This bill is under the House-passed budget resolution, \$40 million under it. It is one-half the current level, so already we have

reformed, and we have cut and made it more efficient.

Mr. Chairman, please do not snuff out the life of this agency that is making so much of a difference in the lives of poor people, in a part of the country that has been ravaged by nature, by the loss of jobs in the coal and textile business, and others. Give us a chance. This organization works to help poor people help themselves from poverty. It works. Poverty rates have been halved in the region. Incomes have increased. High school graduates have doubled during this period of time.

The dollars are targeted to the most severely distressed counties, putting the money where it is really needed, in drinking water lines, sewer treatment for families without indoor plumbing, even in this day and age, and in health care clinics and hospitals in places that had none before, in job skills training for workers displaced from coal mines and textile shops, since closed.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill continues the ARC, but as I have said before, it reforms it. It directs that the remaining moneys be focused on basic infrastructure and health needs. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCREST], chairman of the subcommittee, will later tell you that they have passed through the subcommittee a new authorization bill for the ARC. It will be authorized and modified and reformed.

The facts speak for themselves. ARC works. It is a model of a conservative nature, in my judgment, that marries the best of the voluntarism in the country with local, State, and governmental help, in order to help us to walk up the stepladder on our own. That is what we most desperately want.

I hope Members will oppose the Klug amendment. Help us keep the ARC alive. We have cut it in half. It is being authorized. It is underneath the budget resolution that has passed both bodies of the Congress now, House and Senate. Please give us a chance to help ourselves. Oppose Klug.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], has raised some good questions, as he has on other amendments. However, I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] have dealt with these questions, and they have crafted a very good package for us to continue this program. The gentleman from Kentucky just stated some very strong arguments in favor of the ARC.

The ARC's mission is to equip Appalachian citizens with entrepreneurial skills and enterprise development resources they need to create self-sustaining local economies where people take control over their own economic

destiny and contribute as taxpayers to the national economy.

Mr. Chairman, I know a lot of people from the rest of the country may have questions about this program, so I would like to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], who shares our interest in this program in Alabama.

I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree with me that ARC is a proven example of an effective Federal, State, and local partnership that has had a dramatic effect in improving the lives of Appalachian citizens?

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

Mr. BROWDER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CRAMER. My colleague from Alabama is correct, Mr. Chairman. ARC, as was stated by our colleague from Kentucky, has helped in slashing the region's poverty rate in half. We have cut the infant mortality rate by two-thirds. We have reduced unemployment rates as well. However, despite these successes, this region still has very much economic needs and unmet needs. We have 399 counties that are classified as severely distressed under ARC and 115 of those counties are still severely distressed. We have come a long way, but we have not come the way that we need to go. That is why this amendment is not justified at this time.

As was pointed out by my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, is the gentleman from Alabama aware that this Committee on Appropriations has already cut ARC funding by 50 percent from fiscal year 1995 funding level?

Mr. BROWDER. I am aware of that cut, Mr. Chairman. That is why I cannot support a further cut that would place a heavier burden on some of the most distressed communities in the country.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, this is not the time that Congress should consider further reductions. The Committee on Public Works and Transportation, finally referred to as the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, is completing oversight hearings over ARC. We are in the middle of that oversight review.

This will be a 5-year reauthorization bill that would reform and in fact streamline ARC. This bill eliminates some of the Commission's activities and better targets its resources to the areas of greatest need. One important aspect of ARC is that it is a bipartisan program. At least it has bipartisan support.

Our Governor there in Alabama, Fob James, has stated that ARC is unique in that it is a shared partnership of Federal, State, and local governments. As such, he says ARC provides flexibility to address the needs of the people, and allows Governors and local governments to set priorities, so it is one of the few programs that is responsive to

local and State needs. We only request that this program be retained and other programs in fact modeled after it.

Mr. BROWDER. Governor James' statement is right on point, and ARC is responsive to local and State needs and should be retained, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] for his time in support of ARC. I am sure that my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, after hearing this colloquy, wants to withdraw this amendment and let us move on with this very deserving program. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank my colleague from Alabama for his interest and support for a program that has as its mission to help communities create self-sustaining economies.

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

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I think it might also be interesting to point out, in addition to what the gentleman from Alabama just said, that a lot of other solid conservative Governors who are in favor of cutting wasteful spending have given wholehearted support to the Appalachian Regional Commission. Governor George Pataki of New York, Governor George Allen of Virginia, Governor Don Sundquist of Tennessee, Kirk Fordice of Mississippi, have all given the ARC their ringing public endorsements, because they realize that ARC is an example of a proven program which works, and works well. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROWDER. I appreciate the comments from my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi. I think that demonstrates widespread support for this program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. We have not been a bit bashful in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to move to kill agencies, to move to substantially downsize and to streamline. We are killing the ICC, we are substantially downsizing and streamlining the Federal Maritime Commission, we are in the process of imposing tough reforms on Amtrak in order to see if it can be saved.

GSA, we have stopped the construction of courthouses. We are saving hundreds of millions of dollars through actions on our committee. Indeed, when we looked at the Appalachian Regional Commission, as I said, we have asked ourselves with all of the programs under our jurisdictions, "What can we do here to change this program?"

I really came to two conclusions. The first conclusion was that this kind of a program is in many respects a model program. This is the kind of a program we should be urging the Federal Government and the States and the localities to adopt as a model. Why? Be-

cause the decisions are not being made by a bunch of bureaucrats here in Washington, but are being made by local officials and State officials in cooperation with the Appalachian Regional Commission, which, indeed, as Members may know, is controlled in large measure by the 13 Appalachian Governors.

I would remind particularly my Republican friends that 8 of those 13 Governors are Republican Governors, and all of them, all 13, have communicated to us their vigorous support of this program, because it is a program that works.

My good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, has talked about the boondoggles. He is right, there have been some boondoggles. There is a need for reform. That is precisely what we have done in our committee. We have changed. We have tightened up. We have said that "if you are a severely distressed county, then you qualify for help, but if you are not a distressed county, you do not get any help."

We have not only tightened the requirements, we have cut by \$100 million a year, \$500 million over the life of the next 5 years, a reduction of spending, so we have stepped up to the plate. We have reformed an already outstanding program. We have reduced spending by \$500 million.

My good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, says there is no evidence that the program works. The National Science Foundation studied it and released a report where they compared distressed counties in ARC with distressed counties that are not in ARC. What was their conclusion, not my conclusion, their conclusion? That there was a 48-percent faster economic growth rate in the severely distressed counties in the Appalachian region compared to the ones that are not in the Appalachian region. If anything, this suggests that we should be looking at this as a model program if we want to help severely distressed counties across America.

Indeed, there has been substantial progress, and that is why many of the counties in the ARC region no longer qualify under our tightened requirements. That is why only the distressed counties will be the ones which will be supported, and indeed, of the 399 counties in the Appalachian Regional Commission, virtually all of them were distressed counties 20 years ago. Today 115 of them are distressed counties.

There has been very, very substantial improvement. However, the fact remains that many of these counties are severely distressed, and as has been pointed out, the counties in the Appalachian Regional Commission, even with this ARC support, receive 14 percent less Federal funding than other counties like the counties from Wisconsin, of my good friend who has offered this amendment. Therefore, there is still a need. This is a model program. We should be vigorously supporting this program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by quoting a letter from the 13 Appalachian Governors who strongly support this; indeed, a letter from Tom Ridge, Governor of Pennsylvania, a former Member of this House, who says, "The governing structure of the Appalachian Regional Commission serves as a significant model for how the national and State governments can work together in the administration of Federal funding programs."

In summary, there is a need for ARC; the program works. There has been abuse; we have reformed it. The ARC authorization bill provides those reforms. We have cut \$500 million in spending over the next 5 years. We are doing what the people sent us here to do. That is to streamline, to reform, to reduce spending, but also to continue supporting the building of needed infrastructure for America, particularly in the pockets of poverty for America.

For all of those reasons I would urge my colleagues to join us in a bipartisan effort to defeat this amendment and support this very worthy program.

□ 1415

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KLUG, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SHUSTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. I just want to understand, tell me what it is in 1995 that makes a distressed county in Pennsylvania or West Virginia or Alabama eligible for funds when the same distressed application does not apply to the other 37 States?

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for this question. It is an excellent question. The reason why this should be supported is because we are not talking about an isolated county but we are talking about a region of America that has been severely disadvantaged. Indeed if my friend from Wisconsin wants to come to our committee and say that there needs to be a Great Lakes Commission, or whatever you would like to call it, to accomplish the same kind of thing that we are doing for the Appalachian Regional Commission, I welcome you to do that. I will support this kind of an effort.

No matter where we find these pockets of poverty in America, we should be doing the kinds of things that we are successfully doing in the Appalachian region. I would be very happy to support him in extending this kind of a program to other pockets of poverty across America. It is a great idea, and I welcome the gentleman to come to our committee.

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

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

Mr. GILCHREST. I would like to make a comment, not only is it pock-

ets of poverty in a particular region but a program like the Appalachian Regional Commission is way ahead of its time. We know it has been in effect for a few decades now. This is the kind of program that we want to use Federal dollars because it is Federal-State combination dollars. It leverages money. For every dollar we put down there, the Federal Government is going to get back \$5 in taxes. But it is a model program.

We talk about block-granting programs, how can the Federal Government help these local communities in a much more efficient manner. The Appalachian Regional Commission is that model program.

Mr. KLUG. I ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], are these counties not already eligible for public works money and for economic development money? What I do not understand is how these 13 States are somehow different from the rest of the world.

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

Mr. Chairman, several years ago when I chaired the Economic Development Subcommittee in partnership with my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], we held hearings here in Washington and throughout Appalachia and elsewhere around the country in distressed areas. One of the witnesses, the mayor of Sneedville, KY, said to the committee, "Before the Appalachian Regional Commission came along, we were so far down, we had to look up to see bottom."

What characterized Appalachia for the nearly 100 years before 1965 was 80 acres and a mule. It was isolation.

You have heard about the hills and the mountains of Appalachia. People being isolated. It would take 30 miles for one community to visit another, to go around through the hollows. And why there were generations of intestinal illness from people drinking their own sewage because of the hard pan that would not allow the sewage to filter through, and they needed advanced sewage treatment systems and they could not afford them.

You have heard about the domination of King Coal throughout the Appalachian region, and the whole purpose of ARC was to break that domination, to break the isolation, to build roads, to provide communication, to provide access to markets, to give people an opportunity, to build clinics, to provide health, to build the educational/vocational training centers and the health clinics, to give them an opportunity to get out from looking up to see bottom.

At the time the Appalachian Commission was created, the people throughout the 13-State region averaged 45 percent of the average national income. Forty-five percent. After 20 years of ARC, they were up to 82 percent of national income.

The previous speaker talked about growth in Appalachia during the 1980's.

That was because of the investments made during the 1960's and the 1970's. That was because there were wise investments made, job opportunities created, industrial parks developed, vocational training centers developed, and skills and jobs came to Appalachia.

At Tennessee, we heard from Tilda Kemplin, director of a day care center, a day training center for children of poor families, who talked about how they had elevated the level of education of these children who had little children who had little opportunity.

In concluding her statement, she said, "Gentleman, when you go back to Washington, please try to look over the top of the dollar and don't see George Washington but see a child. See a child whose life has been rebuilt and reborn."

That is what Appalachia is all about. Sure, you can go around and you can pick up any number of projects and say, oh, that was a waste, building a stadium, building this and building that. But that is your judgment. That is a Washington judgment. Those projects were decided by people who live in the area, who have suffered with poverty, who have lost jobs, who made a decision based on a plan of economic development on what suits them best, what can help them grow. That was a local decision. You are going to say, "We are going to substitute our judgment for yours"? No. That is wrong.

We have made changes in the way the Appalachia Regional Commission functions. During the time when I was chairman and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] was the ranking Republican, we brought that bill to the floor. We have reformed the way the Federal Economic Development Administration operates, changed the eligibility standards to terminate those counties that were grandfathered in to require new ways of determining eligibility, and those bills have passed this House on a basis of 4-to-1 votes during the Reagan administration, the Bush administration, on a bipartisan basis, because people realized that this is a commission that works, this is a program that helps people, this is a program that gets to the real needs, helps create real jobs and lift people out of poverty.

It was in West Virginia that we went to, I think it was Martinsburg, WV, where we held a hearing, and the mayor of the city took us to his little store and in back of the cash register on the wall hung a sign that said, "God Never Put Nobody in a Place Too Small To Grow." God never put nobody in Appalachia to be condemned to a life of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, we are a country. We worked together to build America. Let's work to build Appalachia.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment to eliminate funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

It is an amendment whose time has not come.

The energy and water appropriations bill that we are considering today already reduces Federal spending on ARC by \$142 million for fiscal year 1996.

That is a real cut of 50 percent.

Sometimes in Congress we confuse the issue of cuts in spending by talking about cuts that are not actually cuts. They are just reductions in estimated future spending increases that really are not cuts at all. They are only imaginary.

That is not the case with ARC in this bill. H.R. 1905 reduces ARC spending from \$282 million for fiscal year 1995 to \$142 million for fiscal year 1996.

The Klug amendment proposes to go further and completely eliminate ARC. Plain and simple, this is just a bad idea.

For the poverty-stricken areas in Kentucky and the other parts of Appalachia that ARC helps, a 50-percent cut is a very, very tough hit. To wipe out ARC completely would be nothing short of disastrous.

Even now when we are finally making the tough reductions in spending necessary to balance the budget, there are scores of other Federal programs that are not getting cut by 50 percent of anything near this figure.

But we are asking ARC beneficiaries, some of the poorest and neediest people in America, to take a 50-percent hit. They are already doing their fair share and more in helping Congress to get the Nation's fiscal house in order.

Trying to up the ante to a 100-percent cut like the Klug amendment proposes literally adds insult and further hurt to an already aching injury.

The Appalachian Regional Commission is one of those rare Government programs that get results. Because of ARC, infant mortality rates in Appalachia are down 67 percent. ARC spending on education has helped double high school graduation rates.

ARC has helped put in roads to link lonely, isolated areas. It has built water treatment plants for communities that could not treat their sewage.

I know personally that in Kentucky ARC has made a real difference in the essential quality of life in the most impoverished areas in my home State.

Everyone knows that Federal agencies have to tighten their belts if we are going to balance the Federal budget. And under this bill ARC has tightened its belt plenty.

But if the Klug amendment passes, we would be tightening the belt so much that we would end up strangling the victim.

The Klug amendment asks us to take from the poorest of the poor. It is that simple. ARC is an agency that helps some of our neediest communities, and to kill it now would be a sad setback.

We are already cutting ARC funding by 50 percent. Half of the loaf is gone. It would be a sad day if we were to adopt the Klug amendment and take the other half away.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there are many Members of the House who have a stronger record than I do on cutting Government spending. But the Klug amendment is one proposal that goes too far.

It does not slice off the fat of Government spending. It does not just cut into bone. It rips the heart and soul out of the program. It is a wholesale amputation.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on the Klug amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I represent a place a long way from Appalachia, and I do not serve on this committee, but I wanted to rise today in support of the Appalachian Regional Commission and in support of my colleagues who understand how well it works. Both Republicans and Democrats will defend the results of the good work of this Commission.

I also rise because I want to talk about a couple of matters of the atmosphere in this House and in America which occasion amendments like this.

One of the atmospherics, it seems to me, that is beginning to seep into this Chamber is, if it is more than a couple of decades old, it is bad and it does not work anymore. Despite the fact that the data and the facts and the statistics and the evidence may show otherwise, too many people, sometimes a majority tragically in this Chamber, just go by the criteria that "if it's more than two decades old, we've got to get rid of it, it doesn't work." I think that is wrong on the face of it. Let's not govern that way.

When I was first elected 17 years ago and I went to a Kiwanis or Rotary meeting, they were having a retirement lunch for a woman who had been directing that county's welfare office for I think close to 30 years.

□ 1430

She was one of the first welfare department employees in America, and I will never forget, she said this in her little remarks, this wonderful elderly woman, she said, "When I first went to work in this job 40-some years ago," she said, "I asked how long will this job last," and she said, "My boss at that time said, 'Well, until the Depression goes away.'" And she looked out at those Rotarians, and she smiled, and she said, "You see, for thousands of people in this country, the Depression has never gone away."

Well, that is what the Appalachian Regional Commission is about. For a lot of folks in Appalachia, the problems have not gone away. They are new to them. They are new to poverty, and this program will help lift them out as it helped their predecessors come out.

Just because it is old does not mean it does not work.

There is another atmospheric that occasions amendments like this. Let me close by mentioning that. There

have been in my lifetime two great political slogans. One came in the 1960's and the other one in the 1970's. The one in the 1960's was when a young President stood out here on the East Front and said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country." The other great political slogan of my lifetime came in the 1970's when another President looked at America through that window, that eye of the television camera, and during a Presidential debate said, "I will tell you what the question is, my fellow Americans: Are you better off than you were 4 years ago?"

Now, those are two very different Americas. I will take Jack Kennedy's. Support the Appalachian Regional Commission.

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

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to my good friend from Wisconsin, but I would like to make a couple of quick points.

We all know that for every dollar that the U.S. Government spends, we do not often get that money back, but if we look at a program like the Appalachian Regional Commission, and when we spend a dollar on this particular program, very often we get at least \$5 back into the Federal Treasury as a result of the infrastructure created that attracts new jobs. So I think as a program, it is powerfully positive for a region that is deserving and needs it.

The other comment is, what is the difference between the Appalachian region and some other areas of the country? My district is not in the Appalachian region. We do not have any mountains. We are not isolated. So we get no money from ARC in the first district of Maryland.

If you go to places like my good friend from Kentucky has described, and other regions of Appalachia, places like Turkey Fork, Stinking Creek, or Hell for Certain, these places are so mountainous the rivers and creeks and streams barely have room to meander through them.

What did we do with the interstate highway plan when we created that in the 1950's? We did not go through the Appalachian region, because it was too mountainous. We have decided to do that for a couple of decades with the ARC, and the highway program that can bring jobs to that community is 75 percent complete. Let us hold onto this for just a few more years.

The poverty rate is down. Infant mortality rate is down. This is a good program. It is the type of program that we want the Federal Government to be involved in.

If you are fiscally conservative and you are sensitive to the needs of people, you will vote for the ARC.

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

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned some egregious examples of things that may have been funded by the Appalachian Regional Commission, and nobody is here to defend those projects.

I think the chairman of the Committee on Transportation Infrastructure has indicated we have undertaken numerous reforms that are going to tighten criteria for the Appalachian Regional Commission. What the gentleman from Wisconsin did not mention, however, are the many, many accomplishments the ARC has created and the job opportunities created by ARC.

Projects which have been funded by the ARC over the last 10 years are projected to create 108,000 new jobs and to help retain 80,000 more jobs. I think these are the kinds of statistics, the kinds of criteria we need to look at.

As the gentleman from Maryland has said, the highway system which really is the lifeblood of any area, if you do not have transportation in and out of your area, you are never going to be able to grow or have any kind of economic growth. We have got that system nearly completed.

The poverty rate, as has been mentioned, has been cut in half, from 31 percent to 15 percent. Infant mortality rate has slowed dramatically. We have created water and sewer systems. These are not boondoggles. These are not goldplated projects. These are the lifeblood of the community to be able to have decent water and sewer systems.

Health care, a network of more than 400 Appalachian Regional Commission-funded primary care clinics and hospitals now serve over 4 million Appalachians a year. Again, these are facilities that did not even exist in the most depressed, most hard-bitten area of our entire country.

We have had jobs skills training, small-business assistance; there have been a myriad of programs that really have made a difference that have not been boondoggles.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said you have done it all, but the fact is the job still remains to be done.

I think what needs to be emphasized here is Appalachia is not receiving any kind of special dispensation or any kind of extra help. As a matter of fact, they are disadvantaged below the rest of the country now. They actually receive less in terms of Federal funding than any other region of the country, even with the Appalachian Regional Commission help.

But as has been indicated, there is work left to be done. The highway program is not yet complete. Per capita income is still 17 percent below the national average. The poverty rate is 16 percent higher. These are disturbing statistics.

Appalachia has made a dramatic difference, but the work needs to be continued and completed.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding and urge a "no" vote on the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

One quick comment to the gentleman from Wisconsin: When we had the hearings on the Appalachian Regional Commission, I asked for a plan; what are we going to need to stop funding this type of program for Appalachia to come up with the rest of the country, and they have gotten to work on finding a way so that within the next 4 or 5 years this particular program will not be needed. It is a different region. The funds are necessary to complete the task. There is a plan to do that.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

(At the request of Mr. KLUG and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILCHREST was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KLUG. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], you took some time off before you joined me here in Congress in 1990 to work out West. Is that right? Where did you work?

Mr. GILCHREST. I worked within a designated wilderness area in the Bitterroot Mountains of northern Idaho.

Mr. KLUG. So there are mountains in Idaho as there are mountains in Washington, and Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah? These may not be quite as colorful.

Mr. GILCHREST. Reclaiming my time—

Mr. KLUG. What is the difference?

Mr. GILCHREST. Reclaiming my time, let me make a distinction. Do you want to know the distinction between the Bitterroot Mountains of Idaho and the Appalachian region, the Blue Ridge Mountains and this region, the difference is the Bitterroot Mountains, and I will make a distinction with Idaho, it is a national forest, a designated area where there are very few people. There are mostly elk, bear, and so on. In the Appalachian region, in an area that has been so eloquently described by a number of Members here, is a different area because of its geography, but it is also different because you have people there.

Are you going to ask people in the area where the 25 percent of the highway has not been completed so we cannot bring jobs there, they are all going to have to move, or are we going to leverage a few dollars to create jobs for these folks?

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

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this bipartisan amendment, I am pleased to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and the

gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], in offering this amendment to eliminate funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Let us be clear about what this amendment is all about. If we cannot eliminate programs like the Appalachian Regional Commission, we are sending a clear message to the American public that we are not serious about eliminating duplicative Federal programs, and we will be sending a message that we are not serious about ending old-fashioned pork-barrel programs that benefit narrow geographical interests.

That is why both the National Taxpayers' Union and Citizens Against Government Waste have endorsed this amendment.

Earlier this year the Committee on the Budget, which I sit on, passed a resolution that proposed the termination of the Appalachian Regional Commission in the next fiscal year. To quote from the committee report, it says,

There is little evidence that the ARC can be credited with improvements in the economic health of Appalachia. The programs supported by the ARC are duplicative activities funded by other Federal agencies such as the Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Program and the Department of Housing and Community Development block grant program.

Thus, like many other deficit hawks in the House, I was shocked and amazed to see the appropriations bill come out of the committee with continued funding for ARC at levels of \$142 million next year.

How can we face the taxpayers of this country and tell them that we should delay our rate of deficit reduction in order to fund this duplicative, parochial program? How can we face our senior citizens and tell them that we are making cuts of almost \$300 billion in Medicare over the next 7 years so that we can accommodate programs like this that benefit only a few selective geographical areas?

Finally, I would like to conclude by quoting the final sentence of the House budget resolution committee report, which argued for termination of the Appalachian Regional Commission,

The ARC provides resources to poor rural communities in areas that are no worse off than many other areas outside the Appalachian region and, therefore, no more deserving of special Federal attention.

Like many other Members, several of these poorer communities are in my district. They are no less deserving of assistance just because they are not located in Appalachia, and I will give you a specific example: San Juan County, UT, is in the top 10-percent poorest counties in the United States, the top 10-percent highest unemployment rate in the United States, the top 10-percent youngest counties in the United States. This county is not eligible for any funding from the Appalachian Regional Commission to help fund their schools or their economic development projects or their highway systems.

The real question here now, and I admire my friends, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and the chairman of the Transportation Committee, and they have eloquently described what benefit this Commission has provided to the poor in those communities. This is not a question of whether the ARC has provided a benefit. This is not even a question as to whether or not the Federal Government can and should be involved in providing economic assistance to poor communities, and there are many in this body who believe that the Federal Government has absolutely no role whatsoever in doing that.

But even if they assume it does have a role in doing that, why is the role limited to a regional area? Why do we not have such a program that says, "Let us identify the 25 or 30 poorest counties in the Nation and provide assistance to those counties even though they are not in Appalachia?"

Now, the chairman of the subcommittee said to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], "If you wish to create the Great Lakes Regional Commission, come on in, I would support you." How about the Mountain States Regional Commission? How about a regional commission in the Northwest, where they have been hit terribly by logging declines? How about the central farming States that have been hit terribly?

Now, for those of you in this body who believe that the Federal Government ought to be expanding and creating more commissions to pump more Federal dollars into local communities, then you will vote against this amendment. If you believe that even though we ought to be helping poorer communities we ought to help them on the basis of need and not geographic location, you will vote for this amendment. If you believe the Federal Government has no role in providing that assistance, you will vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. RAHALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ORTON was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman makes an excellent point for the ARC by the example he uses that the ARC has been helpful to regional and local economies in the Appalachian region.

The EDA is now trying to take that same example and, by the reforms we are helping the EDA to make, take the successes of the ARC and spread it across the country and help regions such as the gentleman points out in Utah. But let us not zero out the ARC. It has been so successful by involving local communities at the grassroots

level, taking their input and bringing it up; a bottoms-up effort. That is exactly what we ought to be spreading to the EDA as the gentleman points out.

Mr. ORTON. The gentleman really raises the crux of this whole debate. If, in fact, this body believes that we should go out and expand the concept, create more regional commissions, fund it with Federal dollars, and put the money into those regional commissions for these kinds of programs, then, in fact, they should vote against the Klug amendment. But in so doing, you have to make a choice. That means we are going to be spending not \$147 million. We are going to be spending billions of dollars in putting money out into all of those other regional commissions and communities, and if we are going to do that, you have to pay for it or you are going to borrow the money from the future by increasing the deficit, and so if you are going to pay for it, you either have to pay for it by cutting other programs or you have to pay for it by raising taxes.

I do not believe this body is willing to do either of those. I do not want to increase the debt. So I would urge adoption of the Klug amendment.

□ 1445

Mr. RAHALL. Well, the gentleman does not take into account that the ARC has created jobs over the years of its existence. Creation of jobs means revenue generated—

Mr. ORTON. But that argument is an argument that any money the Federal Government spends creates jobs and increases the economy. That argument—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. ROGERS and by unanimous consent, Mr. ORTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. ORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman's State benefit from a thing called the Central Utah Project?

Mr. ORTON. It is questionable whether the State benefits from it, but the State does receive money to build it, yes.

Mr. ROGERS. As a matter of fact, there have been over a billion dollars spent on the Central Utah Project—

Mr. ORTON. Over the past 35 years.

Mr. ROGERS. We increased the funding for that project in this bill by how much, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Four million dollars.

Mr. ROGERS. Four million dollars—

Mr. ORTON. That is a water project very similar to the TVA, a dozen other water projects throughout the Nation. It is—

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman want us to zero out the project—

Mr. ORTON. Different from the ARC. Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman want us to zero out that project?

Mr. ORTON. It is different from the ARC. The ARC is direct money going to communities to pay for highways, for the kinds of—

Mr. ROGERS. It is OK in central Utah, but not in Appalachia.

Mr. ORTON. The gentleman is talking about apples and oranges. He is talking about the construction of water projects which have gone out through the entire United States, or he is talking about specific funding going to local communities simply because they are located in a particular regional area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. KLUG and by unanimous consent, Mr. ORTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. ORTON. I yield to gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. I think the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] makes a good point, though I mean everybody in this Chamber's State receives some money, but the question is whether this series of 13 States gets additional money on top of the normal economic development money.

I say to the gentleman, "Mr. ORTON, for example you have mountains in Utah, and I still don't understand Mr. GILCHREST's argument that your mountains are different than West Virginia's mountains because they have more or less people in them. I mean you have ski resorts in Utah. I mean were you eligible to receive Federal funds to help build ski resorts in Utah or Colorado?"

Mr. ORTON. We did not get any money to build a road to a ski resort in Utah as they did in Pennsylvania.

Mr. KLUG. I will tell the gentleman another story. It is interesting the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] was over here talking about northern Minnesota and contrasting Appalachia. There is a Hockey Hall of Fame in northern Minnesota, not built with any Federal dollars. There is a Bowling Hall of Fame in Milwaukee, not built with any Federal dollars. But there is an Alabama Music Hall of Fame and the NASCAR Hall of Fame built with Federal ARC dollars, and that is what we are talking about is double- and triple-dipping for—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the Chair has been extending the time beyond the 5 minutes, and we have gone 55 minutes now. I hate to do this, but I am going to object if the Chair extends any Member's time beyond the 5-minute allocation.

Mr. KLUG. Would the gentleman and my colleagues on the other side be willing to agree to a time-limit period at this time?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I say to the gentleman, if he is willing at this time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I think we are making pretty good progress. I suppose we can go along with the procedure for a little while longer and see how we are in a few minutes.

Mr. KLUG. If the gentleman objects to a time limit, I understand.

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

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Wisconsin, Florida, and Utah.

The Energy and Water development appropriations bill provides \$142 million for the programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC]. This appropriation cuts the ARC's current year funding in half. It is \$41 million less than the President's request; it is \$40 million less than the authorization which our Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development unanimously passed 2 weeks ago; and it is \$41 million less than the fiscal year 1996 assumption included in the just-passed budget conference agreement.

If we use as a baseline a hard freeze at fiscal year 1995 funding levels for the ARC, this appropriation will save \$980 million over 7 years. As ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I can tell you that the ARC has contributed more than its fair share to deficit reduction.

This amendment seeks to cut what little is left and eliminate all funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Thirty years ago, Appalachia was considered a region apart because its development lagged so far behind the rest of the Nation. With the help of the ARC, the region has made great strides. Yet, one generation cannot overcome a century of neglect.

Although the ARC has helped the region make significant progress, many problems persist. These problems are particularly acute in central Appalachia, where the poverty rate is 27 percent, rural per capita income is only two-thirds of the national average, and unemployment rates are almost double the Nation's average.

The amendment which is before us would kill any effort to turn this around. It would halt development of the Appalachian Development Highway System with only three-fourths of the 3,000 mile system complete and it would cut off the ARC's funding for economic development; cutting Appalachian communities' investments in education, small businesses, and health care.

Mr. Chairman, almost 30 years ago, Congress made a commitment to Appa-

lachia and its people. We promised to help it overcome its isolation, to enhance its quality of life, and to restore pride to this critical area of our Nation. That commitment is not yet fulfilled, and this amendment would make the situation worse.

I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

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

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in sharp opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG]. I hope that my fellow Members of the freshman class are paying close attention. Several weeks ago I had occasion to hear an address by the Speaker of the House. In those remarks the Speaker talked about the need for dramatic decentralization of government where, and I quote, "local folks are solving local problems with local strategies." Now, Mr. Chairman, I know of only one Federal program which is qualified to serve as a model for this approach, and that is the Appalachian Regional Commission. Mr. Chairman, dollar for dollar the ARC is one of the best bargains we get in Congress each year.

Now, as the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Pennsylvania related, the ARC is a model for local, State, and Federal cooperation. Under this model, local officials suggest options and refer them to their Governor. The Governor then prioritizes a list and sends it to the national office, which works in conjunction with the Governors to select applications for approval. Most of these projects are then administered locally by local planning and development districts located in the community selected.

The Federal dollars used under ARC serve to leverage many more times that amount in State and local matches. In many cases the ratio of local and State funds to Federal dollars is as much as five to one, as the gentleman from Maryland pointed out. This is a bottom-up program, not a Washington solution for local problems.

It is important for us to understand where the money goes. There is \$142 million in this bill for ARC. Of that amount 58 percent will go to the ARC highway program.

The highway portion of ARC was authorized by Congress in 1965. It is nearing 75-percent completion. By act of Congress these highways have been brought under the national highway system. These roads are every bit as legitimate as the highways in other sections of the country that have been paved with Federal dollars under the interstate system. And I can tell my colleagues from personal experience that, when ARC money assists in building four-lane highways, it means great-

er business growth, increased access, expanded markets, and more taxpayers for the entire United States of America.

I should also point out, Mr. Chairman, that ARC is not the kind of bloated Federal bureaucracy that we hear about a lot. This little agency has only about 50 employees nationwide. Most of the overhead is paid for by the States.

In addition, it cannot be stressed too much that ARC has been cut in half in this bill. It was funded at \$282 million in fiscal year 1995. Under this bill, it is reduced by 50 percent, and, Mr. Chairman, that is real budget progress and real budget savings. Actually the energy and water appropriation bill recommendation of \$142 million is less than the amount adopted by this House in the budget resolution conference report last month.

I am firmly committed to cutting the budget and cutting programs which do not work, but ARC does work, it is a program that has proven itself. It is not a Federal handout where we take money out of somebody's pocket and write somebody else a check. It develops infrastructure to create private jobs in the private sector. It is working for economic development, and, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Klug amendment and support the ARC program.

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

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to depart from my prepared remarks and deal with a lot of the issues that have been raised. The one gentleman asked why, why is a mountain different in Utah or wherever, Wisconsin, from a mountain in West Virginia, or Kentucky, or wherever. We are talking about a region. We are not talking about a mountain someplace. We are talking about a region and a common tradition, unfortunately often a common tradition of poverty, not because people were inept, not because people did not try, but because of a whole lot of cultural, historical, and industrial factors. Nobody questioned, for instance, coming out of central West Virginia, nobody questioned why it was that we had such low-energy costs for so many years. That coal had a price to it. It had a human price to it. It has a price in roads that were never built, and schools that were never funded, and children that never got educated that that coal came out cheaply and it built this country. That is one of the reasons we are in the situation we are in. Nobody ever talked about absentee ownership, the fact that from so many other parts of the country there was absentee ownership of central Appalachia, and so that is one reason.

I want to—someone asked the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure why would one county be different from another, and he properly replied because we are

talking about a regional approach, not a county approach, not a city-by-city approach, but a regional approach. I think it is worthwhile to note, my colleagues of the House, that Appalachia in fiscal year 1994 had 8.2 percent of the U.S. population, 8.2 percent, and received, even with the ARC going to 13 of the States, Appalachia received 7.5 percent of total Federal expenditures. We are 14 percent per capita below the rest of the country in Federal expenditures, and that is with the ARC, and this would now drop even more because this will cut the Appalachian Regional Commission from roughly \$280 to \$140 million, which incidentally in terms of the Federal deficit this year we are talking about two one hundred thousandths; that is, 0.002, two one hundred thousandths of the Federal deficit.

There have been questions about why is one county different from another. Let me make a point. Madison, WI, Dane County, median family income, \$41,529; unemployment, 3.1 percent. Owsley County, KY, which came before our subcommittee, \$12,200 in median family income; unemployment, 8.4 percent; poverty rate, 52 percent. We are dealing with a special set of circumstances.

The gentleman from Mississippi pointed out the value of the Appalachian regional system of highways. Studies conclusively show that in ARC counties with a four-lane ARC highway, job creation has been three times as high in as in counties that do not have that.

□ 1500

Incidentally, this is money that is coming back to the Federal Treasury. Just recently in my district was announced an ARC grant that would create a water system to an industrial area. I calculated that based upon the average income of the jobs that will be created there, the Federal Government, the Federal taxpayer, will receive their money back in about 1½ years, of what went into the ARC, and for that they got several hundred tax paying, job holding citizens, and all of us are better as a result.

Every region has its own approach. Indeed, interestingly enough, the Economic Development Administration and others may be moving more and more towards the ARC model. I think that is important too. We are talking about grassroots up. Thirteen Governors make up this board. You apply from the local level to the statehouse, then to Washington. But the 13 Governors agree, the majority of which are members of the Republican Party this year. They all support this, as well as all the Democrat Governors. Why? Because they know it is a proven job creator.

We are talking \$142 million for 13 State regions that clearly have the benefits that have been proven with the ARC.

Incidentally, the job is not done. You do not pull this one back and think you

have solved something. You may have made the situation worse, particularly with the highway system that is three-quarters of the way complete. But if you do not complete it, many portions of it will never achieve the promise that they had before.

So I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. Appalachia has made great strides, but we still have a ways to go. This is a relatively small amount of money, that has been cut in half from what it was last year, but is so important to a 13 State region.

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

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

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I associate myself with the comments of my colleague and friend from West Virginia. The gentleman has made an excellent statement. I think the points the gentleman has made are very important. It shows the people of the Appalachian region are finally taking their economic destinies in their own hands. This is all the more important a reason to keep this program going.

The \$142 million contained in H.R. 1905 for the ARC, represents a 50-percent reduction in funds compared with fiscal year 1995—which was set at \$283 million.

The ARC reauthorization bill, reported out of subcommittee, reflects a 35-percent cut in authorized funding levels—set at \$182 million.

I repeat—this funding is a 50-percent cut in funding for a vitally important program—the ARC.

Many of my colleagues are arguing that they voted for the Kasich budget, and therefore will have to vote for the Klug amendment to kill the ARC.

That is no longer a fact. The budget conference report does contain funding for the ARC—Mr. KASICH having agreed to its funding in conference with the Senate.

Thirteen Governors—eight Republicans and five Democrats—representing the Appalachian region, have asked you to defeat the Klug amendment.

Support 21 million Americans who live in Appalachia, in more than 400 distressed counties, who are just now entering the mainstream of America's economy—who are just now taking control of their economic destinies and becoming contributing taxpayers. Don't take away their only means of breaking the cycle of poverty. Defeat the Klug amendment.

In addition, the ARC reauthorization bill, which has been marked up by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development, reflects a 35-percent reduction in the authorization level for ARC in the out years.

We have done our best to be a part of spending cuts and deficit reduction with respect to ARC funding—and we believe the \$142 million in this bill, down from \$283 million in fiscal year 1995, reflects our fair share toward reaching those important goals.

I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, of a newspaper article from one of our State newspapers, written by a reporter who has no love for the ARC. Ironically, in his effort to be caustic about the ARC, the reporter inadvertently

used words that, in fact, tell you what is good about the program.

The lead sentence in the article stated: If you drive a car, flush a toilet, or swallow a gulp of water in West Virginia, you have felt the influence of the ARC.

That statement is a statement of fact—and something I believe we can be proud of.

Indeed, the funds that have come from ARC appropriations over the years have been used to make safe drinking water available to hundreds of small, isolated communities whose children would never have been safe from disease and possible death from impure elements in their drinking water had ARC not been there to provide it. More than 700,000 Appalachians now have access to clean water and sanitation facilities.

The funds have been used to build the Appalachian Development Highway—3,025 miles of road linking rural, isolated towns and hamlets to the rest of the State—and to the rest of the world—for the first time. Through ARC funds, we were able to move towering, rugged mountains out of the path of those who needed to be able to travel beyond their small towns to find good jobs, better homes, an education—a way to break the cycle of poverty.

Beside from water and sewer projects, and aside from highway development, there is the fact that the ARC has helped develop my State's travel and tourism industry—an industry that is crucial to continued job creation in our State.

ARC has also funded adult literacy programs so that unemployed persons needing to read and write in order to find a job, can get that help. ARC helped the Governor's cabinet on children and families plan on how to distribute scarce resources so that the most needy children would be served. ARC funds assisted the State in a tremendously successful effort to teach real West Virginia State history in grades four through eight throughout the public school system. We are really proud of the way the funds have been used to upgrade the quality of education of Appalachia's children.

ARC funds have gone to create or assist 766 businesses, creating 8,000 new jobs. A network of more than 400 primary care clinics and hospitals has been completed with ARC funding, now serving 4 million Appalachians a year.

There are 13 States in the Appalachian Region—and all 13 Governors of those States—eight of whom are Republicans, five of whom are Democrats—all hope and pray that you will defeat the Klug amendment and save the ARC so that it can continue to help those living at and below poverty levels—to help raise themselves up and, as I've said before, to break the cycle of poverty that surrounds them in Appalachia.

There are more than 400 counties in the 13-State region, where 21 million people reside, and who are just now being brought into the mainstream of the American economy, making them contributors to society rather than drains on our national resources. People in Appalachia, through ARC funding, have been enabled—empowered—to take control of their lives, of their economic destinies, and become contributing taxpayers to the Nation's economy.

When I see a newspaper article, intended to deride the ARC, begin with the words, "If you've ever driven a car, taken a drink of

water, or flushed a toilet, you've felt the influence of the ARC," then I know that ARC is working just as it was intended to work.

For if any one of you here on this floor didn't have a toilet to flush, or didn't have safe drinking water available to you and your children, or didn't have a decent road to drive on—you'd darn well be wondering what the Federal Government was spending your tax dollars on. In West Virginia, and in 12 other Appalachian States, we're sending their taxes back to them where, at their discretion, decisions are made as to how it will be spent.

This is a model program that ought to appeal to every Member on this floor—conservative to liberal—because it sends tax dollars where they are needed, and allows the recipient population to decide where those dollars will go. The ARC model could very well be a better model than block grants for turning Federal programs back to the States.

Think about it. Reject the Klug amendment. Save the ARC.

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

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment. You know, the gentleman is getting the reputation of cutting out projects in other parts of the United States, but I know that he leaves his projects alone and does not use the cutting knife when he should be doing so in his own State.

Mr. Chairman, I was on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation from 1963 through 1964 when the Appalachian Regional Commission was conceived and planned and worked out. I know that it is a good program. I helped start it, and it has worked miracles in the Appalachian area.

I live in the heart of Appalachia. I represent a county that was the seventh poorest in the United States. But this is not a pork-barrel bill. This is a bill that helps a region, and, in helping a region, it helps the whole United States of America. It is a good program. It should not be eliminated. Actually it should not suffer a 50-percent loss, but we are willing to accept that. But let us not cut it any further. Hungry people, people who do not have an opportunity in life, they should be building themselves up by their own bootstraps, and this gives a helping hand for them to accomplish that goal.

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

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the First District of Tennessee, a district they now call by his name after 33 quality years of service.

Mr. Chairman, let me say as a freshman conservative Republican Member of this body, who came here to this Congress a few months ago with the No. 1 goal of staying here to see the

Federal Government's budget come into balance, I came here knowing that I represented a part of this country where TVA and the Appalachian Regional Commission have provided quality service for a number of years, and that we would have to cut spending in the programs in my backyard. And we are going to do that. This amendment and the next amendment are taking a budget and shrinking it substantially with severe cuts.

But when I took office I said to the elected representation at the local level throughout my district, will you please tell me as I go to Washington to represent the citizens that you and I represent together, what has worked the best? What is the most effective Federal programs you can refer to?

Let me tell you, the Appalachian Regional Commission was at the top of the list, time after time, because it is hard dollars for roads and gas and sewers and utilities and things that create a better economy in this region. It is a quality service, a critical service, and this is a step toward a balanced budget, a 50 percent cut in funding. This is what a conservative Republican would support, not oppose, as we seek to share this patriotic burden to balance the Federal budget across the board. The ARC has taken a 50-percent cut.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, again I urge defeat of the Klug amendment, and ask everyone to support that effort, because the Appalachian Regional Commission does a tremendously good job.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment. Rather than restate all the reasons everybody else has said, I just join in them.

Not only does the Appalachian Regional Commission make a difference in those counties and States which it serves, it makes a very big difference in those which it does not serve. My district has only eight counties that are qualified and adjoin the district of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] but because of the eight that are qualified and because the districts in Appalachia are improved, the quality of life is improved, the whole State of Kentucky benefits, not just ARC counties. It gives our whole State educational opportunities, economic development opportunities, and I urge strong support for the ARC and strong opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

Mr. BAESLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BOUCHER. I thank my colleague from Kentucky for yielding. I join him in strong opposition to the Klug amendment, which threatens the very substantial progress that we are making in the Appalachian region in our effort to become a part of the American economic mainstream.

Since 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission has been a major force in our economic progress, enabling the construction of industrial parks, water systems, wastewater systems, access roads to those industrial parks, in many instances shell buildings. We are growing economically as a consequence of what the Appalachian Regional Commission is doing. Libraries have been built, schools in our region have become more capable and have expanded their course offerings, enabling the people in our area to have access to the same kind of instruction that students in the more financially fortunate parts of the country have long had access to. Factories have opened and new jobs have been created. But we still have a very long way to go.

In my district in the southwestern part of Virginia, unemployment rates in some of our counties are in excess of 20 percent. I know that is a situation that pertains in many of the counties that exist in the Appalachian region elsewhere across that 12-State area. The ARC is a very important part to our answer to that set of problems, and it is a wise investment in the future of our regional economy and the economy of the Nation as a whole.

It has been pointed out by some of the other speakers that when the ARC makes an investment in an industrial park or other job creating facility, that the economy expands, that the tax base expands, and that as a consequence of that, the Government more than gets its money back based upon the very modest investment that is made in Federal dollars in the first instance.

I have figures showing that for every dollar the ARC invests in an industrial park or other job creating facility, that \$12 in private sector investment is stimulated. That clearly shows the very important economic effect that the ARC is having. It shows that it is a wise investment in our economic future, and for that reason I join the gentleman in his strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAESLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a personal note here. I grew up in the Appalachian Mountains, and I remember the little one-lane roads, the dusty dirt roads, the lack of utilities, the small one-room schools. I remember how it was.

If you go into eastern Kentucky where I came from today, you will see a tremendous improvement. We still have a way to go. But now there are nice highways, nice schools, utilities reaching into the homes, paved highways.

I remember my grandmother, you had to go about 3 or 4 miles up a hollow on dirt roads. And when it was raining, you could not get there. And I remember when she was very ill, we were concerned if she was going to be able to

get out of that hollow to make it to the hospital. Today, you can drive all the way to where her home was at.

It did make a big difference, but there are still things that need to be done. There has been a cut, 50 percent, but we need to continue this program. It is working, one of the few Federal programs that does work, but the reason it does work is because of the community input into it.

I urge defeat of the Klug amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am up here because of one thing, and that is because the sponsor of this bill gave a very effective, very articulate opening statement. As I listened to that statement, had I not know better, I would have said how could anyone disagree with what the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying? How could anyone oppose this amendment?

Well, let me tell you why I am here in strong opposition to this amendment. I am here because what he said was very effective, it was very articulate, and it was very wrong.

You know, if you can close someone's mind by giving an effective opening statement, you can win a trial. Do you know that a trial can be won in a 1-minute opening statement if everybody accepts what is said as true and quits listening? But let me tell you, I am here for the reason that what was said in the opening statement is incomplete, it is inaccurate, and it certainly is not the complete story.

We were told in the opening statement that the people that you would hear advocating for the ARC were going to be from Alabama, they were going to be from Tennessee, they were going to be from West Virginia. We were not told about the gentleman from Minnesota, the gentleman from Montana, the gentleman from California, the gentleman from New York that I may yield to if I have enough time. We were not told any of that. And had you quit listening, had the Members back in their office quit listening, they might have gotten the wrong impression that this was something that only Members from the ARC States were advocating.

Not true. Let me tell you what is even worse than that, and let me tell you something about the flawed argument. When the California floods came, did I, from Alabama, come out here and say "We have got floods in California. Knee deep?" No. I came and I voted to assist those people.

I am from Alabama. I could have got up and said "Let's vote for no earthquake relief in California, or the floods in the Midwest." I could have said you are going to hear from people in the Midwest. And the gentleman from Utah who sponsors this bill, he comes before us and says, "We need to support the people on the Indian reservations." I have never come down here and said "I do not have any Indian reservations." I

do not have any military bases, but I vote for military expenditures.

What an outlandish, illogical argument. Let us not buy this.

Let me conclude in saying then he gave a description of the ARC which was even more inaccurate than who he said would be speaking for this amendment. This is about reducing the number of infant deaths, infant death mortality. This is about clean drinking water. This is about roads for people to get to work and haul their products. But we were told about a few examples that had been limited in the legislation before us, not something that is going to happen but something that happened before and we changed.

Finally, we are not talking about adding. We are talking about a 50-percent cut.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1515

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose this attempt to strip an impoverished region of precious funds.

I admit that I have little confidence in most Government programs. Since I came to Congress 3 years ago, I have always supported budget proposals that release the stranglehold that the Federal Government has on our local communities. Washington, DC, has gorged itself on tax dollars long enough.

However, the Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] is not like most Federal Government programs. It works. I do not know of any Federal programs which involves State Governors and local officials in the decision making process more than ARC. Working through the 69 local development districts that ARC supports, projects originate at the local level, as community leaders determine what programs best serve their needs. As the 104th Congress makes historic and systemic change in the way Washington works, I believe that ARC is already performing in a way that we wish all of our Government programs could operate. It truly is a unique Federal-State-local partnership that should be used as a model for future cooperative efforts, not torn apart.

I understand that times are hard. Sacrifices must be made in all areas if we are going to get the budget deficit under control. My record reflects a strong commitment to reaching a zero budget deficit by 2002 and the subcommittee's bill addresses the necessity to reduce Federal funds for ARC programs. Mr. Chairman, as the bill now exists funding for ARC will be cut in half. That is a significant cut for a program which has in the past provided Appalachian communities with water and sewer systems, access to rural health care centers, child care centers, educational training, job skill training, and affordable housing. Nevertheless, I have heard from a number of local officials in western Maryland who insist that ARC can still play a vital role in our communities. It will simply be leaner, something that all Government programs could be.

Some Members are asking why ARC is still necessary. It has a proven track record of improving the conditions of the Appalachian region. However, the poverty rate for Appalachia is still 16 percent higher than the national average. Appalachia's per capita income is only 83 percent of the U.S. average. Over 20 percent of the youth in northern and southern rural areas grow up in poverty and an even higher 34 percent of youth in central Appalachia live in poverty. In fact, 115 of ARC's 399 counties are classified as severely distressed, which means that they suffer from unemployment rates that are 150 percent of the national average and poverty rates at least 150 percent of the national average.

There are too many Government programs that are outdated and inefficient. The Federal bureaucracy is bloated and needs a serious diet. But gutting ARC does not address our problems, it only creates new ones. I urge defeat of this amendment and support the subcommittee's recommended appropriation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we have beaten up on the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. KLUG] a little too much. This fellow is doing a great job in trying to cut the expenses. I do not happen to think this is a great idea for a variety of reasons.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman means his amendment is certainly not a great idea.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, absolutely. His amendment is not a good idea. I obviously support the ARC. But the thing that I want to mention is that there are two categories of expenses. One is an expense expense; the other is an investment expense. This is really an investment expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] has expired.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and in support of the Appalachian Regional Commission program. Actually in all the years that I have been in this Congress, I do not recall a program receiving the enthusiastic support that this program has received. Today made me feel proud just to have played a role and a part in funding this program, and I wish I could take credit for creating it, but actually, it was created the year before I came to Congress.

I recall, reading the act, when it was passed. It said that the Appalachian

area of the United States is the most depressed area of the United States and this is to assist this area of our country to get back on its feet. And I think it uses the words, to give it an "equal economic opportunity." And that is what it has done.

This is a program that is working, and we do not get to stand up here often, I am sorry to say, and say that this program has worked. This program is doing the job that the Members of Congress intended when they passed it. It is working, and it has been very effective.

I commend those of my colleagues, I notice that we had our former chairman here, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], who is very knowledgeable about this program. He was chairman of the authorizing subcommittee. He, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], called it a model program. He is the present chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

We had the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] here, former chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to stand up and tell us what a good program it is. These are Members that have no connection with the program whatsoever, as far as the area of the country is concerned.

I think my colleague from Alabama made a good point. When we have these emergencies in other parts of the country, we do not get up here and say, This is just regional and it should not exist. We do not get up here and say, These people do not need this help. We are not going to make this a Federal program, and it is not benefiting my State, all of that kind of thing.

This program—for example, just picking out one thing, because there are many—but this program has made it possible in the Appalachian area of this country, the most depressed area of the United States, for every person in that part of the country to be within 30 minutes of some type of medical care, the first time in history, within 30 minutes. Most of them are little rural clinics, cost practically nothing. They have a registered nurse. They have access to a doctor they can call on the phone.

The preventive medicine, my gosh, think of the children that are getting inoculations in those mountain areas now in the Appalachian area that never did get any preventive medicine before. That saves this treasury money. I am sorry you think that is bad, but I think it is good. I think it is good. It is saving the National Treasury money. It is saving the taxpayers of the whole Nation money, because it is benefiting the entire Nation.

So we could go on and on here, but you have covered it so thoroughly. We have in the Appalachian area now stronger vocational schools. We have got the health care centers I mentioned. We have got roads throughout rural areas that could not get the roads

before. They are using this partnership actually, which is, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] said, it is a model program for the United States. I think it ought to be extended to cover the whole United States, because these counties now that have been lifted out of poverty and are now on their own feet and the people are working and the people are getting health care and the people are getting good training at the technology schools. And as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] pointed out, they are coming out of this program because they do not need it anymore.

But we have got 115 more counties still left in the Appalachian area that need help and are poverty stricken and that is out of 399 counties. Can you tell me another program that has succeeded like this? This is exactly what you and I on both sides of the aisle have been advocating, joint partnership, a program where the Governors approve these applications.

So I just want to point out that this program has worked and let us be proud of it and proud that it has worked because it is helping people. That is what our Federal Government is about.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say I am here not to beat up on our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], just to make sure he is defeated in his amendment.

Also, I want to talk about Utah. I do not want to see us get into regional warfare or State-by-State warfare here. Maybe that billion is needed in Utah, but it is not apples to oranges; it is apples to rocks. It is \$1 billion for a State, whether it is Utah or California, whatever area. We are talking again, about \$142 million for 13 States. I am not going to belabor this point. I know we are close to a vote.

I will tell you something. There is a difference in Appalachia and a difference in the entire region. The more we pool those regions up within those States, the better off we will help surrounding States and other areas, for example, in Ohio, that will have to pay for the distressed economies in their States. In Ohio, part of us are in Appalachia, part of us are not in Appalachian; but again, it benefits the whole.

The one thing I would also tell you, I think I bring a different perspective than any other speaker. I used to work for Appalachia. I was on Appalachia's payroll, federally paid. I worked in the Ohio Appalachian office. I was program manager for education, health, and child development programs.

They paid part of the salary. We ran the show. Local development districts, for a minute, how they work in Ohio. We have real people. Tom Closser down in Marion, OH, we have John Quinlin in the Omega region, they are called local development districts. They have mayors that respond to them. They have

mayors that have input. We have OMERSA program run by a gentleman named Craig Closser in Zanesville, OH, who is helping over a couple hundred schools. Small amounts of money we put in that program when I worked there in 1979, very small amounts of money, sometimes \$20,000 to help with a road, with a joint, shared activity with the local government that creates 100, 300, 400 jobs.

We have reams of statistics. There may have been some bad projects, but you do not throw the baby out with the bathwater. We are taking a 50-percent cut. I think that is important. These have been good projects. This is something that all of us should support. Let us not get into some warfare from State to State or region to region. We need the help.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also vehemently speak against my friend from Wisconsin's amendment. I thank him, though, for offering the amendment because it has made me think about something that has been an ultimate success not only for this Nation but for the region of this country in which I grew up, the region which my family is from. And the gentleman from eastern Kentucky who spoke just a few speakers ago spoke so eloquently and from his heart, I know, reminded me myself of growing up in a little town called Summit Mills in Somerset County in southwestern Pennsylvania.

Back in the late 1950's, I went to one of the one-room schools he was talking about, where we had no running water. Where we had only two outhouses out back and you had the overflow that went in the creek. And that is where the kids swam with the raw sewage in the same stream, which is where you would go out to swim.

We could not understand why people were dying of unusual diseases and unusual forms of cancer. We thought that half the roads were supposed to be dirt roads. Of course, certain times of the year you just did not travel from point A to point B, and people knew they were supposed to lay up supplies. After the Appalachian Regional Commission was founded 30 years ago, things began to change. America discovered Appalachia because one of the networks—I wish I could remember which one it was—ran a news documentary about Appalachia. We did not get it. We were watching, but what was so unusual? This is the way we lived. It is the way things were.

I also was reminded by one of the last speakers who talked about the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], who talked about the vaccinations. I can remember several of the kids that were my own age, one who was in my class, some who were younger than me who got polio. I remember them finally bringing the whole community, from up in the mountain tops, grew up very near the Mason-Dixon line and Mt. Davis which is in the district of the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the highest points in the State of Pennsylvania, that brought everybody down.

The took us to the old high school gym. Everybody took three different doses of polio vaccine over a 3-week period so that we would not have to deal with that anymore. You see, while things have changed, while we have had a dramatic turnaround in the last 30 years, we have not made up for 100-plus years of neglect. We have indeed cut the infant mortality rate. We have indeed doubled the percentage of high school graduates. We have cut down on the outward migration of people who are leaving our area. We have reduced unemployment.

In fact, if you take those 399 counties that were included, you are right, only 115 now have poverty. So we are not there yet. I would say to the sponsors of this bill, while this may be a number in a budget, to those of us who have watched members of families die of unusual illnesses and cancers because they did not have a well, could not afford to drill one, did not know about the technology and they were drinking water that flowed into a cistern with all kinds of elements of all sorts and one family member would die, this is not lines on budget, on a Federal budget. This is about the lives of Americans. It is about the Federal Government and the State and local governments working together.

It is about a program that has averaged less than 4 percent in administrative costs. It is about a success that has worked. We are cutting it in half. I cannot understand, because, you see, I still come from an area in Pittsburgh where 4 years ago as a television newscaster I said to the people in the city of Pittsburgh who work at the station, I said, give me a camera crew, I will shoot a story for you. We are going to call it the rural third world. They were dumbfounded.

As we went to towns like Outcrop in Fayette County, the way it still is in those towns today, those towns not yet reached by the Appalachian Regional Commission or any other agency, where the outhouses still sit in the front yards of the houses, where when the winter wind blows, if they have curtains over the windows, they flow back and forth. Where there is maybe one coal stove in the center of the house with holes in the walls and in the ceilings and floors so that the heat can radiate to other parts of that room, where there is one hand pump in the middle of town where people can still go and they can pump their buckets of water, take it back, heat it on that same stove if they wanted to heat it to bathe or to wash their clothes.

□ 1550

People still live this way today in Appalachia. It is a whole region that has been neglected for over 100 years. We cannot make that up in 10 years or 20 years or 30 years, but, Mr. Chairman,

we are getting there. We are asking the Nation to take a look at Appalachia, to vote against the gentleman's amendment, and to help this region come back into the 20th century before the 21st century gets here.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the discussion on this amendment, which has gone on for an hour and 35 minutes now, end at 3:45, the time to be equally divided between the parties.

The CHAIRMAN. To clarify, the unanimous-consent request offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] was that the debate end at 3:45.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. KLUG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if I could extend an invitation to the chairman of the committee, Mr. Chairman, we need 10 minutes on our side, which is what I told my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER]. We miscommunicated. Twenty minutes more and we will be all right.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman, he can have 10 of the 15. How much more generous could I be?

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] please repeat his request?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all discussion on this amendment and any amendments thereto be divided and restricted to 15 minutes, 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and 5 minutes on this side.

Mr. BEVILL. Reserving the right to object, could we get 5 minutes over here, Mr. Chairman?

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

Mr. BEVILL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I would inform the gentleman, we would have 10 minutes, and the gentleman would have 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] will have 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] will have 5 minutes. Is that correct?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my freshman colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say thanks for what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] is doing here. I know a lot of people are opposed to this amendment, and I think it has been a very

healthy discussion. I have sat here a long time and a lot of people have been watching this going on for a long time. What I think he is doing that is so important is we are moving to balance the budget.

These are then tough choices that we have to make. We are having a good discussion, I think, of a tough choice. Here is a program that has been very successful over a period of 30 years. It is a program that has had some failures over 30 years. I will bet we could find that any program in the Federal Government has had both successes and failures over 30 years.

I think the question we have to ask ourselves today, then: Is this program worth continuing, adding more debt on our kids with the successes that it promises into the future or the potential failures on the path that it is on? I think that is the central question we have to ask. Is this worth putting more debt on the kids?

Mr. Chairman. I think it is great we have cut it in half? I understand the program, though, was at \$50 million under the Bush administration, so it has had some up as well as it being knocked on back as well. I just put that question to us, and I say that it seems to me, at the end, in the final analysis, that the biggest problem we are facing as a Nation today is not necessarily what is going on in the Midwest or the Appalachian region or the West or the Northeast or the South, it is the stupid debt and the amount we keep adding to it and growing. If this is worth continuing today what about next year, and the year after that when we really get to the tough choices, in year 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 to balance the budget?

I would suggest that now is the time to make the tough choice. I think we should support the Klug amendment. I think it has been a legitimate debate. I think the program has had good successes. It has had some failures. We are at a point in time in history where we just cannot mortgage the kids any further. That is why I would urge Members to support the Klug amendment.

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I assume the gentleman voted for the budget resolution conference report that came back from the House and Senate conference, is that correct?

Mr. BROWNBECK. Yes, I did, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, does the gentleman realize that in that budget conference the budget allowed for \$182 million for the Appalachian Regional Commission? Was the gentleman aware of that?

Mr. BROWNBACK. The budget resolution also called for the elimination of TVA.

Mr. ROGERS. I am talking about the conference report that came back, the House and Senate conference on the budget that came to the House.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I also voted for the budget that came out of the Committee on the Budget that called for the elimination of TVA. Did the gentleman vote for that one?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, I did. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, it is not TVA, it is ARC. Does the gentleman realize that the budget conference that he voted for that came out of the Senate and House conference provided for \$182 million for the ARC and this bill only has \$140 million in it?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I did realize that.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of inquiry. I understand I have 5 minutes remaining, under the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I will not take the full time. I simply wanted to rise to say this.

I had not intended to speak, Mr. Chairman, and I think almost everyone knows I am one of the most conservative Members of this Congress, but the ARC is one of the most conservative agencies in the entire Federal Government. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out a few minutes ago, just 4 percent of this agency's budget are spent for administrative costs. This is one of the least bureaucratic, least top-heavy agencies in the entire Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I come from Tennessee, and I come from a district where very little is done by the ARC, but I do know of the good work that has been done throughout our region and throughout these entire 13 States by these agencies. I want to salute the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and particularly my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for his yeoman work on this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of ARC and in strong opposition to this amendment. This agency is already taking a 50-percent cut in this bill. If every department and agency in the Federal Government was receiving a 50-percent cut, it would be amazing. We would be operating with a surplus.

As the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] pointed out a few minutes ago, throughout this country, every region, every State has money that is being spent by the Federal Government in some project or by some agency. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] pointed out, the central Utah project, has had over \$1 billion spent on it. This is just \$142 million, and is very small in comparison to many, many projects we could name throughout this entire country.

I rise and urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support one of the finest and most conservative agencies in the entire Federal Govern-

ment, an agency that is working to bring the Federal Government home to the people, not spending money here in Washington, but spending it out in the country to help some of our poorest citizens in this Nation. I think it is a fine organization and it deserves the support of this entire body.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Earlier in this debate, while I was in the Committee on the Judiciary, I understood there was some discussion of a project in my district involving a training stadium at Wofford College. I can tell the Members that I do not fault the people at Wofford for seeking that ARC funding, nor do I fault the Carolina Panthers for wanting to have the team training there. That has nothing to do with it.

What I do fault, Mr. Chairman, is an old way of thinking here in the Congress among us as Members. Shame on us if we cannot move on with this revolution. Shame on us if we cannot think more creatively about how to solve these problems. The ARC has done some excellent work over the years. It was created long ago and did some great work.

The problem with Federal programs is they never die. This is a time to bring this one to a nice death. It is good that the bill calls for a significant cut. I think it is time to take it straight to zero, though. The reason is we have to think more revolutionarily, if that is a verb or an adjective, I guess that was, or maybe it was an adverb, I am not sure. In any event, we have to think more revolutionarily about how to do this thing.

Sure, it is good to get a grant every once in a while in our districts, but let us think that through. If we just got rid of the unfunded Federal mandates, how much money would there be in the State of South Carolina to deal with our needs? Tremendous amounts of money.

This is the heart of the revolution. We have to start at both ends. We have to eliminate the Federal control through the unfunded Federal mandates, but then we have to stop looking at Uncle Sam as the great sugardaddy that is going to give us this free money from Washington to build a water system here or a road there. We have to think more creatively. We have to be able to see the whole revolution. The revolution involves downsizing this Federal Government, shrinking it to core business, and allowing the States to serve the functions that they can better serve.

There is no such thing as a free lunch, and there is no free money from Washington. This money that we are about to spend is going to go on to the deficit and be added onto the debt. Our children will be paying for this amount for years to come. We have a great opportunity here to complete this revolu-

tion, but do it from both ends. We have already taken action on unfunded Federal mandates. We need to go in and repeal some existing ones.

The other part is right here, right now, on this amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, an excellent amendment. Let us just get rid of the ARC. Let us finally bring to an end a program that served a very useful life, but now its time has come. I congratulate the gentleman for his amendment.

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

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. The gentleman speaks of this great revolution, Mr. Chairman. It seems like this gentleman is speaking about an economic Jihad against all Federal Government. That seems to be the best description of the revolution to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the best people to know how to allocate needs within South Carolina, I submit, are people in Columbia, people in Spartanburg, and Greenville. I daresay that not many of those folks would spend some of the money that has been spent the way ARC has spent their money. We create these programs, they fit those categories, and then the money is spent that way.

What we have to do is be willing to think more creatively and say to the locals: "You run it, you raised the money." Let us not have this pool of money that comes from Washington. I understand that the gentleman from Kentucky will likely tell me that it has been a local decision. I understand that. But it appears to be free money. That is the problem.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to demean the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG]. I think he means well and is doing a good job for his people and he is consistent. We have differences of opinion. I can recall as a freshman Member going to visit the grand opening of the Tennessee-Tombigbee, called the biggest pork barrel project in our Nation.

All the news media gathered around their good old friend Jamie Whitten, the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and said "Well, they call you the pork-barrel king, Congressman. What do you have to say about that? This is a great day for you, isn't it?" Jamie Whitten looked at the camera and he says, "I want it to be known that I played a part in investing the American taxpayers' dollars in the heartland of America. My son will get a job, my grandson will get a job, his son and his granddaughter have a shot at getting a job."

I am going to vote against this amendment, and I am going to vote

against the amendment to cut the TVA. We have to cut, and I offered to cut on the foreign aid bill, 1 percent. I did not see all these hawks running around. There was an article in the Wall Street Journal yesterday, Israel got \$13 billion in aid, loans, and grants last year, \$21,000 for every man, woman, and child, and they did not get cut by this Congress.

Do Members want to hear something else? This is not taking off on Israel. Israel has a \$1 billion trade surplus with America and a \$7.5 billion trade deficit with Europe. Come on, Mr. Chairman. I want to make the cuts. I am not going to cut from America. I am not going to cut another damned thing from our people who need it. I think Congress should set its priorities in place. I would ask the Congress to vote "no" on this overwhelmingly, and vote "no" on the amendment to cut the TVA.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I would ask how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been a long debate this afternoon and an important one. It is amazing we are even at this point in Congress, where we are not debating a 50-percent cut for ARC, we are debating whether or not it should be eliminated.

Again, while I may disagree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] on the level, or my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], who has done an excellent job rallying opposition to this amendment, I think we all have to ask ourselves, where are we today in 1995.

Let me just make three more points. First of all, this program was established in 1965, and we have poured billions of dollars into the region. If we listen to the economics we have heard from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST]; for example, we spent \$1 and then got \$5 back. That is a great deal. Why do we not spend the entire U.S. economy there and somehow we will magically multiply by five? Those economics just do not make sense.

Now we are told there was an agreement in the authorizing committee that will phase it out over 5 years. We have had this debate over the budget. Why is 7 years magical? What is magical about 7 years? The bottom line is with a \$200 billion deficit, I say the decision is not 5 years from now, the decision is finally today, in 1995.

□ 1545

Just years after this program was established, the Nixon administration took the first shot at it. Then the Reagan administration took a strong shot at it. We have talked about how tough the programs are in ARC today and where we are.

In the first Bush administration budget, the recommendation was only

\$50 million in funding. Today with a 50-percent reduction, we are at \$142 million in funding. The truth of the matter is since the early 1970's, this program has been on everybody's hit list who has objectively stood back and looked at it. I do not begrudge my colleagues involved in the 13 States involved in the Appalachian Regional Commission. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] I think explained rather passionately, there was a need for this program when it was set up in the 1960's, dramatically illustrated on television and fought for very passionately by President Johnson. But here we are 30 years later. How much longer? How many billions more? How many hundreds of millions of dollars more?

I know that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] has assured us we will be all done in 5 years, but do you really want to bet in this Chamber what happens 3 years from now, that it has got to be just 2 years more, and we cannot do it the year after that because it is another election, so it will have to be 2 more years after that.

I am sure the Governors love the money because it is money they do not have to ask their own citizens for. But the problem is this is a double-dipping and in some cases triple-dipping program that has fundamentally benefited 13 States in this country at the disadvantage of the other 37.

Finally for my colleagues in this Chamber, I think you have to ask yourself fundamentally, what is it today about a poor community in West Virginia or Georgia or Kentucky that is different from New Mexico or Wisconsin or Missouri? The answer is, absolutely nothing. We should do economic development for these communities but it should be in the Economic Development Administration, so that all 50 States in this country are treated equally.

Appalachia needed help. My friends, 30 years of help is enough.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, these are indeed historic times. This Congress has adopted the first balanced budget resolution in over a generation. We have successfully shifted the debate from more and more big Federal programs to fiscal restraint and responsibility. In this vein, I applaud the work of Chairmen MYERS and LIVINGSTON and the committee in crafting an energy and water appropriations bill that reflects this goal.

Nevertheless, I remain concerned that certain programs prime for elimination may escape intact, battered; and bruised but still standing. The Appalachian Regional Commission [ARC] plainly falls into this category.

ARC was formed in 1965 as a temporary response to poverty in a broad section of the United States known as Appalachia. Thirty years later, we continue to spend hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars annually on ARC activities that are largely duplicated by several agencies, including DOT's Federal Highways Program and HUD's Community Development Block Grant Program. The legitimate programs the ARC funds, from building highways to sewer projects, will continue to be funded.

However, ARC has a long history of funding projects that have a rather dubious impact on poverty. The ARC has spent taxpayer money on projects ranging from the NASCAR Hall of Fame to a football stadium for the NFL's Carolina Panthers. ARC has spent \$100,000 for a film history of West Virginia and another \$25,000 to attract German travelers to that same State. During this time of scarce financial resources, we must ask the question, Where is the Federal role here?

I am pleased to join with Representatives KLUG and ORTON to offer this bipartisan amendment to eliminate funding for the ARC. Many will argue that the chairman's mark already contains a substantial reduction in ARC funding for fiscal year 1996 and beyond. However, we are all aware of numerous temporary commissions that have outlived their original mission but continue to survive for political reasons. The Reagan and Bush administrations were successful in dramatically cutting the funding for ARC only to see the program flourish again in future years. In fact, President Bush's first budget called for \$50 million for ARC, a paltry sum compared to the \$142 million that this bill calls for, even with a 40 percent cut.

Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that we act boldly and rip out the roots of ARC now to ensure it doesn't grow back. Many members have correctly noted that the heavy lifting toward a balanced budget begins with the appropriations bills. Let's match our rhetoric with action and take the overdue step of eliminating the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 319, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

AYES—108

Allard	Flanagan	Metcalf
Andrews	Foley	Miller (FL)
Archer	Fowler	Minge
Armey	Franks (NJ)	Nethercutt
Baker (CA)	Frisa	Neumann
Barcia	Funderburk	Nussle
Barton	Goss	Orton
Bass	Gunderson	Oxley
Bereuter	Harman	Parker
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Boehner	Hayworth	Petri
Brownback	Hefley	Porter
Burton	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Camp	Hoke	Rohrabacher
Canady	Horn	Roth
Castle	Hutchinson	Roukema
Chabot	Inglis	Royce
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Chrysler	Kasich	Sanford
Coble	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Kingston	Shadegg
Cox	Klug	Shaw
Crane	Largent	Shays
Cunningham	Linder	Smith (MI)
DeLay	LoBiondo	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Luther	Solomon
Dornan	Manzullo	Souder
Dreier	Martini	Stearns
Dunn	McCollum	Stockman
Ensign	McInnis	Talent
Eshoo	McIntosh	Tate
Fawell	McKeon	Thornberry
Fields (TX)	Meehan	Tiahrt

Torkildsen
Torrice
Upton

Walker
Weldon (FL)
White

Wolf
Zeliff
Zimmer

Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento

Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller

Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

and the other side of the fight will argue.

But from my perspective, frankly, I think we have to ask ourselves why in 1995 the Federal Government is still involved in the hydroelectric business. Mr. Chairman, my great wish is we could have a discussion today about whether or not the Tennessee Valley Authority itself should be privatized.

You see, American taxpayers have already invested millions upon millions of dollars in the Tennessee Valley Authority, which now, frankly, owes the taxpayers of the United States \$28 billion, \$28 billion.

Now, this fight we are about to have in the next hour is not about the power side of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It is about ancillary relationships and ancillary businesses which have grown up around the Tennessee Valley Authority over the course of the last 60 years.

Beginning in the 1930's, the Federal Government began building a series of hydroelectric dams across the United States, the first of which, and really the kind of granddaddy of all those projects, was the Tennessee Valley Authority. It did a marvelous job fulfilling the mission, bringing electricity to much of the Southeast, and to help do important flood control projects. Over the course of time, TVA has begun, like many government projects do, to morph and change and develop an entirely different mission than its original core mission.

Ronald Reagan, back in the 1980's, used to like to say the closest we could ever get to eternity in this lifetime was a Federal project, and so it is with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Now, again, much like the previous debate, I have to give credit to my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], because they have made very difficult decisions. We have substantially lowered the amount of money to be given TVA this year for operations, aside from its power operations, which stand on its own and operate with the taxpayer-financed debt I referred to a minute ago.

Now, in the appropriations process, TVA has had three programs for years, one of which was a research center which has been zeroed out. Again, I know that is tough for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP] and my colleagues in Tennessee, and I can understand their hesitation to cut the programs still deeper.

There are still two programs which exist, a stewardship program which involves operation and maintenance of dams and reservoirs, and I think you are going to hear an argument in a minute that says if TVA does not do those projects, somebody else, perhaps the Corps of Engineers, might. That may be true.

I then make the argument what you can achieve is consolidation and slim

NOES—319

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Billbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Cardin
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)

Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui

McCarthy
McCreery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin

Fox
Hastert
Hefner

NOT VOTING—7

Longley
Moakley
Reynolds

Scarborough

□ 1607

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Scarborough for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. DREIER, KIM, and FOLEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, marked as amendment No. 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 29, line 1, strike "\$103,339,000" and insert "\$0".

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

Mr. KLUG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to 60 minutes, which will be equally divided between the author of the amendment, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], and 30 minutes by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the order of the Chair that the debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and any amendments thereto will be 60 minutes in length, divided equally between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, what we have before us is a test much like the test we just went through on the Appalachian Regional Commission, which is to ask this Congress to fundamentally reevaluate programs set up decades ago and which continue to live on, perhaps with justification, as I suspect my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL],

down a number of other services by consolidating those funds, and perhaps that is an argument we should have.

But, in addition, there is another nearly \$19 million for tourism and marketing. There is a series of recreational facilities located at the heart of the TVA region, which is another \$3.3 million.

Finally, logger education, regional water supply, et cetera, would total about another \$10.9 million, which is another \$103 million, because this is actually the money that is given to TVA this year by the taxpayers around this country to run the power marketing administration in the southeast corner of the United States.

I think it is time that we begin to ask the Tennessee Valley Authority to stand on its own and to operate on its own, and if these services are valuable and if they benefit the residents of the Southeastern United States, again I think we have to ask ourselves why it is that the residents of the Southeastern United States are not paying for tourism.

I think the Federal Government has a responsibility and obligation to the water projects. I think the Federal Government had an obligation and responsibility to first build those powerplants. But here we are, my colleagues, 60 years after the construction of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Bonneville Power Administration in Pacific Northwest and a whole series of other hydroelectric plants around the country, with nearly a quarter of the Department of Energy staff working on the power and marketing administrations, generating, selling, and marketing electric power.

We cannot, I think, move to privatize TVA today. It is too complicated a subject. In time we may have that debate as we do the Alaska Power Marketing Administration, which we will do this year, thanks to the leadership of Chairman YOUNG, and thanks to the fine works of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], we are likely to do in the Southeast Power Marketing Administration, the Southwest, maybe, fingers crossed, the Western Power Marketing Administration.

The issue before us today is, narrowly, whether the Federal Government will cut its relationship to fund the ongoing operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority, not directly tied in to the power business itself.

So I urge my colleagues, if we are serious, as the National Taxpayers Union suggests, to reevaluate Federal projects and to make tough, difficult decisions and to begin to close down government relationships that have gone on for 10, 20, 30, 50, and 60 years, then the Tennessee Valley Authority is the place to begin today.

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

□ 1615

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of control, I yield 15 minutes to

the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and I yield the other 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] will each control 15 minutes of debate time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I stand here, before my colleagues, today as a former member of the TVA Board as well as a former chairman of the TVA Caucus. I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment and strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this measure. I sure want to invite the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] down to the Tennessee Valley area sometime because I think he totally misunderstands the mission of TVA as well as the debt. I know he mentioned awhile ago a debt of \$28 billion, and he is referring to power funds and power debt. Since 1959, we have been under the self-financing act because of the U.S. Congress. We have paid back year after year after year the moneys that were originally borrowed to start TVA back in 1933.

Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] sends out colleague letters and makes statements, he always wants to confuse ratepayers' dollars with appropriated dollars. Over 97 percent of the TVA budget is from power funds, from those funds that are spent or from power bills that people pay on a monthly basis. They do not come from the taxpayers from around the country. He is constantly confusing those issues, and I think the time is right to set the record straight.

My colleagues, adopting this amendment would be a serious mistake. If it is adopted, flood control on the Tennessee River would cease, protection of TVA's reservoir shorelines would not be accomplished, and proper care of over 170 acres of park land would not be maintained. If TVA were to disappear, most of the functions would have to be picked up by the appropriate Federal agency, like the Army Corps of Engineers, the Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the EPA. There are no provisions in the Klug amendment providing for transfer of these duties, and there is no additional funding for these other departments or agencies. Wisconsin and all the other States have provisions, have money, have funding in order to provide for these services, and yet TVA is the vehicle that is used in the seven-State region in order to provide for these services.

But what I want to talk about in my very brief remarks left is the valuable assistance TVA provides for the poor rural counties in seven States which would be eliminated by Mr. KLUG's amendment. When TVA began just over

60 years ago, only 3 farmers in 100 had electricity.

Defeat the Klug amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the TVA Board and former chairman of the TVA congressional caucus, I rise in very strong opposition to the Klug amendment and strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

My friends, adopting this amendment would be a serious mistake. If it is adopted, flood control on the Tennessee River would cease, protection of TVA's reservoir shorelines would not be accomplished, and proper care of over 170 acres of park land would not be maintained. If TVA were to disappear, most of these functions would have to be picked up by the appropriate Federal agencies like the Army Corps of Engineers, the Park Service, the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the EPA. There are no provisions in the Klug amendment providing for the transfer of these duties or additional funding for these departments.

But what I want to talk about in my brief remarks, is the valuable assistance TVA provides for the poor rural counties in seven States which would be eliminated by Mr. KLUG's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague who offers this amendment is not from the seven-State region which TVA services. Perhaps he does not realize the important role TVA plays as a regional development agency.

For those who are not from the valley, let me relate to you a story that emphasizes TVA's importance. In the early 1940's when TVA was not yet a decade old, an old farmer stood up in church on Sunday morning to give a testimonial. "The greatest thing on this Earth is to have the love of God in your heart," he said, "and the next greatest thing is to have electricity in your house."

The farmer knew what he was talking about. He could remember the days before electricity when a coal-oil fired lamp was the only source of light at night, when a block of ice in the icebox was all that kept his meat and milk from spoiling. TVA introduced light and comfort into the farmer's life, and he and his family were grateful. Electricity was a symbol of progress. Electricity brought the Tennessee Valley into the modern age.

When TVA began just over 60 years ago, only three farmers in 100 had electricity. Floods ravaged the countryside every spring. Soils from farm lands were washed away with the rains. Good jobs were scarce. Over the next half of a century, TVA worked with other Federal agencies, the States, business, industry, and the farmers to help solve many of these problems.

These activities continue to this day. While TVA provides electricity to over 7 million citizens in seven States, it is also a resource development agency, charged by Congress to help develop the Tennessee Valley region.

Let me repeat this because I think it gets into the heart of the debate today. TVA is a resource development agency, charged by Congress to help develop the Tennessee Valley region.

TVA is a partner with communities in the Tennessee Valley, providing expertise, support, and ideas needed to help distressed rural areas. TVA's Rural Development Program, which provides valuable assistance to small- and medium-sized businesses to expand their operations and employment, would be terminated under the pending amendment. Mr.

Chairman, the small business sector is the only sector of the economy that is creating jobs right now. We should be adopting legislation which encourages growth for small businesses, not discouraging it.

TVA has a program also targeted for elimination by the gentleman's amendment which focuses on the valley's most distressed counties which have unemployment in excess of 10 percent, per capita income less than 60 percent of the national average, a poverty rate of 26 percent, and derive more than 24 percent of total personal income from Government transfer payments like welfare and food stamps.

Under this program, TVA works with local communities in developing economic development projects, education and skills training, waste management, and business competitiveness. Mr. Chairman, TVA turns down requests for assistance each day because they are unable to meet the demand for this program.

I would like to make a final point regarding some of the misconceptions and outright inaccuracies made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Representative KLUG presumes that the Federal taxpayer is subsidizing TVA's power program.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that prior to 1959, TVA's power operations were financed primarily by Federal appropriations. However, in 1959 Congress passed the TVA Self-Financing Act.

Public Law 86-157 required that TVA's power program be self-sustaining—no longer funded by Federal appropriations. The 1959 act even directed TVA to pay back the Government for its initial appropriations out of future power revenues.

The fact is that TVA must charge sufficient electric rates to cover the costs of operations, maintenance, and capital improvements for the power program. Not one single Federal cent goes into TVA's power programs. So when Representative KLUG states that TVA provides Government subsidized power, obviously he has been misinformed or ill-advised.

Mr. Chairman, TVA's appropriation has already been reduced by 28 percent under the bill. I believe we have taken our fair share of cuts. I urge my colleagues to oppose the gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this afternoon this subcommittee is taking a responsible position on the TVA, cutting what we felt was—could be cut, unnecessary spending, maybe areas that the Tennessee Valley Authority did not belong in, but retaining its right, its responsibility, to operate the rest of its traditional business responsibilities.

A few years ago when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] and I were on the committee it was reckless. We have to say it was not run prudently as a business should be run. Rates were set arbitrarily with little regard about the ratepayer, and it got way out of hand. There was waste, a tremendous

amount of waste, but through the years we have trimmed this down, and I think this year is a huge step. We have reduced the appropriation from last year's level by 26 percent, and that is a level of \$39,534,000 less than last year, and we have reduced the President's request for this by 25 percent, \$37,134,000.

We have made significant cuts. Please support the committee.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] for yielding this time to me and for his efforts at deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the Klug amendment. Mr. Chairman, I think, as my little niece would put it, we have to get real around here about deficit reduction, and, if we cannot cut this \$103 million, we are not going to be able to balance this budget.

Mr. Chairman, as one taxpayers' group put it, this is pure pork. How can we justify Federal tax dollars, Federal taxpayers' dollars, going to such functions as boat landings, campgrounds, and logger education? Mr. Chairman, most of these functions, whether it is boat landings, or campgrounds, or logger education, can and should clearly be operated by State and local governments. Of course the operation of the dams and reservoirs are properly functions of the Army Corps of Engineers. If we truly intend to balance the budget, we must examine each and every program in the budget and ask whether or not it is something we should require taxpayers across the country to pay for.

In this case, Mr. Chairman, the answer is a resounding no. We must, must, have the political courage to shut down such programs as this or allow States to take them over.

Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayers are sick and tired, with all due respect to my good friends from Tennessee who are here fighting hard and representing the Tennessee Valley Authority well, but with all respect to them, Mr. Chairman, this is pork-barrell politics in its pure form, and American taxpayers are sick and tired of such politics. Mr. Chairman, this is a real test of whether this Congress is serious about fiscal discipline.

I urge a vote for the American taxpayer. Vote for the Klug amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Klug amendment to eliminate the Tennessee Valley Authority's appropriated budget. My district is not located in the Tennessee Valley, yet I support continued funding of TVA. This amendment is bad for a number of reasons.

As we have been told, TVA's remaining funds are necessary to carry out

Federal responsibilities in areas such as flood control, land management, and resource stewardship. If TVA does not carry out these responsibilities, they will have to be carried out by other Federal agencies such as EPA, the Corps of Engineers, or the U.S. Forestry Service.

Where are the savings purportedly attained through this amendment? There are no savings because these agencies would need additional funds to carry out these activities. If this amendment passes, land management, flood control, and resource stewardship programs would still be needed and will have to be carried out by other Federal agencies. Therefore, the cost savings will not be realized.

Now the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has made a very good argument perhaps, that programs should be evaluated. That would perhaps need to be taken up by other agencies. Perhaps we could have that discussion. But this amendment does not provide for that discussion. This amendment zeros out this program without a discussion of whether or not these functions should be funded in another part of the Federal budget.

I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] in their committee have done a very good job of tightening the belt and cutting this program down to what we think is reasonable, and I think that it is something that this Congress should approve because it is a good agency, it provides good functions, and those functions would have to be carried out whether they were in the TVA or not.

I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], another classmate of mine and a fierce deficit hawk.

Mr. ZIMMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I commend him for this fight that he has undertaken. The Tennessee Valley Authority is part of our history, it is a proud part of our history, but there comes a time when you have to go back to first principles, especially when we are under the constraints of a balanced budget requirement, and one of the questions that we should ask ourselves with respect to any government program is: Is it appropriate that government—government at any level—fund this program in the first place? I would submit that items such as running boat landings, and campgrounds, and tourism simply are not the appropriate realm for government activity. I would submit that other activities that are covered by this cut, although they may be appropriately within the realm of government, are not within the realm of the Federal Government. This is a quintessentially regional and local program. It is for the benefit of the people who live in the Tennessee Valley, and I do not doubt that there is a considerable benefit to them. But the people

who benefit from the program should pay for the program. It should be done, if they choose, by their State, county, and local governments, but it should not be paid for by people living in other parts of the country.

If we had a surplus instead of a multi-hundred-billion-dollar deficit, I think it might be appropriate to fund programs which are not absolutely necessary but which are merely desirable or appealing from a political or regional point of view, but we do not have that luxury, and I think as we scrutinize every single program, regardless of the noble history, regardless of the sentiment, regardless of the good feeling that they have generated over the past several decades, we have to be clear-eyed, we have to be analytical, and we have to reject those programs that do not meet the test. I believe that the TVA programs covered by the amendment do not meet the test, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment to eliminate TVA funding.

Colleagues, before you cast your vote for the Klug amendment, consider the ramifications of your vote.

Surely no one in this Chamber is going to blindly believe that the numerous functions of TVA are simply going to disappear into the woodwork if this amendment were to pass?

Let us consider some of TVA's responsibilities for just a moment. TVA's work ensures that over 650 miles of the Tennessee River is navigable to meet the needs of America's intercostal water transportation system by operating some 48 locks and dams.

TVA also has the responsibility for the upkeep of over 250,000 acres of Federal land and the largest contiguous forest east of the Mississippi River, known as Land Between the Lakes.

Are we to simply believe the Klug amendment is going to eliminate TVA's responsibility to operate all of these dams and lands?

Are we to assume that if this amendment passes, then the Federal Government will have cleansed itself from its obligations concerning TVA and its functions?

I would certainly hope that no one in this Chamber would believe that.

What is more, under current law, TVA's functions are to be carried out by TVA, and this amendment does not take that into consideration.

Colleagues, TVA is already going to see a reduction of 28 percent of its funding and the elimination of many of its programs as part of the Appropriations Committee's recommendations.

With so much uncertainty involved with this amendment, I certainly do not want to leave TVA's important functions to the whims and wishes of more Government agencies and departments in Washington.

Colleagues, there is a better solution than the Klug amendment.

□ 1630

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment. This amendment would callously eliminate funding for necessary activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority without making any provision for how these functions will be accomplished.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was created in 1933 to provide flood control, improve navigation, promote economic development, and provide electricity in the Tennessee Valley. Its accomplishments are legendary.

I am concerned that my colleague who is offering the amendment fails to fully understand what the effects of his amendment would be.

First, the TVA power program operates entirely without Federal subsidy—it is a user financed program which never adds to Federal expenditures or to the deficit. Funds from the power program cannot be used to make up the funding shortfall.

The remainder of the program, the nonpower program, plays an important and vital role in the lives of the citizens of the Tennessee Valley and the national economy.

TVA has the responsibility for 1,000 miles of navigable waterways, and of operating 52 dams and 14 navigation locks. It also manages 420,000 acres of public lands. If the Klug amendment were to be enacted, there are no provisions for any other entity taking over these responsibilities. Even if other agencies were to be instructed to take on the responsibilities for managing TVA property, there has been no allowance in any other budget to cover the additional costs.

The result would be 7 million people in the Tennessee Valley with no one responsible for flood control or navigation, and these are not insignificant elements of the TVA program.

In 1994 alone, TVA's flood control program prevented an estimated \$1 billion in flood damages across the valley and saved Chattanooga twice from devastation by floodwaters. The navigation system moves 48 million tons of cargo annually. The Klug amendment makes no provision for how these important benefits of TVA will be replaced.

This bill already cuts TVA programs by nearly 30 percent. Let us not be penny-wise and pound-foolish by eliminating necessary functions without adequately considering the needs of the people who depend upon TVA for the same functions which are provided to the remainder of the Nation.

Vote "no" on the Klug amendment.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

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

Mr. Chairman, I am from the Third District of Tennessee, and, gratefully, have more TVA employees in my district than any other district in this Nation—6,000 TVA families live and work in my district. I will tell you from firsthand experience, Mr. Chairman, while it might surprise you, that the Tennessee Valley Authority is not perfect. Neither is the Pentagon perfect, neither are the Centers for Disease Control perfect, neither is the White House perfect, and neither is this institution perfect. But I have not seen any amendments to zero those core functions out.

This amendment does not say "Let's find an area that can be restricted further and reduce it." It says zero. It says cut it off, cold. Let me tell Members this: TVA is much better off than it used to be, because the TVA Board is appointed by the President of the United States. The TVA Board has been run by the Democrats at times, it has been run by the Republicans at times. It survived a few years under the leadership of who they call "Carvin' Marvin" Runyon, who now runs the U.S. Post Office. I will tell the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], he would be one of your kind of guys, because he goes in there and cuts it to the bone. I told TVA at that time I thought it would be good for them to have the years under Marvin Runyon. I tell my friends at the post office the same thing. It is one of the best things that can happen to you. We experienced almost a 50-percent reduction in employment through the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is going in the right direction. There is one basic flaw to the Klug amendment to zero out TVA. That is the stewardship, the water management part, what keeps backyards from flooding all along this river system. There is no provision for the Army Corps of Engineers beginning October 1 of this year when this money runs out to take that function over. We have already gone through that part of this bill, this appropriations bill, and there is no addition to pick this function up. So the bill is fundamentally flawed.

As I said earlier on another amendment, I believe everyone must share in this patriotic challenge to balance the Federal budget. The TVA is no exception, and I told them that earlier when I got here, my friends at TVA, "I am going to fight for you, but you are going to have to take some licks. You are going to have to do your share. You are going to have to show the country." So we reduced the budget in the appropriations process from \$143 to \$103 million, a substantial reduction. This is the TVA's share to this patriotic challenge.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to oppose

the Klug amendment and support continued, but less, TVA funding.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make two points to respond to the articulate argument of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP], in defense to TVA.

First and foremost, one of the programs we are talking about today is additional economic development money, aside from the water development projects the gentleman talks about. As he knows, and I know all too well, given the vote on the last amendment, the region in Tennessee finds itself not only available for the normal economic development money that a county in Wisconsin or a county in Ohio may be eligible for, but now for Appalachian Regional Commission money as well, and now finally Tennessee Valley Authority money.

So now we have got counties in this region of the country that are eligible for three times as much funding as your counties back in Ohio or mine in Wisconsin or those in Colorado or Minnesota, or whatever the case might be.

Second, I would have loved to have crafted an amendment much differently than the one we have in front of us, but the fundamental point is anybody in this institution understands you cannot legislate on an appropriations bill. So I would love to change the ground rules for TVA. I would love to have arguments about transferring this to the Corps of Engineers. I could not do it because the committee would have never let me do it.

But I think what we are faced with today is an amendment that fundamentally tries to send a message to TVA that says eventually we are going to get to a point where you are going to have just the kind of cuts we have had under the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], but eventually TVA is going to have to cut its strings, and eventually, in one form or another, TVA is going to have to stand on its own, whether it privatizes or corporatizes or whatever the model is, because in 1995, the Federal Government should not be in the electric utility business.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman evidences a basic misunderstanding here of what TVA is about. TVA stands on its own on its power production and the ratepayers who use the power in the Valley pay for that. You are not talking about the Federal Government being in the electric power business in 1995.

I, quite frankly, to some degree resent this attack on one area of the country, because I think that we are all one country. My friend from Chattanooga before me pointed out very well that there are some things good happening in the Tennessee Valley because of TVA.

We do not attack people because we do not have something that happens in Wisconsin or New Jersey. We do not have a lot of Coast Guard along the Tennessee River. We do not attack the Coast Guard because they patrol in New Jersey and up in the Great Lakes.

I resent this attack on a small southern area of the country. But more than that, what the gentleman's amendment will fail to do and what he does not understand is this money that is appropriated to TVA is because TVA is the agency of choice to fulfill some of the safety measures that must be undertaken by either the Corps of Engineers, the Coast Guard, or others along 600-plus miles of the Tennessee River with dams and locks and those sorts of things.

That is the kind of money we are appropriating, because the TVA can do it efficiently, and it is the agency of choice in this regard. There is a fundamental difference here between power money, which is not involved, and safety money, which is.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD].

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Klug amendment. Back in 1963, President Kennedy initiated a project of TVA called the Land Between the Lakes. And there were 2,500 families and children and mothers and fathers moved out of that property, not because they wanted to leave their farms, but because the Government instituted eminent domain authority and forcibly removed them from the property. So they left.

Under the Klug amendment today, they are going to zero fund this project, as well as others of TVA. This project has nothing to do with electric utilities or anything else, but it is one of the largest wildlife preserves in the United States.

Today at LBL you can find endangered red wolves, bald and golden eagles, coyotes, black vultures, redtail hawks, and there is no provision on what is going to happen to this land, 170,000 acres of it. There is a herd of buffalo on this property. Two million visitors a year visit this property, and they come from all over the United States.

When you make the argument that this is something different or the Federal Government should not be involved in it, we have national parks throughout this country that people visit all the time. This is 170,000 acres of wildlife preserve that this Government made a conscious decision that they wanted, and they moved 2,500 people off of the property, forced them off.

So I say that we are trying to redefine the role of Government, and we can do that, but we need some time. They are reducing the TVA budget this year by 28 percent, but we are not asking many agencies of Government to go to zero funding. We need time, and we can reach that time and make arrangements.

With that, I vigorously urge you to oppose the Klug amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, in my brief 1½ minutes, let me try to clear up a couple of misunderstandings.

First of all, there has not been a penny of taxpayer Federal dollars going to the TVA power program since 1959. What little Federal money goes to the TVA goes to carry out Federal mandates. And these Federal dollars, as has been pointed out, have been cut by 28 percent already.

So let me point out what are these Federal mandates. Where are these Federal dollars going. TVA manages the Nation's fifth largest river system, using 48 dams to control flooding and maintain the navigability along 652 miles of the Tennessee River. TVA is responsible for keeping up with 250,000 acres of Federal land along with 11,000 miles of environmentally sensitive shoreline, and the Land Between the Lakes, which is a 170,000-acre national recreation area, which is the largest contiguous forest east of the Mississippi River.

□ 1645

So to cut these funds any further does not cut the responsibilities, it just shifts it from one pocket to the other.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this has cleared up some misunderstandings, and I hope my colleagues will vote to only cut the TVA nonpower funds by 28 percent.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me, if I can, clarify somewhat the relationship between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Federal Government.

This is a General Accounting Office report, dated June 1995. The headline says, Tennessee Valley Authority, problems raise questions about long-term viability.

If I can, Mr. Chairman, let me read briefly:

"While no cash flow crisis exists today, GAO believes that TVA's financial condition threatens its long-term viability and places the Federal Government at risk."

If there is no relationship between the TVA and the Federal Government, how can they possibly be at risk?

"Resolving TVA's financial problems will be costly and require painful decisions.

"In other words," concludes this report, "without the guarantee of the Federal Government, much of the financing of the Tennessee Valley Authority is the equivalent of a junk pile."

That is not my conclusion, that is the conclusion of the U.S. Congress General Accounting Office.

So let us not for a minute pretend there are not any significant financial ties between the U.S. Government and its taxpayers and the Tennessee Valley Authority, because, as everybody in this Chamber understands who is now defending the project, TVA only exists because of \$28 billion in taxpayer-financed subsidies.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

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

Let me say this. As has been pointed out by so many other speakers, TVA is already taking a 28-percent cut in the Federal appropriation. There are very few other agencies or departments in the Federal Government that are taking a hit or a cut of this size. And I yield to no one in my desire and determination to balance the Federal budget. But balancing the Federal budget and reducing Federal spending is one thing; totally eliminating the Federal appropriation is another thing, because very few people are trying, I think, to totally do away with the Federal Government. That is really based on what we are doing with regard to the TVA, if we eliminate this Federal appropriation.

Let me say this, I want to spend most of my time talking about the Federal role here because there is a very important Federal role. TVA is primarily or at least in large part a benefit to citizens all over this country. The people of the Tennessee Valley benefit to a certain extent, but people all over this country benefit from TVA's activities.

For instance, when the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers overflowed 2 years ago, TVA restrained the flow of the Tennessee River saving billions of dollars and an untold number of lives. In 1988, a drought stalled hundreds of barges, and TVA released water that helped keep the Mississippi flowing. The Mississippi, which flows from Minnesota down to New Orleans, again, saving millions, potentially even billions of dollars for shippers and for American consumers, American consumers who live all over the country.

In 1994, 34,000 barges traveled the waterways managed by TVA, 34,000 barges. These barges carried goods and products intended to be used all across the country. In addition, the cheap cost of this type of transportation helped keep prices low for American consumers in every State in this country.

A recent study by the Iowa Department of Transportation stated that it would take 58 tractor-trailers to carry what one barge carries. If TVA had not managed these waterways for the 34,000 barges which used them last year, we could have potentially had to have at least an additional 1.9 million tractor-trailers on our highways. By making

these rivers navigable for barge transportation, TVA helps reduce air pollution, road damage and the potential for serious highway accidents.

The amendment would also reduce TVA's ability to manage 11,000 miles of shoreline for which it currently has responsibility. Supervision of this land is not only critical for flood control but also to industrial development, recreation, and wildlife management.

TVA operates 160 public recreation areas for boating, hunting, fishing, hiking, and camping. People from all over the United States visit and enjoy these facilities. Visitation to these recreational areas contributed \$1.25 billion to the economy last year.

Thus, in many ways, Mr. Chairman, TVA is a major asset to this country, in many different ways.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], distinguished ranking member of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and urge that Members vote against it.

I know my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], is like all of us, we are anxious to get the budget balanced and we are certainly well on our way to doing it. I do know that there is a little confusion about this.

As my colleagues know, the TVA is not something new. This was an act of Congress, recommended by President Roosevelt, and has been one of the most successful Federal programs that we have ever had in the Nation.

We are talking about a big part of seven States; we are talking about an installation that has over 40 dams along the Tennessee River and its tributaries. We are talking about closing down, privatizing. I notice the gentleman, the author of the amendment there, says, we need to privatize the TVA. We need to get the TVA out of the power business. And can you imagine that? Can you imagine if an amendment like this passed that cut the funding from this program, I will not attempt to talk about all the disasters it would create. Can you imagine the 170,000-acre park down there, without any doubt the biggest animal preserve in the continental United States just suddenly being closed; 2 million people no longer would have a park to go to and the biggest preserve would be closed down there, just automatically, no study, no nothing, no thought about it?

And think about what would happen to the \$20 million a year payment that the TVA is paying every year to the U.S. Government. Is that the way you balance the budget? Cut off your income? That is \$20 million coming in every year. It is a check. It is money. It is being brought to the U.S. Treasury.

Now, are we going to cut that off, privatize it? That word privatize amazes me, the way they throw it around here. The shoe shine boy even mentioned it the other day. He said, They are trying to privatize me. I hear that word coming in from every angle around here. It sounds like it is magic or something. But I cannot imagine having a complaint about a \$20 million payment coming into our Federal Government. I do not know of any other program we have that does that.

If any of you know of it, I would like to know about it, because I have not heard it.

I think the gentleman's intentions are good, but to be exact, there are 48 dams there, 652 miles of the Tennessee River, and there is some thousands of tons, 48 million tons of cargo going down this Tennessee River, this part of the TVA system. We could just go on.

If you want to privatize TVA, let us get a bill and get a study made and see what ought to be done about it. I think they would recommend we forget about it.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, may I be advised how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] has 17½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 3 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER], and that they be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to make two points. First, on the argument of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] that somehow this idea of privatizing the TVA is absolute anathema and will mean the end of the world. May I again refer to the same GAO report on the financial viability of the Tennessee Valley Authority:

TVA's links to the Federal Government—these links that do not exist which do exist, says the GAO—

and its high debt limits have enabled it to borrow the billions of dollars needed for its nuclear construction program. TVA's electricity rates and power production decisions are not subject to the same oversight that other utilities routinely face. Although protected from competition by legislation and its customers contracts in the short run, TVA will have to compete with other utilities in the long run. Because of heavy debt burden and resultant high financing costs, TVA lacks the flexibility to successfully compete in this environment.

May I suggest that if we do not figure a way to privatize the Tennessee Valley Authority, your taxpayers in Alabama and mine in Wisconsin will at

some point have to eat \$28 billion in TVA debt. I am not making that up. That is the conclusion of the General Accounting Office.

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

Mr. KLUG. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, let us not tell the TVA to quit sending that \$20 million a year to the government. Let us agree on that.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, sending how much to the Federal Government? Twenty million?

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, \$20 million a year paid in to the government. We are talking about balancing the budget.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I will make a deal with the gentleman. They can keep the \$20 million and you let me keep the other \$103 million that is part of the debate right now.

The second conclusion on the TVA, this was in the House budget resolution:

Eliminate Federal support for the Tennessee Valley Authority. In 1995, Congress appropriated \$143 million for these activities. This proposal would end this annual subsidy for TVA.

I would like Members to listen very carefully to the last sentence here:

Other equally deserving regions of the country fund these activities either through higher rates for electric power, local tax revenues, or user fees.

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

Mr. KLUG. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to the gentleman, he has been reading from a report by the GAO. But in a letter to Mr. QUILLEN, dated June 28, 1995, the GAO said this:

Dear Mr. Quillen, your staff asked us to clarify whether the scope of our current review of the Tennessee Valley Authority included work on TVA's nonpower programs. Our review focused on TVA's power program. It did not examine TVA's nonpower programs.

We are today discussing TVA's nonpower programs. We are not discussing TVA's power programs. That is the bulk of the TVA work, 98 percent of it. But the GAO report that the gentleman from Wisconsin has been reading from repeatedly today did not examine the nonpower programs that we are discussing here in this amendment today. So there is a pretty big distinction there that I think should be made clear to everyone who is listening.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, is absolutely correct. But I brought this report out in order to counter arguments from a number of Members on his side who have been saying, There is no longer a Federal relationship because the power administration operates on its own and the only money the Federal Government is somehow tied

to TVA for are these ancillary operations. All I was trying to do in raising this GAO report is to say, any suggestion that the Federal Government is not deeply intertwined in the financial longrun future of TVA is not correct.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, but the gentleman does understand though that the TVA power programs are self-supporting and that taxpayers in Wisconsin and other parts of the country are not subsidizing the power programs of the TVA?

Mr. KLUG. Correct, Mr. Chairman, in that they are not paying current payments, but not correct to the degree that they got subsidized loans initially not available to other parts of the country.

Mr. DUNCAN. Initially, many years ago.

Mr. KLUG. Many years ago, correct, but it is still subsidized.

Mr. DUNCAN. The gentleman does understand, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] pointed out a few minutes ago, that TVA power rates have not been subsidized since 1959, and then it was only to a very, very small extent.

□ 1700

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HILLEARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I guess I am going to give a slightly different perspective. I am going to reiterate some of the points, but slightly different. I grew up in the very shadow of TVA. From my parents' home, the home I grew up in, you could actually see the TVA dam and the cooling tower sticking out from the trees. We actually had our best friends in the world work for TVA. Now their sons and daughters work for TVA.

TVA has been a lot of good things to the Tennessee Valley. It has been some bad things. It has provided jobs, flood control, electricity, and in doing so, provided a lot of economic development in a region that sorely needed it. However, I will go a little further than my other colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP], in saying that it is not perfect. It is a long ways from being perfect. In fact, in my opinion, it has been extremely wasteful and mismanaged over the many years in the power part of TVA, not the nonpower part of TVA.

Of course, we pay for this in the Tennessee River Valley with higher rates. No taxpayers in Wisconsin or any other part of the country pay for this, but we, the ratepayers in the Tennessee River Valley, pay for this management.

The amendment of our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, does nothing

to alleviate these problems. His amendment seeks to zero out TVA's nonpower budget. In a way, I have no problem with this, in some ways. I have no problem with TVA taking a hit. I tell everybody who comes into my office, people who are very sincere about their programs. Some programs in Tennessee were in the southern region, and I say to them that they are going to have to take a hit, too. We all have to take a hit to balance this budget. I think TVA is taking a hit, 28 percent.

I have no problem with some Federal programs being zeroed out. I think there are some programs in the Federal Government that are absolutely worthless, and should be zeroed out. However, that is not the case in the TVA's nonpower budget. The TVA's nonpower budget goes, to a large extent, for flood control, navigational management, ecological, and environmental stewardship. These things, once again, will have to be picked up by some other Federal agency. These will have to be picked up by some other Federal agency, Mr. Chairman, so this is not one of those Federal programs that needs to be zeroed out.

If it is not picked up by some other Federal agency, the is only one other choice. Those of us in the Tennessee River Valley will be accepting mediocre and in some cases unsafe stewardship of our shoreline, of our flood control. I just do not think that is the right thing to do.

For all these reasons, I urge all my freshman colleagues to pay attention to these very big distinctions. All of us are budget hawks up here. Many of us in the freshman class ran on this, and this is what we are dedicated to. However, this is a big distinction in this particular case. I urge all my colleagues in the freshman class and otherwise to vote "no" on the Klug amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to my colleagues that are both here on the floor and those that are in their offices listening to this debate. I want to say to my classmate, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG], I applaud him for his consumption with the budget and keeping us on the edge of where we need to be. As we from districts that have irons in these budget fires, the gentleman squeezes this budget and some of us feel the pain from that, but he has made us realize that we have to accept some cuts, that we have to reanalyze some of our connections to the Federal Government, because we cannot keep spending money at the rate or at the level we have been spending money.

However, I also want to say to my classmate that he is consistent with regard to my region, the ARC amendment and how this TVA amendment, and the space station fight we go through annually. I want to echo some of the words of my colleagues from

Tennessee and from Kentucky and the other regions that certainly have interests connected to this issue here. I want to remind my colleagues, we are taking a 28-percent cut here. We are talking about an agency that runs dams, almost 50 dams in the TVA area. We are talking about an agency that is charged with obligations that it cannot meet if this irresponsible amendment passes here today.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not speak to other alternate ways for us to run those almost 50 dams. This amendment does not talk about the flood control issues that our region of the country would be saddled with. There are many troublesome reasons that we need to oppose this amendment. This amendment ensures that rural communities in the Tennessee Valley will lose access to a variety of information sources, including education, health care, and business opportunities.

Much like the speaker who just spoke from Tennessee, my region takes a cut, a significant cut. We have the environmental research center, a TVA project, that is located in my district. It bears the direct impact of this budget cut, this 28-percent cut here today. That is a very important program in my district that TVA has started, that has environmental impact. I think those of us from our region have taken our fair share of cuts. We only ask the Members not to go so far as to cut us off. We think we have been responsible in this effort. I urge Members to oppose this Klug amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding the additional time.

However, I would like to set the record straight. As chairman of the TVA Caucus, I am delighted to do that, and I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] should listen carefully. Under the bond covenants financing the power program, there is a provision that no income from ratepayers can be used to maintain the dams, to provide for flood control, to provide for navigation, and all the things that he lists here as stewardship, water and land, land between the Lakes, et cetera, which are a Federal obligation.

Those obligations are performed by the Corps of Engineers throughout the other regions of the United States. If he is successful, and I hope he is not, in his amendment there is no provision in the energy and water bill to increase the funding for the Corps of Engineers to take over this operation. I think what the gentleman is saying is something that is completely foreign to the facts.

Also, the intent of the TVA Act when it was created in 1933, was that the

power rates—the income from the power production—was not to be used for flood control, was not to be used for navigation, was not to be used for the protection and the care of the lands bordering the Tennessee River and the dams that they have constructed, so what he is doing is cutting, absolutely cutting and making TVA an inoperative agency.

Therefore, I urge this body, each and every Member, to oppose his amendment, because he does not have the facts in this case. Mr. Chairman, I remember when TVA was created in 1933. I remember how the flooding drove people out of the area. The farmers could not farm. The floods took and washed their crops away. It was disastrous.

Then farsighted Members of this body created the Tennessee Valley Authority to control the flooding, to provide farmland for the farmers to use for this Nation to enjoy the fruits of their labor and the food to eat. It was created. Over the years some 48 dams have been constructed on the Tennessee Valley, in the Tennessee Valley program, along the Tennessee River. It is a power-producing area, and the Federal Government does not pay any of the power production costs. That is done under the bonding of TVA itself.

Mr. Chairman, I remember going over to the Secretary of the Treasury with Marvin Runyon when he was Chairman of the Board of TVA. We finally persuaded the Government to replenish and give us permission to pay the Government off with a private bond program. Finally, after several trips, we were successful in doing that, and TVA issued bonds and paid off the Federal Government, relieved them of that obligation.

Already in this bill \$42 million has been cut, whittled away. I do not like that, but I am willing to accept it. However, certainly, we are not going to destroy the viability of TVA. There is no money in any other agency to take over these obligations. In Wisconsin there are 14 Corps of Engineers projects, spending some \$15 million. I do not see any amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to cut out the Corps of Engineers' projects in Wisconsin. That is what he is trying to do, to seven States in the Tennessee Valley area, to cut out and rape the TVA program. I think what is good for the goose is good for the gander. We should defeat his amendment. Defeat it we must, and defeat it we will.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 144, noes 284, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

AYES—144

Allard	Funderburk	Nussle
Andrews	Gallegly	Orton
Archer	Ganske	Owens
Armey	Gibbons	Oxley
Baker (CA)	Goss	Parker
Baldacci	Green	Paxon
Ballenger	Greenwood	Petri
Barcia	Gunderson	Porter
Barrett (WI)	Gutknecht	Portman
Barton	Hancock	Pryce
Bass	Harman	Ramstad
Bilbray	Hastert	Reed
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Blute	Hayworth	Rivers
Boehner	Hefley	Roemer
Bonilla	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bono	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownback	Hoekstra	Roth
Burton	Horn	Roukema
Camp	Hunter	Royce
Canady	Inglis	Salmon
Castle	Kasich	Sanford
Chabot	Kennedy (RI)	Saxton
Christensen	Kennelly	Scarborough
Chrysler	Klecza	Schaefer
Coble	Klug	Schumer
Coburn	Largent	Seastrand
Combest	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Cooley	Lazio	Shadegg
Cox	LoBiondo	Shaw
Crane	Luther	Shays
Cunningham	Manzullo	Smith (MI)
DeLay	Martini	Smith (NJ)
Deutsch	McCarthy	Smith (WA)
Doyle	McCollum	Solomon
Dreier	McHale	Souder
Dunn	McInnis	Stearns
Ehlers	McIntosh	Stockman
Ehrlich	Meehan	Talent
Ensign	Metcalf	Tate
Fawell	Meyers	Thornberry
Flanagan	Miller (FL)	Tiahrt
Foley	Molinari	Torkildsen
Forbes	Moorhead	Torricelli
Fowler	Myrick	Upton
Franks (NJ)	Neal	White
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Zeliff
Frisa	Neumann	Zimmer

NOES—284

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Fields (LA)
Ackerman	Coleman	Filner
Bachus	Collins (GA)	Flake
Baesler	Collins (IL)	Foglietta
Baker (LA)	Collins (MI)	Ford
Barr	Condit	Frank (MA)
Barrett (NE)	Conyers	Franks (CT)
Bartlett	Costello	Frost
Bateman	Coyne	Furse
Becerra	Cramer	Gejdenson
Beilenson	Crapo	Gekas
Bentsen	Creameans	Gephardt
Bereuter	Cubin	Geren
Berman	Danner	Gilchrest
Bevill	Davis	Gillmor
Bishop	de la Garza	Gilman
Bliley	Deal	Gonzalez
Boehlert	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Bonior	DeLauro	Goodling
Borski	Dellums	Gordon
Boucher	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Brewster	Dickey	Gutierrez
Browder	Dicks	Hall (OH)
Brown (CA)	Dingell	Hall (TX)
Brown (FL)	Dixon	Hamilton
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Hansen
Bryant (TN)	Dooley	Hastings (FL)
Bryant (TX)	Doolittle	Hayes
Bunn	Dornan	Heineman
Bunning	Duncan	Hilleary
Burr	Durbin	Hilliard
Buyer	Edwards	Hinchee
Callahan	Emerson	Hoke
Calvert	Engel	Holden
Cardin	English	Hostettler
Chambliss	Eshoo	Houghton
Chapman	Evans	Hoyer
Chenoweth	Everett	Hutchinson
Clay	Ewing	Hyde
Clayton	Farr	Istook
Clement	Fattah	Jackson-Lee
Clinger	Fazio	Jacobs

Jefferson	Miller (CA)	Slaughter
Johnson (CT)	Mineta	Smith (TX)
Johnson (SD)	Minge	Spence
Johnson, E. B.	Mink	Spratt
Johnson, Sam	Mollohan	Stark
Johnston	Montgomery	Stenholm
Jones	Moran	Stokes
Kanjorski	Morella	Studds
Kaptur	Murtha	Stump
Kelly	Myers	Stupak
Kennedy (MA)	Nadler	Tanner
Kildee	Ney	Tauzin
Kim	Norwood	Taylor (MS)
King	Oberstar	Taylor (NC)
Kingston	Obey	Tejeda
Klink	Olver	Thomas
Knollenberg	Ortiz	Thompson
Kolbe	Packard	Thornton
LaFalce	Pallone	Thurman
LaHood	Pastor	Torres
Lantos	Payne (NJ)	Towns
Latham	Payne (VA)	Trificant
Laughlin	Pelosi	Tucker
Leach	Peterson (FL)	Velazquez
Levin	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Lewis (CA)	Pickett	Visclosky
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Volkmer
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Vucanovich
Lightfoot	Poshard	Waldholtz
Lincoln	Quillen	Walker
Linder	Quinn	Walsh
Lipinski	Radanovich	Wamp
Livingston	Rahall	Ward
Lofgren	Rangel	Waters
Lowey	Richardson	Watt (NC)
Lucas	Riggs	Watts (OK)
Maloney	Roberts	Waxman
Manton	Rogers	Weldon (FL)
Markey	Rose	Weldon (PA)
Martinez	Roybal-Allard	Weller
Mascara	Rush	Whitfield
Matsui	Sabo	Wicker
McCrery	Sanders	Williams
McDade	Sawyer	Wilson
McDermott	Schiff	Wise
McHugh	Schroeder	Wolf
McKeon	Scott	Woolsey
McKinney	Serrano	Wyden
McNulty	Shuster	Wynn
Meek	Sisisky	Yates
Menendez	Skaggs	Young (AK)
Mfume	Skeen	Young (FL)
Mica	Skelton	

NOT VOTING—6

Fields (TX)	Hefner	Moakley
Fox	Longley	Reynolds

□ 1731

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Longley for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Messrs. HOLDEN, VENTO, FATTAH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CRAPO, and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. COOLEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. BONO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

The Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. Sec. 505 of Public Law 102-377, the Fiscal Year 1993 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, and section 208 of Public Law 99-349, the Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1986, are repealed.

SEC. 502. Sec. 510 of Public Law 101-514, the Fiscal Year 1991 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, is repealed.

SEC. 503. Without fiscal year limitation and notwithstanding section 502(b)(5) of the

Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, or any other provision of law, a member of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board whose term has expired may continue to serve as a member of the Board until such member's successor has taken office.

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any applicable Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I could get the attention of the gentleman from Texas, the majority whip. I have just run across a flyer here on the floor that says that we are going to be in session tomorrow evening, and we are not going to adjourn by 6 o'clock. We are going to be out Friday, but also it says that we are going to be in Monday, and I have already scheduled something out in my district, so I will have to make changes this coming Monday, and votes will begin by 5 o'clock. Is that correct?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. I think the majority leader had every intention later on this evening to explain the new schedule.

Mr. VOLKMER. Tonight we go to about midnight?

Mr. DELAY. I am advised that, yes, we intend to go to midnight tonight. We are going until we finish this bill for sure, and we are going tomorrow until we finish the Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. The majority leader will come in and fully explain why on all of this?

Mr. DELAY. I think the majority leader had the intention of explaining the schedule later on this afternoon and this evening as the schedule applies to tomorrow, I mean, and next week.

Mr. TRAFICANT. If the gentleman will yield, we will be discussing that later. I had a question: Many Members had scheduled that Monday. Is it possible to roll those votes until Tuesday?

Mr. DELAY. Certainly we can take that under advisement, but I think Members need to, right now, plan on votes after 5 o'clock on Monday.

And if we can get a hold of some of the time on some of the amendments, maybe we can schedule the session a little earlier during the days of the week.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask the majority whip a question? Would it be possible tonight, instead of going into the amendment process, to take the rule, then have general debate and stop after general debate and begin the bill tomorrow? That way many Members will be enabled to go home at a fairly reasonable hour, about 10 o'clock.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, to answer the distinguished

ranking member of the interior appropriations bill, we, in looking at the amendments that have been published in the amendments, we understand that will be offered on the Interior bill and trying to extrapolate that over time of tonight and up through tomorrow, it looks that we have it pretty well scheduled to where we have to get into amendments in order to finish the Interior bill by tomorrow evening.

Mr. YATES. You may have to go to midnight tomorrow night as well, because, as I understand it, there are 71 amendments to the Interior bill.

Mr. DELAY. Well, we understand that, and if we have to go to midnight tomorrow night to finish the Interior bill, we will just have to do that. We lost a lot of time last week and the early part of this week, and we have every intention of passing every appropriations bill before and honor the August 4 adjournment date.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. If the gentleman will yield, why do you not look into having us come in next week and the week after, just to try to come in at 9 o'clock on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and work until 9 o'clock, 12 hours a day? That gives Members a better time to plan, and it makes a lot of sense. I know that does not work very well around here. You ought to look at it from 9 to 9 and do it Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, and it will certainly help Members.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I think the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has a very good point, and we just may very well have to do that. We may very well have to look at working the weekend of the 28th and the 29th, through the weekend, in order to finish these bills. We do not intend to take away the privilege of any Member to offer any amendment to strike on an appropriations bill, and we want to make sure every Member of the House has the opportunity to do that, and as we look at the number of amendments that are being filed, it is obvious to us that many Members are taking advantage of that, and we have to adjust the schedule accordingly.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I would hope that the Republican leadership would look at rolling those votes until Tuesday. If we have a schedule where we make plans, even at this critical time, we should try and look at that.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 505. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, this is an amendment that has been incorporated in all of the appropriations bills. It is the same amendment that has been approved on all others. It poses no controversy. It provides that we might even buy some American-made products and give a little notice encouraging same.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, the author of the amendment, for yielding. This is an amendment that you have championed for a number of years, very successfully.

This committee has accepted it in the past, and the Republicans accept your amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I thank the chairman. I support his bill.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I have no objections.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for an "aye" vote.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARKEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY: 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.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly raise a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to increase an appropriation not authorized by law and, therefore, is in violation of clause 2(a) of rule XXI. Although the original account funding from nuclear waste fund is unauthorized, it was permitted to remain pursuant to the provisions

of the rule we are now considering that provided for consideration of this bill.

When an authorized appropriation is permitted to remain in a general appropriation bill, an amendment merely changing that amount is in order, but the rules of the House apply a merely perfecting standard to the items permitted to remain and do not allow insertion of a new paragraph not part of the original text permitted to remain, to change indirectly a figure permitted to remain. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts cannot be construed as merely perfecting, and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair rule the amendment out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARKEY. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, on page 81 of the committee report, committee states itself quite clearly that the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and the Nuclear Waste Policy Act Amendments of 1987 authorize a waste management system for the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste from commercial and atomic energy defense activities.

These laws establish the nuclear waste disposal fund to finance disposal activities through the correction of fees from the owners and generators of nuclear waste. The committee recommends \$226 million to be derived from the fund in fiscal year 1996, et cetera, et cetera.

Clearly, the underlying Nuclear Waste Policy Act has authorized, and the Waste Policy Act of 1987 have authorized the money. That is the platform legislation which we are using for discussion in this debate, and any ruling to the contrary would negate the long historical legislative record in this area that clearly makes the amendment which I have before the House in order this evening.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana wish to be heard?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do.

If the gentleman would go over to page 124, the committee has recognized those programs and agencies that are not authorized by law. You will find, pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law, and nuclear waste disposal fund is about the sixth one down.

Mr. Chairman, in title XLII, section 10222, paragraph (e), the administration of a waste fund, the last section, the Secretary may make expenditures from the waste fund subject to appropriations which shall remain available until expended. Appropriations shall be subject to triennial authorization, very clearly.

I insist on my point of order.

Mr. MARKEY. Clearly, there is an internal contradictory position which the committee has taken within its own document.

Page 81, they make it quite clear that the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and the Nuclear Waste Policy of 1982 and of 1987 each have authorized the waste management system, and then within their own document they negate that conclusion by the arbitrary statement that the nuclear waste disposal fund is not authorized. Clearly, there is right now an ongoing excavation at Yucca Mountain. Clearly, there is an ongoing collection of funds from all the nuclear electric utilities in the United States, and clearly the whole subject of this debate is premised upon the authorized 1982 and 1987 Nuclear Waste Policy Acts.

The statement by staff in a committee report later on that this is not, in fact, authorized only seeks to make possible the point of order which the gentleman is making right now, but clearly the earlier part of this legislation that is the committee report had to be stated this way in order for the committee to proceed at all.

□ 1745

So, any ruling by the Chair, notwithstanding the objection by the gentleman from Indiana, has to reflect the actuality that this committee has stated clearly, that the legislation has been—that this has been authorized and, in fact, has been authorized going back to 1982, with continuing legislation in 1987, and the Chair in ruling, I think, should reflect the history of this entire area plus the very statement of the committee in their own document with regard to the authorizing of these funds.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there has been long precedents in this House that conclusively establishes that the proponents of an amendment bear the burden of responsibility of establishing the appropriation added by the amendments is authorized in law. Nevertheless, I observe that the payments for the nuclear waste fund are subject to triannual, as we just cited in title XLII, authorization. Pursuant to the provision of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, as amended, such authorization has not been enacted since 1987, long past the established provisions of title XLII of the U.S. public health and welfare. It says they must be subject to a triannual authorization.

I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. MARKEY. I wait for the Chair's ruling with great anticipation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] violates clause 2 of rule XXI by providing an unauthorized appropriation.

The amendment proposes to insert a new paragraph on page 29 in title V that will indirectly change figures in three earlier paragraphs in title III on pages 16, 18, and 26. It would reduce the amount provided for energy supply, research and development, and increase the amounts provided for nuclear waste disposal and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The increases proposed by the amendment are not authorized by law. The Chair notes that the amounts already carried in the bill for those objects are likewise unauthorized, as indicated on pages 124 and 125 of the committee report and the law cited by the gentleman from Indiana, 42 U.S.C. 10222(e). However, the unauthorized amounts in the bill were permitted to remain by House Resolution 171.

Where an unauthorized appropriation is permitted to remain in a general appropriation bill, an amendment directly changing that amount in that paragraph, and not adding legislative language or earmarking separate funds for another unauthorized purpose, is in order as merely perfecting. But an amendment adding a further unauthorized amount is not in order.

The precedents that admit a germane perfecting amendment to an unauthorized item permitted to remain—for example, Deschler's volume 8, chapter 26, section 3.38—deal with actual changes in a figure permitted to remain. They apply a merely perfecting standard in the strictest sense of that phrase. None involve the insertion of a new paragraph—not part of the text permitted to remain—to change indirectly a figure permitted to remain.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts cannot be construed as merely perfecting under the precedents. Accordingly, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 255, noes 167, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

AYES—255

Allard	Bilbray	Callahan
Archer	Bilirakis	Calvert
Army	Bliley	Camp
Bachus	Blute	Canady
Baker (CA)	Boehlert	Castle
Baker (LA)	Boehner	Chabot
Ballenger	Bonilla	Chambliss
Barr	Bono	Chenoweth
Barrett (NE)	Brownback	Christensen
Bartlett	Bryant (TN)	Chrysler
Barton	Bunn	Clinger
Bass	Bunning	Coble
Bateman	Burr	Collins (GA)
Beilenson	Burton	Combest
Bereuter	Buyer	Cooley

Cox	Houghton	Quinn	Lincoln	Olver	Serrano
Crane	Hoyer	Radanovich	Lipinski	Ortiz	Sisisky
Crapo	Hunter	Ramstad	Lofgren	Orton	Slaughter
Creameans	Hutchinson	Regula	Lowey	Owens	Spratt
Cubin	Hyde	Riggs	Luther	Pallone	Stark
Cunningham	Inglis	Roberts	Maloney	Pastor	Stokes
Danner	Istook	Rogers	Manton	Payne (NJ)	Studds
Davis	Jacobs	Rohrabacher	Markey	Payne (VA)	Stupak
de la Garza	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen	Mascara	Pelosi	Tejeda
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Roth	Matsui	Peterson (FL)	Thompson
DeLay	Johnston	Roukema	McCarthy	Peterson (MN)	Thornton
Diaz-Balart	Jones	Royce	McDermott	Pickett	Thurman
Dickey	Kasich	Salmon	McHale	Pomeroy	Torres
Doolittle	Kelly	Sanford	McKinney	Poshard	Torrice
Dornan	Kennedy	Saxton	McNulty	Rahall	Towns
Dreier	Kim	Scarborough	Meehan	Rangel	Traficant
Duncan	King	Schaefer	Meek	Reed	Tucker
Dunn	Kingston	Schiff	Menendez	Richardson	Velazquez
Ehlers	Klug	Seastrand	Miller (CA)	Rivers	Vento
Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner	Mineta	Roemer	Visclosky
Emerson	Kolbe	Shadegg	Minge	Rose	Ward
English	LaHood	Shaw	Mink	Roybal-Allard	Waters
Ensign	Largent	Shays	Mollohan	Rush	Watt (NC)
Everett	Latham	Shuster	Moran	Sabo	Williams
Ewing	LaTourette	Skaggs	Murtha	Sanders	Wise
Fawell	Laughlin	Skeen	Nadler	Sawyer	Woolsey
Fazio	Lazio	Skelton	Neal	Schroeder	Wyden
Fields (TX)	Leach	Smith (MI)	Oberstar	Schumer	Wynn
Flanagan	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)	Obey	Scott	
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)			
Forbes	Lightfoot	Smith (WA)			
Fowler	Linder	Solomon	Ackerman	Fox	Longley
Franks (CT)	Livingston	Souder	Browder	Hefner	Martinez
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Spence	Chapman	Jefferson	Moakley
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Stearns	Coburn	Kaptur	Reynolds
Frisa	Manzullo	Stenholm			
Funderburk	Martini	Stockman			
Galleghy	McCollum	Stump			
Ganske	McCrery	Talent			
Gekas	McDade	Tanner			
Gephardt	McHugh	Tate			
Geren	McInnis	Tauzin			
Gilchrest	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)			
Gillmor	McKeon	Taylor (NC)			
Gilman	Metcalfe	Thomas			
Goodlatte	Meyers	Thornberry			
Goodling	Mfume	Tiahrt			
Gordon	Mica	Torkildsen			
Goss	Miller (FL)	Upton			
Graham	Molinari	Volkmer			
Greenwood	Montgomery	Vucanovich			
Gunderson	Moorhead	Waldholtz			
Gutknecht	Morella	Walker			
Hall (TX)	Myers	Walsh			
Hancock	Myrick	Wamp			
Hansen	Nethercutt	Watts (OK)			
Hastert	Neumann	Waxman			
Hastings (FL)	Ney	Weldon (FL)			
Hastings (WA)	Norwood	Weldon (PA)			
Hayes	Nussle	Weller			
Hayworth	Oxley	White			
Hefley	Packard	Whitfield			
Heineman	Parker	Wicker			
Herger	Paxon	Wilson			
Hilleary	Petri	Wolf			
Hobson	Pombo	Yates			
Hoekstra	Porter	Young (AK)			
Hoke	Portman	Young (FL)			
Horn	Pryce	Zeliff			
Hostettler	Quillen	Zimmer			

NOES—167

Abercrombie	Condit	Frank (MA)
Andrews	Conyers	Frost
Baessler	Costello	Furse
Baldacci	Coyne	Gejdenson
Barcia	Cramer	Gibbons
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Gonzalez
Becerra	DeLauro	Green
Bentsen	Dellums	Gutierrez
Berman	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Bevill	Dicks	Hamilton
Bishop	Dingell	Harman
Bonior	Dixon	Hilliard
Borski	Doggett	Hinches
Boucher	Dooley	Holden
Brewster	Doyle	Jackson-Lee
Brown (CA)	Durbin	Johnson (SD)
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Johnson, E.B.
Brown (OH)	Engel	Kanjorski
Bryant (TX)	Eshoo	Kennedy (MA)
Cardin	Evans	Kennedy (RI)
Clay	Farr	Kildee
Clayton	Fattah	Kleczka
Clement	Fields (LA)	Klink
Clyburn	Filner	LaFalce
Coleman	Flake	Lantlos
Collins (IL)	Foglietta	Levin
Collins (MI)	Ford	Lewis (GA)

NOT VOTING—12

Browder	Fox	Longley
Chapman	Hefner	Martinez
Coburn	Jefferson	Moakley
	Kaptur	Reynolds

□ 1811

Messrs. OWENS, KLECZKA, DURBIN, and BALDACCIO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. FAZIO of California, DICK- EY, HASTINGS of Florida, MFUME, and GORDON, and Mrs. KENNELLY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, preprinted, amendment No. 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to revise the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that such revision provides for an increase in the springtime water release program during the spring heavy rainfall and snow melt period in States that have rivers draining into the Missouri River below the Gavins Point Dam.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward amendment which simply prevents the Army Corps of Engineers from revising the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual in such a way that it would increase the likelihood of springtime flooding.

Such a commonsense amendment is needed to ensure that the corps does not repeat its previous mistake—a proposal which would have devastated farms, businesses, landowners, and countless communities along the Missouri River.

Last year the corps issued its proposed changes to the Master Manual and made a colossal blunder by proposing to drastically increase the flow and water level of the Missouri River during the months of April, May, and June. These obviously are the very months when States such as Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri are already most vulnerable to flooding due to the mountain snow melt in the Rocky Mountain West and heavy spring rains swelling the immediate watersheds of the Missouri River tributaries in the four-State area.

It's bad enough that farmers and other landowners along the river have to contend with natural disasters. They shouldn't be forced to deal with the kind of man-made disasters which would have been caused by the corps' proposal. The floods of 1993 and the heavy rains this spring offer clear and convincing proof that the corps' recent proposal was seriously flawed.

At a series of two dozen hearings throughout the Missouri River basin region, many hundreds of participants expressed very strong, even vociferous and nearly unanimous opposition to a number of provisions in the corps' preferred alternative. One of the most detested provisions was the proposed increase in its so-called "spring rise."

Mr. Chairman, following this massive opposition to the proposed changes, the corps acknowledged the flaws in the original proposal and expressed a willingness to reevaluate the issue. Hopefully, the corps has gotten the message loud and clear and now understands the devastation which would be caused by the spring rise they originally envisioned. However, this Member believes this common sense amendment is needed to make absolutely certain that the corps does not repeat this mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I know a couple of my colleagues would also like to speak on this. I yield to a colleague and neighbor who has been working very diligently on this effort, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for the Bereuter amendment and to commend my colleague and friend from Nebraska on offering this amendment.

The Bereuter amendment prevents the Army Corps of Engineers from spending any funds to implement changes in the corps' Missouri River Master Control Manual that would increase springtime water releases along the river or its tributaries.

I have been pleased to work with Mr. BEREUTER and roughly two dozen colleagues who represent areas downstream on the Missouri or Lower Mississippi Rivers to oppose the so-called "preferred alternative" for river management.

This plan would have resulted in exactly the type of spring-time flooding increases the Bereuter amendment seeks to prevent.

These spring rises coupled with fall flow reductions would have been extremely damaging to my constituents, their land and our local economy.

Fortunately, the Army Corps' Omaha office, under the very able leadership of

Cmdr. Mike Thuss, has come to the sensible conclusion that the "preferred alternative" is seriously flawed and a comprehensive reevaluation of water control alternatives is needed.

I hope as this effort continues, all my colleagues who represent districts where river navigation and flood control are important will work with Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. DANNER of Missouri other Members and myself who are interested in this issue to ensure that the Federal Government's historic commitment to flood control and river navigation continues.

□ 1815

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska for yielding to me, and I rise in very strong support of his amendment and commend him for his action here.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bereuter amendment to prohibit any of the bill's funds from being used to make any changes in the Corps of Engineers' Missouri River Master Manual for their plan to increase spring-time water release along the Missouri River and its tributaries. The so-called "Preferred Alternative" is being touted by the Corps of Engineers on behalf of recreational interests and radicals in the environmental community who want to shut our inland waterway system down and restore the breeding ground for the ever-elusive Pallid Sturgeon. Put simply, this plan is misguided and ill-conceived. It would have a devastating impact on agriculture, flood control, and navigation on most of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

The Missouri and Mississippi inland waterway system is a major link for commerce and industry in order to move goods and services throughout America and around the globe. In fact the Missouri River alone is responsible for the shipment of 2.5 million tons of commercial cargo each year. In addition, as its largest tributary, the Missouri River provides 45 percent to 65 percent of the water that flows into the Mississippi River between St. Louis, MO and Cairo, IL—a stretch responsible for tons of cargo valued at \$16 billion annually. More than 70 percent of the Nation's total grain exports are handled through Mississippi River port elevators and one half of the total grain exports eventually end up in New Orleans. The controversial plan that some political types would force the corps to foist on the public would significantly shorten the barge season in the fall when commerce and agriculture need water the most to carry their goods to market. It would put barge operators out of business and ruin river transportation. Quite clearly, agriculture and navigation are the targets here—clear them out and shut down the river.

Moreover, the plan proposes to raise the level of water on the Missouri in the springtime—a time of the year when the river is at its highest level. After the Midwest floods of 1993 environmental extremists made ridiculous assumptions that it was the levees that

caused the flooding and that we couldn't build them back. Well, I submit to you that if this plan were to go into effect we won't need the levees because each spring the corps will release an extra 20,000 cubic feet per second of water during the flood-prone spring months and it will devastate communities protected along the river. All of this in the name of protecting water skiers and a fish.

Last, Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that the Environmental Protection Agency—a Federal agency whose work I rarely extol on this floor—has studied the corps' plan. They claim, and I quote, "the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers draft environmental impact statement for the Missouri River Master Water Control Manual is environmentally unsatisfactory . . . contains inadequate information . . . and is likely to result in little, if any, improvement to the Missouri River ecosystem, including habitat for federally listed threatened or endangered species."

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Bereuter amendment and preserve our navigation, our flood control, and inland waterway system as we know it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from Nebraska for this amendment.

As one who has suffered from the floods in the Missouri River Basin in the year of 1993 and again this spring, I realize that the master plan as originally drafted and if implemented by the corps would have meant the types of floods that we had in 1993 and again this spring in 1995 would have been almost an annual thing in the spring, with the spring rains and all the thaws up north and the release of the waters from the reservoirs in the north. It would have meant that we would have had an annual flood. And it does not make sense in order to do so.

It also would have meant that in the time frame of August through December, we would have such a low flow in the Missouri River that we would not have any ability to have barge transportation to move our agriculture products. It just did not make sense.

I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska. We have been working together, those of us from the States of Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Illinois, and others, in order to make sure that this does not happen. The gentleman has a very good amendment. I urge the House to adopt the amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, my sister has been sandbagging in the gentleman's district the last 2 years and hopefully she will not have to do it the third year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, my wife was sandbagging in 1993 in my home town of Lexington. I point out that my home is on the Missouri River and, throughout my lifetime, I have seen the problems of the rising of the spring floods. And I want to commend the gentleman for this amendment.

I also wish to point out that had the master manual plan gone into effect, it would have been devastating for all of us, particularly for agriculture in the State of Missouri.

The gentleman who has heard us in the Corps of Engineers, and I wish to pay tribute to him, Colonel Mike Thuss, has done a remarkable job of listening and hopefully his recommendations will be along the line that will be suitable for all of Missouri for agriculture and for those downstream people who depend so much upon the natural flow of this river.

I thank the gentleman, and I support the amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I recognize the legitimacy of the concern he seeks to address. Speaking from the upstream perspective on the Missouri River, there is a word of reservation I want to advance about dealing in an appropriations bill with the minutiae of the administrative branch, in this case the Corps of Engineers. The process has already worked as it should. The Corps of Engineers had extensive hearings on the spring rise proposal and received a ton of input, nearly all of it negative. They no longer have plans, as I understand it, to implement the spring rise proposal as initially advanced. They are back to the drawing board.

Therefore, this kind of restriction imposed without hearing in the appropriations process is, in my opinion, not necessary, although I do acknowledge the gentleman's concern and would note that my wife, in 1993, spent 3 weeks working in Iowa on the flooding there.

Mr. Chairman, from its origins in Montana to its end near St. Louis, the mighty Missouri River is managed and controlled by the Army Corps of Engineers. Five years ago, the Army Corps of Engineers began a review of its river management plan, commonly called the master manual. This was the first major review of the manual since it was implemented in 1960.

This fair and objective review process, now underway, has included Representatives of each of the States affected by the Missouri River and the master manual, including Mr. BEREUTER. At this point, Congress should not alter this process within the energy and water appropriations bill.

Last month, the corps informed Members of Congress of preliminary draft recommendations for reviewing and updating the master manual. The corps has received thousands of comments on its initial draft recommendation and is specifically concerned with its draft proposal as it relates the spring rise. The corps is addressing the spring rise issue in a revised draft that will be released in 1997.

To be brief, the process is working as intended. The corps put forth a proposal that

contained a number of flaws, including the spring rise. Now the corps is reexamining those issues to develop an alternative that will be acceptable to those affected by the spring rise and other Missouri River management concerns.

This Congress should not get involved with the specifics of the master manual. Instead, we should allow the process to proceed as it has with input from all interested and affected parties.

In fact, I do not necessarily oppose the intentions of my friend, Mr. BEREUTER, in addressing his concerns of the spring rise. However, within the process of revising the master control manual we should not address specifics of revising the manual within this appropriations bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I would say that as the elected Representatives of the people, they expect us to take action when appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my neighbor, the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. DANNER].

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment. Let me say, for those of us who represent areas that have been flooded, not only in 1993 but in the other serious flood in 1995, we know that we have issues that need to be addressed.

I believe that the gentleman's amendment does that. I am pleased to have been able to work with you during this period of time so that we could bring to the attention of the Corps of Engineers that there were some flaws in their proposal, flaws that needed to be corrected. I think that this will go a long way in that direction.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PALLONE: Page 29, after line 25 insert the following new section:

SEC. 505. The amount otherwise provided in this Act for the following account is hereby reduced by the following amount:

(1) "Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund", aggregate amount, \$1,000.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is basically to reduce the amount of money that is set aside for interim storage of nuclear waste and essentially make the point that there is not enough funding for a permanent repository.

As the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, I be-

lieve we have a responsibility to both the taxpayers and the ratepayers of our county to ensure that we have a safe and environmentally sound permanent repository for our Nation's nuclear waste.

I also believe that we need to make good on the Federal Government's commitment to utilities to assume responsibility for this waste.

However, I do not think it is fair to anyone to sacrifice long-term disposal for short-term gain. In fact, in the course of two comprehensive hearings held by the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, it became abundantly clear that long-term storage was the priority for all interested parties. That is why I am concerned about the language that is in this bill that funds interim storage yet directs DOE to downgrade or terminate its activities at Yucca Mountain.

This language, in addition to being at odds with existing law, I believe, jeopardizes the important gains we've made in the last 2 years toward siting a permanent repository by focusing funding on an unauthorized interim storage facility. The amendment I am offering makes a token reduction in the waste disposal fund, which is necessary for the amendment to be in order, but my intent is to redirect the focus of the program back to building a permanent waste repository.

I understand the desire to have interim storage, even though onsite storage is safe, and I am not opposed to the idea of interim storage. However, I believe the Federal Government has a moral and statutory responsibility to continue with site characterization work for a permanent repository.

My amendment would allow the Government to fulfill its responsibility to permanently dispose of nuclear waste by indicating the intent of Congress that funds appropriated in this bill for the DOE and NRC be used for site characterization of Yucca Mountain. This is the most responsible approach we can take at this time.

I don't think I have to remind my colleagues that what we are talking about here is ratepayer money. This program is wholly funded by monies paid in good faith by the users of nuclear power. In fact, nuclear utility customers have paid billions of dollars into the fund beyond what has been spent and they continue to pay more each year than we appropriate. So restoring proper direction to this program is, in effect, only an effort to make good on the agreement we made with the ratepayers. These ratepayers provide us with more than \$600 million in funding for this program each year: It's only fair that we use that money for the purpose it was intended.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the committee is willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUNDERSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUNDERSON: Page 29, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Army Corps of Engineers Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway System Navigation Study may be used to study any portion of the Upper Mississippi River located above Lock and Dam 14 at Moline, Illinois, and Bettendorf, Iowa, except that the limitation in this section shall not apply to the conducting of any system-wide environmental baseline study pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has explained his amendment to the committee. We accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will read the last two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1996".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Mr. OXLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution No. 171, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 27, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie	Crapo	Hastings (FL)
Ackerman	Cremeans	Hastings (WA)
Allard	Cubin	Hayes
Andrews	Cunningham	Hayworth
Archer	Danner	Heineman
Armev	Davis	Herger
Bachus	de la Garza	Hilleary
Baesler	Deal	Hilliard
Baker (CA)	DeLauro	Hobson
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Hoekstra
Baldacci	Deutsch	Hoke
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Holden
Barcia	Dickey	Horn
Barr	Dicks	Hostettler
Barrett (NE)	Dixon	Houghton
Barrett (WI)	Doggett	Hoyer
Bartlett	Dooley	Hunter
Barton	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Bass	Dornan	Hyde
Bateman	Doyle	Inglis
Bentsen	Dreier	Istook
Bereuter	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Berman	Dunn	Jefferson
Bevill	Durbin	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Edwards	Johnson (SD)
Bishop	Ehlers	Johnson, E. B.
Bliley	Ehrlrich	Johnson, Sam
Blute	Emerson	Johnston
Boehlert	Engel	Jones
Boehner	English	Kanjorski
Bonilla	Ensign	Kaptur
Bonior	Eshoo	Kasich
Bono	Evans	Kelly
Borski	Everett	Kennedy (MA)
Boucher	Ewing	Kennedy (RI)
Brewster	Farr	Kennelly
Brown (FL)	Fawell	Kildee
Brown (OH)	Fazio	Kim
Brownback	Fields (LA)	King
Bryant (TN)	Fields (TX)	Kingston
Bryant (TX)	Flake	Klecza
Bunn	Flanagan	Klink
Bunning	Foley	Klug
Burr	Forbes	Knollenberg
Burton	Ford	Kolbe
Buyer	Fowler	LaFalce
Callahan	Franks (CT)	LaHood
Calvert	Franks (NJ)	Lantos
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Canady	Frisa	Latham
Cardin	Frost	LaTourette
Castle	Funderburk	Laughlin
Chabot	Gallegly	Lazio
Chambliss	Ganske	Leach
Chapman	Gejdenson	Levin
Chenoweth	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Christensen	Gephardt	Lewis (GA)
Chrysler	Geren	Lewis (KY)
Clay	Gibbons	Lightfoot
Clayton	Gilchrest	Lincoln
Clement	Gillmor	Linder
Clinger	Gilman	Lipinski
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Livingston
Coble	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Coburn	Goodling	Lofgren
Coleman	Gordon	Lowe
Collins (GA)	Goss	Lucas
Collins (IL)	Graham	Luther
Collins (MI)	Green	Maloney
Combest	Greenwood	Manton
Condit	Gunderson	Manzullo
Conyers	Gutierrez	Markey
Cooley	Gutknecht	Martinez
Costello	Hall (OH)	Martini
Cox	Hall (TX)	Mascara
Coyne	Hamilton	Matsui
Cramer	Hancock	McCarthy
Crane	Hansen	McCollum

McCrery	Portman	Stokes
McDade	Poshard	Studds
McHale	Pryce	Stump
McHugh	Quillen	Stupak
McInnis	Quinn	Talent
McIntosh	Radanovich	Tanner
McKeon	Rahall	Tate
McKinney	Ramstad	Tauzin
McNulty	Rangel	Taylor (MS)
Meehan	Regula	Taylor (NC)
Meek	Richardson	Tejeda
Menendez	Riggs	Thomas
Metcalfe	Rivers	Thompson
Meyers	Roberts	Thornberry
Mfume	Rogers	Thornton
Mica	Rohrabacher	Thurman
Miller (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Rose	Torkildsen
Mineta	Roth	Torres
Minge	Roukema	Torrice
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Molinari	Royce	Traficant
Mollohan	Rush	Tucker
Montgomery	Sabo	Upton
Moorhead	Salmon	Velazquez
Moran	Sanford	Visclosky
Morella	Sawyer	Volkmer
Murtha	Saxton	Vucanovich
Myers	Scarborough	Waldholtz
Myrick	Schaefer	Walker
Neal	Schiff	Walsh
Nethercutt	Schumer	Wamp
Neumann	Scott	Ward
Ney	Seastrand	Watt (NC)
Norwood	Serrano	Watts (OK)
Nussle	Shadegg	Waxman
Oberstar	Shaw	Weldon (FL)
Obey	Shays	Weldon (PA)
Olver	Shuster	Weller
Ortiz	Sisisky	White
Orton	Skeen	Whitfield
Oxley	Skelton	Wicker
Packard	Pallone	Williams
Pallone	Jefferson	Wilson
Pastor	Johnson (CT)	Wise
Paxon	Johnson (SD)	Wolf
Payne (NJ)	Johnson, E. B.	Woolsey
Payne (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Wyden
Pelosi	Johnston	Wynn
Peterson (FL)	Jones	Yates
Peterson (MN)	Kanjorski	Young (AK)
Petri	Kaptur	Young (FL)
Pickett	Kasich	Zeliff
Pombo	Kelly	Zimmer
Pomeroy	Kennedy (MA)	
Porter	Kennedy (RI)	

NAYS—27

Becerra	Foglietta	Owens
Beilenson	Frank (MA)	Parker
Bilbray	Furse	Reed
Brown (CA)	Harman	Roemer
DeFazio	Hefley	Sanders
Dellums	Hinchev	Schroeder
Dingell	Jacobs	Sensenbrenner
Fattah	McDermott	Vento
Filner	Nadler	Waters

NOT VOTING—7

Browder	Hefner	Reynolds
Fox	Longley	
Hastert	Moakley	

□ 1847

Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TUCKER, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 530

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from cosponsorship of H.R. 530.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, regretably I missed the vote, rollcall No. 482, on final passage of the foreign ops bill yesterday.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

As a Vietnam veteran, I had been invited by the President to attend the White House ceremony announcing normalization of relations with Vietnam. At the time I departed for the ceremony, debate on the bill was scheduled to continue past the time the ceremony was expected to end, permitting me to attend and return to Capitol Hill to cast my vote. My beeper went off, indicating the vote, just as the guests had been seated in the East Room and the President was about to enter, and, under the circumstances, it would have been extremely rude and inappropriate to get up and leave. As soon as the President finished his remarks, I returned to the Capitol as quickly as possible, but the vote had been closed. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE FRANK MASCARA, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable FRANK MASCARA, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 11, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, effective July 11, 1995.

Very truly yours,

FRANK MASCARA,
Member of Congress.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 186) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 186

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the committees indicated:

(1) to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Representative Frank Mascara of Pennsylvania; and

(2) to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Representative Tim Holden of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I simply would indicate that these two gentlemen are very much eligible for the committees they have been recommended by our caucus to assume. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA], a new Member, former county commissioner from Washington County, PA, is eminently qualified for the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. When he came to this Congress, he was not given a major committee.

With the opening on the former Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MASCARA] sought and was unanimously selected by our steering committee for that role. In assuming that assignment, he made available a position on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight which allowed a second-term Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLDEN], to accept a second committee because he had been prevented from having more than his major committee, the Committee on Agriculture.

I think there is no controversy. The ratios on these committees are maintained.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat torn as to what to do here today regarding the privileged resolution of the minority caucus leader. The resolution, offered at the direction of the minority caucus, would appoint Mr. MASCARA to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and Mr. HOLDEN to the Government Reform and Oversight Committee.

As I pointed out to the minority leader last Monday, the history and precedents of this House allowed each party to appoint those members of its caucus to available committee slots as it saw fit, without the consent or approval of the opposing caucus.

Never before last Monday has a Member of this body had to face the recorded vote of members of the other party to accept his conference's assignment to a standing committee.

Now it seems to me that if the minority wishes to engage in a case of tit-for-tat, then for us as the majority, it is a bit like engaging in a duel with an unarmed man. Two hundred thirty-two Republican votes would indicate that the minority would have a difficult—if not impossible—time placing any member of its caucus on a committee unless the majority party felt it was in the majority's interest to have that minority member on the committee.

And yet, this is what the minority seems to want as a new precedent of the House given their actions of last Monday.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time if I might, I do

not believe I have a great deal of time. How much time is available?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 1 hour.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Well, I think that might give me sufficient time to yield further.

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank my friend the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of comity, however, I will not call for a recorded vote, subjecting your leadership, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. HOLDEN to the humiliation of defeat.

I would hope that in the future, those Democrats who care for this institution, have a respect for the history of the House, who are tired of pointless dilatory tactics, and who want to roll up their sleeves and get to work on balancing the budget, preserving Medicare, and saving our country for our children, I hope they will prevail upon their leadership to put childish actions aside and put the interest of the country before those of a partisan few.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if I might comment at this time, I think in all the time I have been associated with the leadership on this side of the aisle when we were in the majority, I can remember no instance in which an appointment to a committee was made that would have changed the committee ratio without the complete consultation of the minority leader and the Speaker. I know for a fact that whenever a special election would occur and changes would occur in the ratio of our memberships in the full body or on each committee individually, our Speakers, whether they were recent or in the distant past, consulted with the minority leader, and when it was required, we adjusted the number of members on the committee to conform to the ratio that we had reached agreement on at the beginning of that Congress.

My personal problem with what happened with the appointment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] was that we did not have that kind of consultation which occurred in every instance when we were in the majority. That is the reason why I think our side reacted as we did. It was not a question of who. It was a question of process, mutual respect, and recognition of each party's role once we had agreed on the ratios at the beginning of the Congress.

I think that was the point that the people on this side of the aisle reacted to, and I think that was really why we acted as we did. Not in a manner that could be described as childish but in a manner that reflected the degree to which we resented the treatment that we had been accorded.

But I think that is behind us for now. Perhaps we will visit this issue again at some point. But I do appreciate the fact that the majority is not going to interfere with the appointment that these two gentlemen seek which does not change the ratios whatsoever and which merely maintains our balance as

it existed at the beginning of the Congress on both these committees.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no further comment or request for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection and pursuant to the provisions of clause 1 of rule XLVIII and clause 6(f) of rule X, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to fill the existing vacancy thereon and to rank after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 185 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f), 306, or 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. The amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendment printed in section 3 of this resolution are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. Points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consider-

ation of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole is as follows:

Page 57, line 21, strike “:Provided further” and all that follows through “Act” on page 58, line 2.

Page 75, line 24, strike “equivalent to” and insert “not to exceed”.

SEC. 3. The amendment against which all points of order are waived is one offered by Representative Schaefer of Colorado or Representative Tauzin of Louisiana as follows:

Page 57, line 11, strike “:Provided” and all that follows through “Reserve” on line 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

(Ms. PRYCE asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule to the floor of the House today. It is not an overly complex or unique rule, and I believe it keeps faith with the new majority's pledge to consider major legislation in a manner which is reasonable, open, and fair to both sides of the aisle.

First, this rule is completely open. After an hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill will be open to amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The rule provides that the bill shall be read by title, rather than by paragraph, and that each title shall be considered as read.

Under this open rule, any Member can be heard on any germane amendment at the appropriate time, provided it is consistent with the standing rules of the House. I would point out to our colleagues that of the five regular appropriations bills which have come before the Rules Committee thus far, this is the fourth open rule granted by the committee.

Second, the rule provides a limited, but necessary number of waivers which reflects the close cooperation between the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee and the proper authorizing committees.

For example, since authorizing legislation for several programs within the bill has not yet been approved by the House, the rule provides the necessary waivers of clause 2 of rule XXI(21), which prohibits unauthorized provisions. Let me stress that this was done in close coordination with the will of the authorizing committees.

The rule also waives provisions of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill which deals with new entitlement authority and with matters which are within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee. To address these concerns, the rule provides for the automatic adoption of an amendment printed in the rule, which is included at the suggestion of the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Finally, the rule waives points of order against the amendment printed in the rule relating to the sale of oil from the strategic petroleum reserve, if offered by Representative SCHAEFER of Colorado or Representative TAUZIN of Louisiana.

As in previous rules this year, priority in recognition is accorded to Members who have printed their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration.

Giving Members the option of preprinting amendments for their colleagues to review in advance merely enhances the deliberative process, Mr. Speaker, and I hope Members will continue to take advantage of this useful tool in the future.

One final note on amendments, the rule waives clause 2(e) of rule XXI(21), relating to nonemergency amendments offered to a bill which contains an emergency designation.

We have also included one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1977 is a very responsible piece of legislation, and I congratulate my colleague from Ohio, Chairman RALPH REGULA, for his leadership in trying to balance the need for meaningful deficit reduction with the need to protect and enhance our Nation's natural and cultural resources.

As we heard in the Rules Committee yesterday, this bill responds to the mandate of the American people to reduce the size and cost of Government by cutting overall spending by more than 11 percent from the 1995 spending levels.

To achieve these savings, the bill recommends that a number of existing agencies or programs be terminated, consolidated, or funded at significantly lower levels on the assumption that they will be phased-out in the near term. H.R. 1977 is more than \$1.5 billion below last year's level, and is consistent with the 7-year balanced budget resolution passed by the House this year.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I believe the rule before us today is both fair and open. House Resolution 185 was reported unanimously by the Rules Committee yesterday, and it will allow our Members to participate most fully in the deliberative process.

I urge its adoption, and encourage our colleagues to use this open amendment process responsibly, and productively.

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

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

[As of July 11, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	32	71
Modified Closed ³	49	47	12	27
Closed ⁴	9	9	1	2
Totals:	104	100	45	100

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

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

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

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

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 12, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95)
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95)
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95)
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95)
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95)
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95)
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/10/95)
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95)
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95)
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95)
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95)
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95)
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95)
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95)
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1517	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ:223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	

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

□ 1900

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this rule, and we urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can amend the rule to make in order the Brewster-Harman deficit-reduction lockbox amendment.

We do appreciate the fact that this bill is open to any amendment that is otherwise eligible to be offered under the standing rules of the House. Members should be aware that, as many previous rules this year have provided, this rule permits the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

However, House Resolution 185 is a relatively complex rule for an appropriations bill. It waives several House rules for provisions in H.R. 1977, as well as several sections of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill. The rule also contains a self-executing amendment, and it waives points of order against an amendment to be offered by Representative SHAEFER or TAUZIN, relating to the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The rule provides blanket waivers of clause 2 and clause 6 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislation in an appropriations bill, and prohibiting reappropriations in an appropriations bill. We recognize that, because Congress does not always complete action on the relevant authorization bills in a timely manner, it is often necessary to waive the prohibition against unauthorized appropri-

tions. In addition, there are often valid reasons for protecting legislative language in an appropriations bill.

We approve of the fact that the majority is generally following the practice—a practice that was established when Democratic members were in the majority—of providing waivers for legislation or unauthorized appropriations only in cases where the relevant authorizing committee chairman agrees to those waivers. In past years, we found that this practice was the most fair and practicable way of moving appropriations bills through the House in a timely manner, while still protecting the prerogatives of authorizing committees. It appears that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle—despite their past criticism of waiving rule XXI—have now reached the same conclusion.

Unfortunately, that same policy has not been extended to ranking minority members. I would note that the senior Democratic member of the Resources Committee, Mr. MILLER of California, strongly objects to waiving the prohibition on legislation in an appropriations bill for provisions in H.R. 1977 that directly or indirectly amend laws under the jurisdiction of the Resources Committee. He noted in a letter to the Rules Committee that the Resources Committee had not considered the impact of changes that H.R. 1977 would make on a number of major environmental laws.

The rule also waives three sections of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill. Two of the waivers are needed to cover the salaries and expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission, which is a minuscule amount of spending. A third waiver covers a change in budget scorekeeping related to the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

As a matter of principle, we are normally reluctant to waive the Budget Act. However, because none of the provisions which require these waivers would have any real impact on our efforts to control spending, we do not consider the waivers here to be significant violations of the Budget Act.

An additional budget-related waiver contained in the rule is the waiver of clause 2(e) of rule XXI, which prohibits the consideration of nonemergency amendments to be offered to a bill containing an emergency designation under the Budget Act against amendments to the bill. H.R. 1977 contains at least two such emergency designations but, without this waiver, no amendments to the bill could be considered.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we could have had a more evenhanded rule, and probably a better outcome for the bill, had the majority accepted three amendments we offered to the rule in the Rules Committee yesterday.

One amendment would have allowed Representatives RAHALL and KLUG to offer an amendment to the bill that would renew the existing moratorium on new mining patent applications. A second amendment would have permitted Representatives BREWSTER and HARMAN to offer an amendment to apply any savings from spending cuts to a deficit-reduction lockbox. Both of these amendments would have required some of the same waivers that the rule already provides for provisions in the bill; as a matter of fairness, the majority should have been willing to provide waivers for these amendments as well, we believe.

And, in fact, as I mentioned at the beginning of my statement, if the previous question is defeated, we shall amend the rule to provide for consideration of the Brewster-Harman lockbox amendment.

The third amendment would have removed a waiver provided by the rule for language relating to the use of wildlife fees under the Emergency Wet-

lands Resources Act. Objection to this waiver was made by Representative YOUNG, chairman of the Resources Committee, as well as Representative DINGELL. Normally, the Rules Committee would accede to such an objection if it is made by the chairman of the relevant authorizing committee; in this case, for reasons not well explained to us yesterday, the majority decided not to do so.

Beyond our concerns about the rule itself, many of us have strong objections to the bill this rule makes in order, primarily because of the bill's deep cuts in funding for many important and useful programs—programs that cost very little for the immense value they add to the quality of the lives of tens of millions of American citizens.

We realize that the subcommittee on Interior had an extremely difficult task in determining just how to cut 12 percent of the funding for programs under its jurisdiction, especially since many of those programs have already been squeezed in recent years. But the subcommittee was in that position only because the Republican majority has imposed budget priorities that do not serve the best interests of our Nation. Those priorities are forcing us to cut next year's funding for the relatively modest programs in this bill, for example, by \$1½ billion, so that we can fritter away hundreds of billions of dollars over the next several years on unnecessary increases in military spending, and on tax cuts that will mainly benefit the wealthiest among us.

These program cuts will cost our Nation dearly in countless ways:

The bill's 27-percent cut in energy conservation programs will mean a slowdown in the progress we have been making toward reducing our Nation's dependence on imported oil, as well as the cost of energy;

The cut of all but a nominal amount of funding for land acquisition for national parks, and other public lands, will mean that there will be less opportunity in the future for Americans to enjoy the experiences our national parks have to offer;

The 40-percent cut in funding for the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities—the first step of a 3-year phaseout of both organizations—will mean that fewer Americans will be able to enjoy the very many cultural benefits these organizations have made possible;

And, the elimination of funding for prelisting and listing activities for endangered species will greatly impair our ability to save animal and plant species before they reach critical levels, and the result is likely to be the decline, and possible extinction, of many more species.

In these, and many other ways, the natural and cultural resources, resources of our Nation—resources that help make the United States the greatest nation on Earth—will be severely

harmed by this bill. In this misguided attempt to save a modest amount of taxpayers' dollars, we will be robbing our Nation of some of its greatest strengths and assets.

Mr. Speaker, again, we urge Members to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can amend the rule to allow consideration of the Brewster-Harman deficit-reduction lockbox amendment.

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

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and the Budget Process.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Columbus, OH [Ms. PRYCE] for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of this remarkable open rule. I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] we indeed are proceeding under the lockbox. Our subcommittee has already had hearings. We are diligently pursuing that. Things are happening. Under this resolution, the House will consider H.R. 1977, which is a remarkable open rule. The fiscal 1996 Interior appropriations bill is what it is about. It is under a completely open amending process.

Now, this in itself is not remarkable, I agree, since all but one of the appropriations bills this year has come to the floor under an open rule. However, what is remarkable about this rule is it is the first reported by our committee since the July 4 break, and what is remarkable is the decision to continue granting open rules.

We do this in good faith and with full regard to protecting the deliberative debate process for each and every Member despite the recent what I would call guerrilla campaign, to quote the newspapers, of dilatory tactics by some Members of this body.

I am pleased, and I think most of our Members are pleased, that a sense of comity has indeed been restored to the floor, and I hope we continue our work on these important bills which are the vital business of our Nation under a workable open process.

Mr. Speaker, the Interior appropriations bill is an especially important bill for our Nation and for Florida as well. It includes vital Everglades restoration money, which will complement the State of Florida's efforts to protect additional lands in or near the national park, and funding that will allow the Park Service to fix some of the hydrology problems in the park, to begin to restore the natural historical sheet flow to the legendary river of grass.

Also vital to Florida's economy is the annual outer continental shelf oil and gas exploration moratorium, which protects our fragile coastline from devastating oil pollution. While I recognize the early moratorium is not the

best way to accomplish this goal, it is necessary while we work on a better long-term solution.

This year's Interior bill is not all good news. Many important programs have been drastically scaled back, as my friend from California has noted. Land and water conservation funds, for instance, used to fund land acquisition in our wildlife areas and elsewhere have been reduced by over 70 percent. This is a big hit.

But I understand the overriding need to balance our budget, and I applaud the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], and the members of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work trying to craft a reasonable solution, which is this bill.

I would ask my colleagues to support this rule, which provides for full debate, which is what I think the Committee on Rules should be proud of, and I urge the support for this rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

We have had quite a discussion of the need to cut, need to get the budget balanced, and as a supporter of the balanced budget amendment. I agree there. We have got to do it with a certain sense of priority.

We have also got to realize there are two ways to get a balanced budget. One is to make cuts, and the other is to raise revenues.

What this rule and consideration of this bill specifically prohibits is an egregious loophole which is being used by foreign corporations and by large corporations in America; that is, the giving away of the mineral lands of the western United States for \$2.50 an acre.

Just last year a Canadian corporation which pays no income taxes in the United States, they do pay some employee taxes, but no income taxes, got a \$10 billion resource for \$9,700. That is the return to the U.S. taxpayers.

Now, if we are really serious, we would allow an amendment to this bill that would allow us to raise revenues to offset some of the unwise cuts in this budget.

What are the unwise cuts? Well, for example, we are going to eliminate the Bureau of Mines of the United States of America at the same time that we are allowing foreign corporations to come here and buy our precious mineral resources at \$2.50 an acre. We are eliminating the United States Bureau of Mines, something that has been in existence for more than 100 years, an agency that has already been reformed, an agency which has cut its budget 20 percent in the last 2 years, an agency which helps develop the conservative use of these mineral resources, the safe environmental use of these resources.

□ 1915

They provide technical expertise to our small miners and prospectors. They work on safe extraction techniques for

the people who work in the mines. They have developed restoration plans for bad mining practices that went on earlier in this century. They have developed ways to classify solid waste. They have developed ways to do in situ purification of heavily polluted waters.

No, we are going to eliminate them. We are going to eliminate the United States Bureau of Mines because we would not want to ask a foreign corporation like American Barrick to pay the American taxpayers a fair return for the extraction of those depletable mineral revenues, and under this bill we will not be allowed to ask those foreign corporations to pay, no. We will eliminate an essential agency, a vital function, investment of the United States Government before we will ask a foreign corporation to pay a penny.

We do not get the same privilege in their country. They should not get it for free here.

We are cutting other vital investments in this bill. We are cutting investments in State and private forestry. We are cutting investments in the O and C lands in the Western United States. We are cutting investment in the National Forest System management. We do not have enough money now to develop the plan proposed by the administration to manage the Federal forest lands in the Western United States or to begin a deliberate program of forest health recovery across the lands that are ravaged in the inner Mountain States, in eastern Oregon, and other States.

We need more investment, and it is the place to get it, but it is not allowed under this bill.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I speak in favor of this rule tonight. This rule is an open rule. It allows amendments to cut or strike any program, any program that someone does not like. They can feel free to offer an amendment to reduce the funds. They can feel free to offer an amendment to eliminate the funding and let the argument stand on its merits. But by defeating this rule, it will not allow a lot of issues to be debated, and the reason for this is because, as often happens, the authorizing process has not caught up with the appropriations process yet, however this bill does conform to the authorized levels as they are pending at this moment.

I think that is important to stress. Regardless of anyone's views on different programs within this appropriations bill, I think I would hope that all Members would agree they should be openly debated on this floor and let the majority of this body work its will.

Now there are a couple of programs that I think are very important. I know some Members here are planning on voting against this rule because they are opposed to the NEA and the

NEH. I would say it would be a severe mistake if Members vote against this rule because they hope to kill those programs. Members can move to strike those programs if they wish; that is allowed for under this rule, but I would hope that we would keep the funding levels for them. As many Members would know, NEA and NEH have been reduced in funding under this appropriations bill. They are taking a substantial reduction, a reduction of a third this year in the case of NEH. People who want to attack those programs, if that is their opinion, they can do so by offering an amendment, but please do not try a back-door approach to this because that will prevent those issues from being voted on on their merits up or down.

Again I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this rule is an open rule. It allows every Member the chance to offer amendments to reduce or cut. Please do not take a back-door approach to try to scuttle programs and prevent debate on their merits.

I hope the rule is adopted.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, deficit hawks, freshman Members, lockbox supporters, Members of the House, this is a lockbox. It looks a lot like another box over there, a brown one that says Solomon on it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is a wise man, as was King Solomon of ancient days, and I am sure that his box is full of many wise documents.

But, Mr. Speaker, this lockbox is empty. It does not contain the savings that derive from the many cuts we have made to the appropriations bills we have already debated. Imagine this. Those cuts amount to so far \$131.58 million. In fact just yesterday and today, Mr. Speaker, four amendments were adopted to the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act totaling \$20.48 million. That brings the total to \$131 million. That money will not go to deficit reduction because we do not have the lockbox as part of this appropriations bill under this rule or the three previous appropriations bills.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Appropriations scooped up not only the \$130 million in cuts we have passed, but other unused 602(b) spending allocations. It gave some of its subcommittees increased spending allocations and put more than \$805 million in an unallocated 602(b) reserve, not a lockbox, a reserve. I say to my colleagues, When you add all this together, we are close to \$1 billion in unused spending or spending cuts that will not go to deficit reduction. I call this hypocrisy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield since she has called the appropriators hypocrites?

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, did the gentlewoman vote for the budget resolution?

Ms. HARMAN. Did I vote for the budget resolution 2 days ago?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Ms. HARMAN. No.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Why not? The budget resolution calls for a decline in the deficit to the point that by the year 2002 the entire budget deficit will be eliminated.

Now is the gentlewoman not for budget reduction?

Ms. HARMAN. I certainly am for budget reduction, and I am a supporter of the balanced budget amendment and a supporter of the 7-year balanced budget sponsored by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest, if the gentlewoman would yield, she should use the word "hypocrite" very carefully.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would agree that the gentleman has made a point, and, as a Member here who tries to operate on a bipartisan basis, I agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying this:

My point is that almost \$1 billion in spending cuts and unused spending will not go to deficit reduction because the deficit lockbox, which was supported on this floor earlier this spring by 418 Members and only opposed by 5, cannot be offered as an amendment to this appropriations bill. It is precluded under this rule as it was precluded in the rules for the three previous appropriations bills. On that basis, without reference to the word hypocrisy but with reference to the word candor to the American people, I would urge a defeat of the previous question.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the author of this most fair and open rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I wish the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] would not leave the floor because she knows I have great respect for her, and she has worked with us on a bipartisan basis, but I am more than a little taken aback because there has been an all-out effort on both sides of the aisle to really bring this lockbox concept into reality. We have been working together. The Committee on Rules and our subcommittee, the Government Operations Committee and the Committee on the Budget have held hearings in which the gentlewoman was invited to participate and to testify, and we all know that in the Crapo lockbox legislation, which is a Republican initiative, there are problems that need to be worked out so that we can make it work. There are problems with the Brewster-Harman approach which need to be worked out. We have to do it on a bipartisan basis.

The gentlewoman knows that we now are almost to the point of coming up with a consensus bill which I am sure she is going to agree to, and I am going to agree to, and we will hold another hearing on this, we will bring it to the floor in the form of a bill. We will do two things. We will bring it to the floor as a piece of legislation so that that can be debated and amended, if necessary, and then given to the President for his signature. Now that may never get past the other body because there is over in the other body a bird over there, and the bird is going to oppose anything like this, and we all know it. So, in tandem approach, which we have agreed to and we have worked on a bipartisan basis we also want to take this finally agreed to consensus piece of legislation and attach it to whatever appropriation bill is on the floor at the time, the next one that is available. We will make it not only retroactive, we will make it inclusive for all of the appropriation bills so that any action that has been taken thus far and will be taken in the future on these 13 appropriation bills, all of those cuts will end up in that lockbox.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very excited about what the gentleman is saying. It is correct that on a bipartisan basis we are working to deal with the remaining technical issues.

It is the first time that I have heard that the lockbox would be retroactive. That is excellent. Retroactivity can deal with the issue I have raised today and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BREWSTER] and I have raised day after day in appearing before the Rules Committee. We are concerned that \$130 million plus \$800 million might escape the lockbox, and what the gentleman has just said about retroactivity is extremely reassuring.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, it is, and just for example:

One of the problems we have is that we end up not comparing apples to apples. We end up with apples and oranges, and we cannot do that, but what we want to work to is so that the final conference report, whatever that level of spending is—in other words that locks it in. We lower those caps. That means the money never gets spent and the savings are there for the American people.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding this time to me, and I would simply like to ask my very good friend from the Palos Verdes Peninsula if in light of this strong statement that has come from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules if she would now be inclined to support us on this open rule which is

very fair and balanced and will, in fact, be inclusive of the lockbox provision once we come up with a bipartisan compromise.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. I appreciate the request, and I will consider the request, and I certainly do see progress here. I am extremely encouraged by the statements that were just made, and I would just like to commend the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] since he was mentioned. He is a classmate of mine, and he and I and many others have worked on this issue for over 2½ years, through two Congresses. The lockbox has wide popularity in this body and enormous popularity with the public. I think that if we can enact a real lockbox, as you have just described it, we will have done a great service for the American people. We will be well on the way to balancing the budget which we all support.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, if I could, let me make an appeal to the gentlewoman because there is a lot riding on this.

As my colleague knows, we only have something like 13 legislative days, and maybe it is even less than that now, before the August 4 district work period break. We have to deal with these appropriation bills. If this Interior appropriation rule goes down tonight, I am going to tell the gentlewoman, it is going to jeopardize not only a telecommunication bill, if you are interested in that, an antiterrorism bill, if you are interested in that, or a banking and regulatory reform bill, if you are interested in that, because we are losing time that cannot be recovered. I even don't know how, if we pass this Interior rule tonight, how we are going to finish it by tomorrow night.

So I am just going to say to the gentlewoman she knows we are sincere in wanting to bring a lockbox bill to this floor. I am satisfied it is going to meet her satisfaction, it is certainly going to meet Mr. CRAPO'S and therefore the gentlewoman ought to support this rule tonight, and let us have faith in each other in solving this problem.

Ms. HARMAN. Let me just finally answer the gentleman that I may well do it, and let me state, further, that I am very concerned about the reason some others may oppose the previous question or the rule which is to eliminate any funding for the NEA and the NEH, actions I strongly oppose. So, for several reasons I will actively consider the gentleman's request.

□ 1930

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I think everybody who is interested in this issue ought to vote for this rule. We ought to get on with our business, because there is no time next week to deal with it. We are going to try to get something up. We are going to consult with the

gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] on your side, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] on ours, both of whom support the concept, and let us move the legislation.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and members of the committee, I would hope that we would oppose this rule tonight and vote this rule down. I do so because of the numerous areas in which this legislation seeks to legislate on an appropriations bill in violation of the rules of the House of Representatives.

The rule provides for waivers so this can be done, but what in fact this means is that we rush to judgment in a number of areas where the committee of jurisdiction has not been allowed to have the debate and to weigh the merits of the various proposals being put forth.

These areas affect the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act, the California Desert Act, the American Indian Trust Fund and Management Resources Act. These are changes that were made in consideration with everybody on the committees of jurisdiction, and now they are seeking to change those without the debate and without the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I have for many years opposed legislation on appropriations and tried not to do it when I was chairman of the committee and tried not to let the Committee on Appropriations do it, and in the last few years we have not done it. But here we see in a wholesale manner this take place.

Others, I think, should consider opposing this legislation because of what it does to environmental policy in this country. This is a dramatic step backward in time. It is a dramatic step away from science. It is the inhibiting of science.

It is very interesting that people say, with regard to the Endangered Species Act, they want decisions made upon science. Yet when we have the opportunity to gather that evidence, to protect our environment, to make rational decisions, to allow processes to go forward, we now see that they restrict the ability to even gather the evidence.

In my area, the National Biological Survey, and those kinds of efforts, use volunteers. They use volunteers from Chevron Corp., from Dow Chemical, from du Pont and others; employees who go out and do these counts and figure these issues out to help so we can provide for open space, habitat protection, and provide for economic development in our areas so that we can get on with home building and address those issues.

This says we can no longer do that. We can no longer conduct those surveys if we are using volunteers and, in

fact, even if we have the permission of the landowner. That is a step back in my area in terms of economic development, and I think it is wrong.

This bill also lifts the moratorium on the leasing of Federal lands for mineral exploration. That means that we go back to the law of 1872. We continue to give away Federal resources for \$2, \$3, \$4, \$5 an acre and those mining companies can take hundreds of millions, and in some cases billions, of dollars of resources off the Federal lands and pay no royalties.

On the leases that they have right next door on private lands, they pay royalties for the privilege of doing that. But we are going to once again engage in that practice, because of what the committee did in lifting that moratorium.

This bill also goes in reverses: Reverses the decision made in the previous Congress with respect to the California Desert Wilderness bill and denies funding for the transfer of the East Mohave Preserve and does not allow us to carry out the decisions and the laws of the land with respect to the East Mohave, even over the objections of the local chambers of commerce, local supporters of that effort, newspaper editorials throughout the South and throughout the State of California asking that we go ahead with that provision to protect the East Mohave.

Mr. Speaker, I think that what you will see if you go through this legislation is that we have a fit of pique here against the environment, against a number of programs that have been very helpful to the protection of the environment in this country.

I would also say that the legislation on appropriations that is provided in this rule not only pertains to the Committee on Resources, it also pertains to the other committees, the Committee on Commerce and other committees where those actions have been taken.

Mr. Speaker, we should reject this rule. We should go back and write a rule that complies with the House rules, and we should get on with the debate and let the chips fall where they may. But we should not write special privilege into the bill and then protect it by the rule for those who seek to have a vote on that matter. I urge rejection of this rule.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to support this rule today. I have these reservations because through this rule we are setting two dangerous precedents.

First, the rule waives all points of order against legislating on an appropriations bill and this has been done in many instances in the past by the authorizing committees. It has been done, but in this particular case, it was done despite the objection of the authorizing committee. Such a precedent seriously undermines the committee system.

Second, the language which is being protected allows the sale of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. If this sale goes forward, it will be done without any hearing or debate on the impact of such a sale and how it will affect our economy, our national emergency security, or domestic oil markets, our ability to comply with the international energy agreement which we have signed or the cost-effectiveness of taking such a step.

Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I plan on offering an amendment that was made in order by the Committee on Rules to strike the language authorizing the oil sale. I firmly believe that an issue as important as this, whether or not we should maintain a viable oil reserve to protect us in times of oil shortages, deserves more consideration by this body than it has gotten so far. We should not carelessly throw away a national asset as valuable as the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, by my standards, the interior appropriations bill for this year is not a good bill.

Our current national resources will suffer. The Indian people are going to take a big hit. The protection of our environment will be diminished. Our cultural resources will be severely ambushed. The program to help the needy with their weather problems has been cut most drastically.

Even though I feel that the bill is a bad bill, Mr. Speaker, nevertheless I will vote for the rule because the rule will make in order the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute for Museum Services. Were the rule not to protect them because they have not been authorized, they would be stricken when they reached the floor on a point of order.

For that reason, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the rule.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. These are difficult times and there are a lot of tough decisions in this bill, not all of which I agree with. But it does afford us a thoughtful outline through which to proceed through this section of the appropriations bill, and the open rule allows us all to bring forth whatever amendments we see fit and to have this body vote on them.

I know that there are strong feelings among some that we should eliminate immediately in one year NEA, NEH, organizations like that. I would just remind them that while we cut the TVA and the ARC, organizations that have a

lot of opposition in this body, we did not pull the rug out from under them. We cut them. We gave them time for them and the States that they serve to think through how best to accomplish the goals that so deeply affect the people that benefit from the work of the TVA and the ARC.

The NEH does some extremely important things, as does the NEA and the Museum Services Administration. The NEH, for example, is sponsoring the brittle books program. The brittle books program will preserve valuable 19th century works printed on acidic paper which are now crumbling at an alarming rate.

Over 12 million unique items, books, maps, music scores, things that are critical to preserving, to tracking the historic and cultural heritage of this Nation, are at risk, and, frankly, only the Federal Government has either the expertise or the dollars to assure the preservation of that heritage.

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is exactly right. The National Endowment for the Humanities is the lead organization in preserving the brittle books that are being consumed by the erosion of the pages, and at least one-third of all the great books in this country are being consumed by that slow-burning process. That is why, if there were no other reason, that is enough to support the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, having no further speakers at this time.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Ohio [Mr. REGULA], chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio and I rise in strong support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all the Members to vote for the rule. I say that because the rule allows ample opportunity to debate all the issues involved in this bill. It offers an opportunity, through amendments to change the dollar levels, to subtract from a program if you choose to do so. I know some would like to make a change in the dollars on NEA and NEH, and under this rule, they have every opportunity to do so.

The rule does provide waivers for some of the legislative items in the bill. But I want to say to all of you that at the urging of the leadership, we communicated very frequently and very thoroughly with the authorizing committees.

For example, on NEA, NEH and IMS, we followed the guidelines of the authorization bill that was passed out of the full committee of jurisdiction. The same thing is true on a number of other instances in the bill.

So, in the process of putting this bill together, we made every effort to ensure that it did represent something that was approved by the authorizing committees, that we were not appropriating in opposition to the legislative intent of the committees of jurisdiction. And, therefore, since there are some legislative issues and programs for which authorizations have expired in the bill, which we have worked out with the authorizers, they are protected by a waiver. But that does not preclude anyone from offering amendments to take out money or, for that matter, to add money.

We have tried in this bill, in the face of a reduction of almost \$1.8 billion in budget authority, if you include the rescission bill, and a reduction of almost \$1 billion in outlays, from 1995, or roughly 11 percent to help with the deficit reduction package, but nevertheless, to ensure that we provide ample funding to allow the people of this Nation to have access to the resources they enjoy.

□ 1945

I think we have, working with the subcommittee members, with the authorizers, with the leadership of the full Committee on Appropriations and others, crafted a bill that I think is responsible. I think it does the things that are important to the people of this Nation, addresses their needs while at the same time saving money.

We also tried to eliminate things that have downstream costs, which is necessary if we are to leave as a legacy to our children and grandchildren a balanced budget, something Alan Greenspan said in testimony before the Committee on the Budget, would result in providing them an improved standard of living over ours. If that is to be our legacy, we have to get on a glide path that will take us to a zero deficit in 7 years.

Therefore, in crafting the bill, we tried to avoid starting programs or funding programs or funding new construction, things that will have a substantial downstream cost because we recognize that in future years we will have even less to meet the challenges of this bill.

Having said all those things, I would strongly urge the Members to support the rule so that we can get on with an open debate on the policy issues. I want to say there are a lot of policy issues involved here. I hope the Members will pay attention to the debate so that they can help make the decision, because as we address these policy issues by virtue of amendments and vote on them, we are fulfilling our role under the Constitution.

We are the legislative branch. It is our role to set policy. It is the role of downtown, the President and his team, to execute policy. And there will be a number of opportunities under this rule and under the amendments that will be offered to make, I think, some rather significant policy choices.

We have tried in crafting the bill not to put a personal spin on it but to, rather, bring those issues to all the Members of this body.

So, again, I urge the Members to support the rule. You will have your opportunity during the open debate and the amendment process to express your concerns and your ideas on the policy issues embodied in this legislation.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Committee on Rules for putting together a good rule. I likewise would like to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for putting together what I feel to be a good package.

I have been trying to remember ever being in the well or at one of the manager's tables in a debate on a rule in which some folks felt that the rule should be more restrictive, that the argument, the thrust was that the rule is too open. But that is basically the case. I cannot ever remember hearing that argument.

I had not really thought about it, but some folks believe that this rule should be more restrictive. The fact is, if anybody has any quarrel with anything in this bill, they can come to the floor of the House with a funds limitation amendment or move to strike anything they would like to zero. That is their purview under the rules of the House and this rule.

Some folks would say, well, what we really would like to do is strike things on points of order so that we do not have to vote on them.

Look, this is not a perfect world. Other people disagree with that. And I think that we ought to work our way through this bill, vote issues, vote issues up or down. If we have a majority on one side or another, let the majority prevail. Let us not deal with technicalities. Let us not get ourselves all tied up in knots.

Let me say this. If this rule goes down, the next rule will probably also go down, and we will not end up getting a rule passed that allows us to consider the Interior appropriations bill on the floor, which means that we will tie up the business of the House, possibly risk not having an August break, taking the whole schedule into September with additional complications and causing ourselves great problems.

Anybody that has an issue that they want debated on this floor of this House can bring it forward. Anybody

that wants to limit any program in the bill to zero can offer that.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] sitting over here. I wish he would pay attention, too, because it is very important.

Under the old majority, under the Democrat majority around here, when there was an issue like the Endowment for the Arts and we wanted to cut it, which I always wanted to do, the Democrats would gag us. They would not allow us to bring that amendment to the floor. We are not going that way this year. We are opening up these rules so that any Member of this body if they do not like the Endowment for the Arts, the Endowment for the Humanities, they have a right to bring it on this floor. Let us fight it out like men and let us cut it. That is what I am going to help them do. But to try to say that we should gag these rules like we were forced to accept in the old days, that is dead wrong, and we are not going to do it around here.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for the rule, the aspects of the rule that I asked for. We asked for a fair debate. I am surprised, my good colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, one of the great athletes, great competitors in this Chamber, I never thought I would see the day when he would want to prevail on a technicality, would not want to come out here and get it right, talk about the National Endowment for the Arts.

Let us have a fair debate. Let the Congress decide this issue. I am surprised at my good friend. I think the chairman is right; everybody can offer any amendment they want. This is an open rule.

To walk away from it because you want to win on a technicality, I think, is, I am surprised.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this is an open rule. There is a fair shot at any program in the bill. It ought to be adopted. I hope that our membership will vote for this rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I do want to point out to our good friend, the chairman of the committee from upstate New York, that past bills, past appropriations bills from this subcommittee have also been open, have come to the floor under open rules, and one was able under those rules in previous years to also attack the same institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILIAMS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman's last comments. I have

been here 17 years, and without exception—I hope the Members who came last January are paying attention to this—without exception, in every one of those 17 years this bill has come to the floor with an open rule. So all of the posturing about how, well, we are finally getting an open rule, particularly from the newer people in the Chamber, is becoming a bit wearisome, tiresome and, worse, it is really inaccurate.

Now, let me join the leadership on the new majority side in supporting this rule. I think that folks who are urging a “no” vote, and that is Members on both sides, including my own leadership on this rule, are wrong. It is a bad bill? You bet. Very bad. Do the majority of Members and people in this country disagree in poll after poll with the specifics that are in this bill? Absolutely. This is a bad bill.

You put this bill up to a referendum with the American people, it could not pass. But we are not voting on the bill. We are voting on the rule. Do you know what the vote is on the rule, whether or not to protect the National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to vote “yes” on this rule. If you believe as I do that the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are worth protecting, these are the agencies that nurtured Garrison Keillor in Lake Wobegon. These are the agencies that created that wonderful film *Civil War*. These are the agencies that created the design for the Vietnam Memorial Wall. These are the agencies that created the film *Baseball*. These are the agencies that allowed the author to write *Driving Miss Daisy*.

These two agencies have nurtured this country, and this vote is whether or not to continue to support the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities. A vote yes on this rule is a vote for these two very small but very important agencies to the cultural life of this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the rule on H.R. 1977. I support open rules because they afford Members the opportunity to bring their concerns before the whole House. It is my understanding that some of my colleagues are opposing the rule because they oppose funding for the Arts and the Humanities.

The Interior appropriations bill funds the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] and the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH] at levels that

match the recommendations of the Interior Subcommittee. Funding for these two agencies has been slashed by 40 percent. The Arts and the Humanities have absorbed their fair share of the budget cuts, and I want to urge my colleagues to oppose any efforts to eliminate or make further cuts in funding for the NEA and the NEH.

I wholeheartedly believe that Government should support the arts. Americans highly value the arts and culture in their lives. Art is the symbolic expression of who we are. It is how we remember. Here in the Capitol, the history of our Nation is documented in its art and architecture.

Cultural funding is a mere two one-hundredths of one percent of our multibillion-dollar budget. We spend 70 cents per person on the humanities and 64 cents per person on the arts—on history, English literature, foreign languages, sociology, anthropology, comparative religion, and other disciplines.

Let us take a closer look at the humanities.

Seventy cents per person buys teacher training programs. These programs provide professional development opportunities for our teachers to increase their knowledge of their field and pass it on to their students. It is estimated that the 1,000 teachers who participate each summer in NEH-funded summer institutes directly impact 85,000 students each year.

Seventy cents per person buys museum exhibitions throughout the country, both permanent and traveling, and learning experiences for children in museums. As a result of NEH-funded fellowships, nearly 2,000 books have been published, many of which have received national awards.

Mr. Speaker, our legislative agenda could have far-reaching implications for the cultural vitality of our Nation. It is important, even vital, that we support and encourage the promotion of the arts and humanities so that the rich and cultural story of our past can be made available to future generations.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and oppose amendments that would greatly reduce or eliminate the NEA and the NEH.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to my colleagues on our own side of the aisle. In 4 years, I never voted in this House for a rule unless it was an open rule. And that is what we fought for your right to come here for and that is why we fought for a majority.

In the last bill, there were some things that hurt California but it was an open rule. It was a fair and open debate. I did not like that. But that is the way that I think that we have to fight for this place.

The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are in my subcommittee. You are concerned that the Senate

has a 7 year, we have a 3 year. I voted every single year to totally cut out the humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, and if I thought it was going to go on indefinitely, I would do that again. But what I do want to do is allow the good programs that survive in this program to phase out over a 3-year period and let them establish their own endowment. I think that is fair, and I think that is fair under an open rule. I urge my colleagues to vote for this.

If you do not, in my subcommittee, I will not authorize it at all, if they try and go beyond that.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a vote against this rule. There are a lot of things in this rule that I would like to protect. But not at the expense of waiving points of order so that the action that Congress took last year on the California Desert Act can be, by fiat of the Committee on Appropriations' will, reversed.

I also do not think that we ought to reverse the Outer Banks Protection Act. I just do not think that we ought to be asked to pay the price for being asked to pay in terms of ignoring our responsibilities to the environment in order to pass this rule.

I think if Members are genuinely interested in having a bipartisan approach and a bipartisan rule, they will quit using the appropriations process to accomplish an ideological agenda that would not be possible under normal parliamentary circumstances.

I would urge strongly a vote against this rule. We can do better.

□ 2000

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Claremont, CA [Mr. DREIER], vice chairman of the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Columbus for yielding me this time. I would like to congratulate her for handling this very challenging rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule for several reasons, first and foremost, because I want to have a chance to vote as I have in the past to zero out the National Endowment for the Arts, to zero out the National Endowment for the Humanities. Guess what, this rule is going to give me a chance to do that. There some people who have been claiming that we will not have a chance to do that if we pass this rule. That is wrong.

I happen to be a very strong supporter of the arts. The former chairman of the subcommittee walking right up to the aisle there, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], knows very well that my family has encouraged me to be a supporter of the arts. However, I want to see us do it privately. That is why I am going to support the Crane amendment, if we can get this measure through.

It is my belief that as we look at other way important provisions within this bill just discussed by the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, like defunding the California Desert Protection Act, that gives us another very important reason on our side of the aisle, especially, to vote in favor of this rule.

The other reason is the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] made it very clear. When it comes to the lockbox, we are going to proceed and make retroactive, retroactive, the provisions that we come to, in a bipartisan way. This is a rule which is balanced, fair, and it is open. I would not dream of voting against an open rule. I cannot imagine why anyone would do that. It is fair, it is balanced, it allows us to zero out the NEA and the NEH. I believe everyone in this House should support it in a bipartisan way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 193, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 495]

YEAS—235

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

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

NAYS—193

Abercrombie	Deutsch	Johnson (SD)
Ackerman	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Andrews	Dixon	Johnston
Baesler	Doggett	Kanjorski
Baldacci	Dooley	Kaptur
Barcia	Doyle	Kennedy (MA)
Barrett (WI)	Durbin	Kennedy (RI)
Becerra	Edwards	Kennelly
Beilenson	Engel	Kildee
Bentsen	Eshoo	Kleccka
Berman	Evans	Klink
Bevill	Farr	LaFalce
Bishop	Fattah	Lantos
Bonior	Fazio	Levin
Borski	Fields (LA)	Lewis (GA)
Boucher	Filner	Lipinski
Brewster	Flake	Lofgren
Browder	Foglietta	Lowe
Brown (CA)	Ford	Luther
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Maloney
Brown (OH)	Frost	Manton
Bryant (TX)	Furse	Markey
Cardin	Gejdenson	Martinez
Chapman	Gephardt	Mascara
Clay	Geren	Matsui
Clayton	Gibbons	McCarthy
Clement	Gonzalez	McDermott
Clyburn	Gordon	McHale
Coleman	Green	McKinney
Collins (IL)	Gutierrez	McNulty
Collins (MI)	Hamilton	Meehan
Condit	Harman	Meek
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Menendez
Costello	Hayes	Mfume
Coyne	Hilliard	Miller (CA)
Cramer	Hinche	Mineta
Danner	Holden	Minge
de la Garza	Hoyer	Mink
DeFazio	Jackson-Lee	Mollohan
DeLauro	Jacobs	Montgomery
Dellums	Jefferson	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
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson

Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Townes
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Nethercutt
Ney
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Pelosi
Petri
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen

Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Solomon
Spence
Stump
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thorkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wolf
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Tiaht
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Hall (OH)
Hefner

Hoke
Moakley
Reynolds
Stark

□ 2021

Mrs. MALONEY changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 238, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No 496]

AYES—192

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combust
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham

Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doggett
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen

Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (CT)
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Maloney
Martini
McCollum
McCrery

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Burton
Cardin
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)

NOES—238

Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graham
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hayes
Hayworth
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek

Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Neumann
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Radanovich
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Scarborough
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shadegg
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman

NOT VOTING—4

□ 2042

Mr. HAYWORTH and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. SAWYER, GIBBONS, HASTINGS of Florida, DOGGETT, and SCHUMER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and myself.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VOLKMER moves that the House do now adjourn.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 238, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

AYES—177

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
Clay

Clayton	Hoyer	Pelosi	Leach	Packard	Smith (TX)
Clement	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (FL)	Lewis (CA)	Parker	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)	Lewis (KY)	Paxon	Solomon
Coleman	Johnson (CT)	Pickett	Lightfoot	Petri	Souder
Collins (MI)	Johnson (SD)	Pomeroy	Linder	Pombo	Spence
Condit	Johnson, E. B.	Poshard	Livingston	Porter	Stearns
Conyers	Johnston	Rangel	LoBiondo	Portman	Stockman
Costello	Kanjorski	Reed	Longley	Pryce	Stump
Coyne	Kaptur	Richardson	Lucas	Quillen	Talent
Cramer	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers	Luther	Quinn	Tate
Danner	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer	Manzullo	Radanovich	Tauzin
Davis	Kennelly	Rose	Martini	Rahall	Thomas
de la Garza	Kildee	Roybal-Allard	McCollum	Ramstad	Thornberry
DeLauro	Klink	Rush	McCrery	Regula	Tiahrt
Dellums	LaFalce	Sabo	McDade	Riggs	Torkildsen
Deutsch	Levin	Sanders	McHale	Roberts	Trafigant
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer	McHugh	Rogers	Upton
Dingell	Lincoln	Schroeder	McInnis	Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
Dixon	Lipinski	Schumer	McIntosh	Ros-Lehtinen	Waldholtz
Dooley	Lofgren	Scott	McKeon	Roth	Walker
Doyle	Lowey	Serrano	Meehan	Roukema	Walsh
Durbin	Maloney	Sisisky	Metcalf	Royce	Wamp
Edwards	Manton	Skaggs	Meyers	Salmon	Watts (OK)
Engel	Markey	Skelton	Mica	Sanford	Weldon (FL)
Eshoo	Martinez	Slaughter	Miller (FL)	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Evans	Mascara	Spratt	Molinari	Schaefer	Weller
Farr	Matsui	Stark	Moorhead	Schiff	White
Fattah	McCarthy	Stenholm	Morella	Seastrand	Whitfield
Fazio	McDermott	Stokes	Myers	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Fields (LA)	McKinney	Studds	Myrick	Shadegg	Wolf
Filner	McNulty	Stupak	Nethercutt	Shays	Young (AK)
Flake	Meek	Tanner	Neumann	Shuster	Young (FL)
Foglietta	Menendez	Taylor (MS)	Ney	Skeen	Zimmer
Ford	Mfume	Tejeda	Norwood	Smith (MI)	
Fowler	Miller (CA)	Thompson	Nussle	Smith (NJ)	
Frank (MA)	Mineta	Thornton			
Frost	Minge	Thurman			
Furse	Mink	Torres			
Gejdenson	Mollohan	Torricelli	Archer	Ortiz	Tucker
Gephardt	Montgomery	Towns	Boehner	Oxley	Waxman
Gonzalez	Moran	Towles	Boucher	Payne (VA)	Williams
Gordon	Murtha	Velazquez	Moran	DeFazio	Wilson
Gunderson	Nadler	Vento	Hefner	Scarborough	Zeliff
Gutierrez	Neal	Visclosky	Lantos	Shaw	
Hall (OH)	Oberstar	Volkmer	Moakley	Taylor (NC)	
Hamilton	Obey	Ward			
Harman	Olver	Waters			
Hastings (FL)	Orton	Watt (NC)			
Hayes	Owens	Wise			
Hilliard	Pallone	Woolsey			
Hinchey	Pastor	Wyden			
Holden	Payne (NJ)	Wynn			
		Yates			

NOES—238

Allard	Combest	Goodling
Army	Cooley	Goss
Bachus	Cox	Graham
Baker (CA)	Crane	Green
Baker (LA)	Crapo	Greenwood
Ballenger	Creameans	Gutknecht
Barr	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Hancock
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Hansen
Bartlett	DeLay	Hastert
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Dickey	Hayworth
Bateman	Doggett	Hefley
Beilenson	Doolittle	Heineman
Bereuter	Dornan	Herger
Bilbray	Dreier	Hilleary
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hobson
Bliley	Dunn	Hoekstra
Blute	Ehlers	Hoke
Boehlert	Ehrlich	Horn
Bonilla	Emerson	Hostettler
Bono	English	Houghton
Brownback	Ensign	Hunter
Bryant (TN)	Everett	Hutchinson
Bunn	Ewing	Hyde
Bunning	Fawell	Inglis
Burr	Fields (TX)	Istook
Burton	Flanagan	Jacobs
Buyer	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Callahan	Forbes	Jones
Calvert	Fox	Kasich
Camp	Franks (CT)	Kelly
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Kim
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	King
Castle	Frisa	Kingston
Chabot	Funderburk	Klecza
Chambliss	Gallegly	Klug
Chenoweth	Ganske	Knollenberg
Christensen	Gekas	Kolbe
Chrysler	Geren	LaHood
Clinger	Gibbons	Largent
Coble	Gilchrest	Latham
Coburn	Gillmor	LaTourette
Collins (GA)	Gilman	Laughlin
Collins (IL)	Goodlatte	Lazio

subject to the call of the Chair in order to enable the Committee on Rules to report those rules so that they can be taken up tomorrow.

In the meantime, I think it is safe to tell the Members that there will be no more recorded votes tonight and the House, of course, will reconvene at the appointed time tomorrow of 10 a.m. We would expect at that time, or very soon thereafter, to be picking up the new, more up to date, more passable rule on Interior appropriations and then be able to move on the bill tomorrow.

We would still try our very best, in examination of the dual considerations of Members' travel schedules, work period schedules, and our desire to move the bill, to work late tomorrow evening, perhaps, but then try our very best to enable Members to avoid having to work on Friday or the weekend.

But at this point, I cannot say anything more definite about that other than, obviously, it is our desire to be able to resolve the legislative schedule without trespassing against the Members' weekends. I hope to be able to be more clear in my understanding of this in a moment.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], does the gentleman have a number of bills he would like to complete by late tomorrow night so that we could leave for the week, or do you know that at this point?

Mr. ARMEY. Of course, if the gentleman had his way, he would complete all the rest of these appropriations bills by tomorrow night and then everybody could take a vacation. But I would at least like to see us complete the Interior appropriations bill by tomorrow night. I would think that would give us the chance to reinstate our schedule for the August 4th district work recess period.

Our principal focus is to try to protect that departure time for that recess period while we complete the appropriations bills. So if we can find our way back on track as quickly as we can, then hopefully we can smooth things out a little bit again.

Mr. GEPHARDT. And would the gentleman further yield. I saw in a flyer that was on the floor from the distinguished majority whip earlier in the evening that you believe that the House will be in session now on Monday, July the 17th, and votes would begin at 5 p.m. Is that still your intention?

Mr. ARMEY. I am very confident that we will reconvene the House on Monday, the 17th, for votes to begin after 5 o'clock. My only concern right now is whether or not this front end we will get out and have our work down tomorrow night so that we can, as the flyer said, not have votes or work on Friday.

But yes, whenever we finish this week's work, we will be coming back next Monday for votes to begin after 5 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

NOT VOTING—19

Ortiz	Tucker
Oxley	Waxman
Payne (VA)	Williams
Reynolds	Wilson
Scarborough	Zeliff
Shaw	
Taylor (NC)	

□ 2101

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

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

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion to go into the Committee of the Whole.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader about the schedule for the rest of this evening and tomorrow.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for asking. With respect to the schedule for the rest of this evening, tomorrow, and possibly days beyond, let us start with this evening.

In a few moments, Mr. Speaker, we are going to ask that the House begin special orders. While those special orders are underway, the Committee on Rules will be meeting in order to consider a new rule for the Interior appropriations bill and/or possibly other rules.

We will, if necessary, later in the evening, have a recess of the House

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-95)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of January 30, 1995, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c).

1. On December 22, 1994, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan government in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked.

2. There has been one amendment to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report on January 30, 1995. The amendment (60 Fed. Reg. 8300, February 14, 1995) added 144 entities to appendix A, Organizations Determined to Be Within the Term "Government of Libya" (Specially Designated Nationals ("SDNs") of Libya). The amendment also added 19 individuals to appendix B, Individuals Determined to Be Specially Designated Nationals of the Government of Libya. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

Pursuant to section 550.304(a) of the Regulations, FAC has determined that these entities and individuals designated as SDNs are owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly on behalf of, the Government of Libya, or are agencies, instrumentalities or entities of that government. By virtue of this determination, all property and interests in property of these entities or persons that are in the United States or in the possessions or control of U.S. persons are blocked. Further, U.S. persons are prohibited from engaging in trans-

actions with these individuals or entities unless the transactions are licensed by FAC. The designations were made in consultation with the Department of State and announced by FAC in notices issued on January 10 and January 24, 1995.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in transactions under the Regulations, issuing 119 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. Consistent with FAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (83) concerned requests by Libyan and non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock bank accounts initially blocked because of an apparent Government of Libya interest. The largest category of denials (14) was for banking transactions in which FAC found a Government of Libya interest. One license was issued authorizing intellectual property protection in Libya and another for travel to Libya to visit close family members.

In addition, FAC issued one determination with respect to applications from attorneys to receive fees and reimbursement of expenses for provision of legal services to the Government of Libya in connection with wrongful death civil actions arising from the Pan Am 103 bombing. Civil suits have been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and in the Southern District of New York. Representation of the Government of Libya when named as a defendant in or otherwise made a party to domestic U.S. legal proceedings is authorized by section 550.517(b)(2) of the Regulations under certain conditions.

4. During the current 6-month period, FAC continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made by or on behalf of Libya. The FAC worked closely with the banks to implement new interdiction software systems to identify such payments. As a result, during the reporting period, more than 171 transactions involving Libya, totaling more than \$6.5 million, were blocked. As of May 25, 27 of these transactions had been licensed to be released, leaving a net amount of more than \$5.2 million blocked.

Since my last report, FAC collected 37 civil monetary penalties totaling more than \$354,700 for violations of the U.S. sanctions against Libya. Eleven of the violations involved the failure of banks to block funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks. Two other penalties were received from companies for originating funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks. Two corporations paid penalties for export violations. Twenty-two additional penalties were paid by U.S. citizens engaging in Libyan oilfield-related transactions while another 54 cases of similar violations are in active penalty processing.

Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods have continued to be aggressively pursued. The FAC has continued its efforts under the "Operation Roadblock" initiative. This ongoing program seeks to identify U.S. persons who travel to and/or work in Libya in violation of U.S. law.

Several new investigations of potentially significant violations of the Libyan sanctions have been initiated by FAC and cooperating U.S. law enforcement agencies, primarily the U.S. Customs Service. Many of these cases are believed to involve complex conspiracies to circumvent the various prohibitions of the Libyan sanctions, as well as the utilization of international diversionary shipping routes to and from Libya. The FAC has continued to work closely with the Departments of State and Justice to identify U.S. persons who enter into contracts or agreements with the Government of Libya, or other third-country parties, to lobby United States Government officials or to engage in public relations work on behalf of the Government of Libya without FAC authorization. In addition, during the period FAC attended several bilateral and multi-lateral meetings with foreign sanctions authorities, as well as with private foreign institutions, to consult on issues of mutual interest and to encourage strict adherence to the U.N.-mandated sanctions.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January 7 through July 6, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the Libyan national emergency are estimated at approximately \$830,000.00. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce.

6. The policies and actions of the Government of Libya continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. In adopting UNSCR 883 in November 1993, the Security Council determined that the continued failure of the Government of Libya to demonstrate by concrete actions its renunciation of terrorism, and in particular its continued failure to respond fully and effectively to the requests and decisions of the Security Council in UNSCRs 731 and 748, concerning the bombing of the Pam Am 103 and UTA 772 flights, constituted a threat to international peace and security. The United States continues to believe that still stronger international measures than those mandated by UNSCR 883, possibly including a worldwide oil embargo, should be imposed if Libya continues to defy the will of the international community as

expressed in UNSCR 731. We remain determined to ensure that the perpetrators of the terrorist acts against Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 are brought to justice. The families of the victims in the murderous Lockerbie bombing and other acts of Libyan terrorism deserve nothing less. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against Libya fully and effectively, so long as those measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments as required by law.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 12, 1995.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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 Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART 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.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REPORT ON H.R. 2020, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

Mr. LIGHTFOOT, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Report No. 194-183), on the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

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

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CHANGING THE STATUS QUO IN CONGRESS

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, we have tried to revise the way we do business in Congress. Everybody is excited about getting out early tonight. We have done a lot of things to revise and change the status quo in Congress. And this freshman class and this new majority has really just rebuilt the way we do business.

As Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, PAT ROBERTS says, "The status quo doesn't live in Washington, D.C. anymore."

One of the things we did early on is pass a balanced budget amendment in the House. Now, the United States' other body has not seen fit to pass the balanced budget amendment yet, but in the House of Representatives, we are living under the philosophy that we did pass the balanced budget.

It is the intent of the American people to balance the budget and all of our appropriations bills are moving us in the direction of having a balanced budget by the year 2002. Now, a lot of people ask me why are you waiting seven years? And unfortunately it does appear that there are so many programs, it is so complicated when you are spending \$1.4 trillion, that you have to go about these things slowly.

Part of the mechanism for balancing the budget is reducing spending, consolidating Government agencies, eliminating bureaucracies, eliminating duplications, getting some of the redtape off of small businesses and large businesses so that they can grow, expand in the economy, create more jobs, and bring in more tax revenues as a result of that.

I see the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is here, the able-bodied chairman of the Theme Team, the most articulate Member of the floor. If the gentleman would like to add to this, I will yield to you.

Mr. HOKE. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON]

yielding to me. There seems to be a great deal of commotion here in the House this evening. We failed in passing a rule and we almost devolved into the Committee of the Whole to deal with this Interior appropriations bill without a rule.

□ 2115

Can you tell me what is going on?

Mr. KINGSTON. What has been going on is that the appropriations process, this \$1.4 trillion that we spend each year of taxpayer's money and future taxpayers' money, because we deficit spend, as you know, it is broken down in 13 different bills. Each of those bills has a number of cuts; each of those bills has a number of eliminations of policies; each of those bills reduces the growth of spending. And because of that, the Interior bill is controversial, as any other of the 13 bills are, because Members feel very strongly about certain pet projects that are being cut and so forth or being reduced.

So as has been the case here lately, now that we are getting into the appropriations cycle, there is a little more friction, often between parties but sometimes intraparty, among the House Members. So we are having to adjourn for the evening here.

Mr. HOKE. We are certainly not going to adjourn. I hope we are going to continue to talk about it.

Mr. KINGSTON. You and I are, but we are not going to have any more votes tonight until Members agree to the final print in the appropriations process.

One of the things, as you know, that we do is when we reduce spending on a bill, we try to earmark the funds from one area to the other. So a lot of times a guy from one area of the country will try to cut spending from somebody else's area, because it is cheap. There is a political cost to him or her.

Mr. HOKE. Are you suggesting that one person's, one Member's pork is another Member's laudable project of great American strength and importance?

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman is a learned politician and that is true.

I was not here, neither were you, when we had the infamous Lawrence Welk debates where the U.S. Congress was funding the Lawrence Welk Museum. I am not sure where he was from.

Mr. HOKE. I can assure you it was not from my district.

Mr. KINGSTON. Of the 435 House districts, all of them but one thought that that was pork. And, yet, we all have that problem.

Mr. HOKE. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. HOKE. To be a little bit more serious, it seems to me that there is a question about this particular bill and the rule and whether what we have seen here tonight is a reflection of a systemic problem in the House with respect to the appropriations process or if what we are dealing with is a problem with respect to this specific bill.

I have some strong feelings about that, that this in fact reflects a systematic problem in the whole appropriations process in the way that we spend money, the taxpayers' money. But maybe it is just about this bill. What are your thoughts?

Mr. KINGSTON. I do not think the problem that we are having right now is directed toward the Interior appropriations bill. It has to do with money.

MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). 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 appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues tonight with regard to some very important legislation the House will be taking up in the weeks and months ahead.

With health care being so important and with making sure that our constituents get the kind of health care delivery that is so important, I am happy to see that the House is looking to two very important areas.

The first one would be Medicare preservation. We know that within 7 years, if nothing is done, Medicare, as we know it, will not be, in fact, here in the United States. So the Republicans and Democrats are working together to try to make sure that Medicare is preserved.

In my own district of Montgomery County, PA, we have a Medicare preservation task force. We are having a meeting tonight for the purpose of having seniors and others who live in the district to come up with ways and means to make sure that we eliminate the fraud and abuse and waste that is in the system.

The Congressional Budget Office has come up with the fact that, and the GAO, that in fact there is \$44 billion in waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid systems. If we eliminate that kind of fraud, waste, and abuse, we will get to the heart of what has to be done to reform Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the things I want to make sure I understand clearly on Medicare is, I hear that the Republicans are changing it and, yet, is it not the Clinton-appointed Democrats who are saying that Medicare is going to be broke in under 6 years; is that correct?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is correct. The fact is that the bipartisan task force studying Medicare has come up with the fact that, in fact, we will be out of money in 7 years. Most of the Clinton appointees, the Secretary of Health and Human Services and others, have clearly said we are going to have a problem. What is interesting about the President though is that he has come up with no solution for it.

Mr. KINGSTON. But the gentleman, if he will continue to yield, it is the Clinton Democrats who are saying Medicare is going broke and yet it is Members of the Republican Party who are trying to preserve and strengthen Medicare through reforms?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What we are trying to do is make sure we eliminate the fraud, abuse, and waste in the system.

Mr. KINGSTON. What has the Democrat leadership done through the Clinton administration or through the House to offer Medicare solutions?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. They have been absent without leadership; there has been nothing at all.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yet they are criticizing what we are trying to do when we talk about strengthening and preserving the system.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. You are right. We are the ones who in this session have already met and worked with seniors to make sure that we help them earn beyond \$11,028 a year, to make sure that in the next 5 years if they earn \$30,000 without deducting for Social Security, and we are also saying, the same leadership of this House that has always come forward with the idea of rolling back the unfair 1993 Social Security tax increase, we are here working in a bipartisan fashion, I believe, to try to come up with the kinds of solutions that are meaningful. And it may be that from our own districts, our own Medicare preservation task forces will see that managed care is an option. We will see that the fraud, abuse, and waste is certainly a part of the equation. We need to hear from the American public so that we can make sure we preserve and protect and expand Medicare.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I have a chart here that I think goes to exactly what the gentleman is talking about. This is a quotation from the trustees of the Medicare trust fund. These are five people, men and women appointed by the President of the United States. It includes three members of the President's Cabinet, Cabinet Secretaries Shalala, Rubin, and Reich, and the specific quote here is that the fund, the Medicare Health Insurance Trust Fund is projected to be exhausted in 2001.

You have to ask yourself the question, is there a problem or is there not a problem? If there is a problem, then it seems to me that our responsibility as elected officials, as people who have been elected, Members of Congress that have been elected by the people in their districts to represent them, that if there is this problem that is a pressing problem, if it has been identified by the trustees of the President's trust fund, that we have an absolute responsibility to deal with that. And that if we do not deal with it, we are abrogating that responsibility in a way that is

completely without precedent and terribly, terribly irresponsible in terms of the implications it has for the rest of the country.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, what you are saying then is if we do nothing by 2002, the Medicare trust fund then becomes insolvent?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. BAKER of California. I think then we have an obligation, because we were elected by the people to preserve, protect and strengthen Medicare, not to kill it, that we have to take some action which will allow it to live beyond just our generation.

Is that the point the gentleman is making, it that what the trustees, the Democrat members of the trustees have said?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

MORE ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we have got 5 minutes remaining. I would like to pursue what you were just talking about, Mr. BAKER.

I think you are absolutely right. It seems to me, here is what we have got to realize, is that there is a genuine problem here. It is very easy, with any of these problems in Congress, to subject them to demagoguery, to subject them to hyperbole, to subject them to political talk that is essentially designed to sway people in a way that will give the speaker a political advantage.

The question that you have to ask yourself, as a Member of Congress, that I have to ask myself and that, frankly, the public has got to figure out for themselves is, they have got to cut through the politics of it and decide, is there or is there not a problem? And the truth is that there is a problem. It was not identified yesterday. It was not just identified in April 1995. It has been identified in the previous trustees reports of the past several years that Medicare is going broke.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that must mean that it is the previous two administrations' trustees have told us that is we do nothing, then that line that Mr. KINGSTON from Georgia is showing us will take effect. This is Medicare part A. This is hospitalization. This is nothing that we can fool with, if we want Medicare to be preserved, strengthened and protected for future generations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is the report of the Clinton, the Democrat Clinton trustees that came out in April.

Mr. HOKE. April 3, 1995.

Mr. BAKER of California. Previous administrations also have made the same conclusion, that we have about a \$140 billion trust fund that will be exhausted because we are now for the first year spending more than we are taking in.

The seniors in my district, who are relatively affluent, want more for their children than they do for themselves. And they want this system to continue. So they are not greedy and they are not selfish. They know there is a problem, but they want us to do something. I wonder if we have the guts and political will to do something.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is it not the intent of this Congress, this Republican majority, to increase spending on a per person basis on Medicare from a \$4,800, approximate—

Mr. HOKE. Reclaiming my time, what I have heard on television and I have seen it in some news reports is that the Republicans are slashing spending on Medicare.

Mr. KINGSTON. But, in fact, is it not true that the committees are talking about going from about \$4,800 per person to \$6,400 per person? Those are round numbers. Is that not an increase over the next seven years?

Mr. HOKE. I just happen to have a chart that shows exactly what we are going to do here. We are going to go from \$4,816 per person per beneficiary per year up to \$6,734 per beneficiary per year. That takes into account all of the new additions to the Medicare population, Medicare ranks.

I think maybe even more interesting is another chart that shows you that we are going to go on a per beneficiary per month basis from about \$401 in 1995 to \$561 per month per beneficiary in 2002. We are going up from \$178 billion in 1995 to \$274 billion in 2002.

Obviously, our challenge as a nation, our challenge as a Congress is to give solutions and reforms that will make it possible for us to serve the Medicare population using this number of dollars.

But it is crystal clear that what we are doing is from where we are today at \$178 billion, which is covering that population, we are increasing up to \$274 billion in 2002. I think that that is a pretty important fact that the public deserves to know.

Mr. KINGSTON. As Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania said earlier tonight, we are looking at ways to slow the growth, the expense of Medicare to the senior citizens. Medicare inflation right now is about 11 percent. Regular medical inflation is lower than that. Regular inflation, I think, is about 4 percent. So we are trying to reduce that level of cost increase.

Mr. HOKE. What you are saying is completely correct. The health care component of inflation in the private sector right now is about 4.4 percent. But in fact there are other models in the private sector of specific companies or industries that have been able to

flatten their health care costs completely, no increase whatsoever, while giving as much as greater choice and service to the people that they are covering.

□ 2130

Mr. HOKE. We ought to be looking at those kinds of models to in fact improve Medicare for the senior citizens of America.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, the thing that I am curious about is this administration made such a big play on health care reform, it is interesting that they are absent to the Medicare, except to criticize.

Mr. BAKER of California. Well, let me summarize, because we have run out of time, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield one more second, and that is we have established now, there is a problem, because two generations of trustees, Republican and Democrat, have told us we start going broke this year and we will finish going broke in Medicare part A by 2002. It is not a Democratic problem, it is not a Republican problem, it is a congressional problem and we have to act.

Mr. HOKE. It is an American problem.

BONNEVILLE POWER CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce one of the most outrageous and arrogant abuses of government power that I have witnessed since coming to Washington. Sadly, it involves a U.S. Government agency, the Bonneville Power Administration, or better known as BPA, which unilaterally has refused to honor an electric power contract with a Nebraska company, Tenaska Washington Partners II. This decision, if not reversed immediately, could wind up costing the American taxpayer over \$1 billion.

To give you a little background on this situation, back in 1991, Bonneville Power issued a request for proposals. They were needing to build some more power into their unit and so they were looking to expand and they sent out a request for proposals. Over 102 bidders responded. Of those 102 bidders, Tenaska won the bid. Well, they went ahead and constructed the facility and are almost 70 percent complete by now. Just last month they went over the 70 percent completion.

In April 1995, Bonneville Power informed Tenaska that the power administration no longer intended to honor the power contract, claiming recent dramatic reductions in projected demand for Bonneville Power. In subsequent correspondence and meetings, Bonneville Power repeatedly has stated that it will not perform its obligations under the power purchase agreement.

Bonneville's action here constitutes a willful repudiation of a valid, binding contract. Bonneville Power has never alleged, nor can they allege, that there has been any fault on the part of Tenaska. In so doing, Bonneville Power violates the principle of the sanctity of contract, a principle that is so fundamental under U.S. law that it underlies every business transaction.

Indeed, the U.S. Secretary of Energy, the head of the very agency which supervises Bonneville Power, recently has explained that breaking a contract in the power industry could substantially inhibit the development of more competitive wholesale power markets, concluding that a competitive market simply will not flourish if the integrity of contractual agreements is subject to question.

Well, that is exactly what has happened here, Mr. Speaker. If Bonneville Power fails to correct what has gone on in the past few months, Tenaska will have no other recourse than to resort to litigation. With the law clearly on Tenaska's side, Bonneville Power should expect that any forum which hears this dispute will likely hold Bonneville Power liable to and for damages, perhaps in excess of \$1 billion.

Why \$1 billion? Well, this represents the amount of money already expended by Tenaska in construction of its power facility, plus the net present value of what it could expect to receive under the contract. The ability of an aggrieved contracting party to obtain such damages is a fundamental principle of American contract law.

Bonneville Power officials have claimed that there is not enough money in the power administration's trust fund to pay for such damages. Accordingly, American taxpayers would be forced to bail out Bonneville Power to the tune of over \$1 billion. The money likely would come from either the Federal Judgment Fund supported by general tax dollars, or from a significant rate hike on Bonneville Power customers.

By taking this action, Bonneville perhaps believes that it is wiser to incur a greater expense later via litigation when a far lesser expense can be incurred today through honoring the contract. What I think is probably more likely the situation that Bonneville Power has chosen here is they would prefer that the money come from another part of the government instead of their own budget.

Such reasoning I believe would be an extraordinary abuse of power. I know that the people of Nebraska, the people that I represent, do not want to be stuck paying the tab for Bonneville Power's unwillingness to live up to its contractual agreement, a signed document. I doubt that any other taxpayer in this country would be pleased that Bonneville Power is spending our money in such an unwise fashion.

I believe the only logical solution is for Bonneville Power to honor its written contract with Tenaska. In order to

abide by the law, retain its political viability, and provide for fundamental fairness to its contractors, Bonneville Power must honor its contractual obligations by enabling the Tenaska plant to produce power and to serve Bonneville Power and its customers just like they agreed to and just like they have and will perform.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in a day and a time when the American people are wondering about the efficiency of the Department of Energy, I believe that them stepping forward and telling one of their agencies to honor the contract like they agreed to would be a good step in the right direction.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my family and the funeral back in my district today, I was unavoidably detained and I would like to record, Mr. Speaker, how I would have voted on separate votes today dealing with the Energy and Water appropriations bills.

I would deal with them as follows: on rollcall No. 487, the Obey amendment No. 25, I would have voted "no."

On the rollcall 488, the Klug amendment No. 14, I would have voted "no."

On the rollcall 489, the Ward amendment, I would have voted "yes."

On the rollcall 490, the Volkmer amendment No. 32, I would have voted "yes."

On the rollcall 491, the Klug amendment No. 8, I would have voted "yes."

On the rollcall 492, the Klug amendment No. 9, I would have voted "yes."

On the rollcall 493, to sustain the ruling of the Chair, I would have voted "yes."

On the rollcall 494, final passage of the Energy and Water appropriations bill, H.R. 1905, I would have voted "yes."

MEDICARE CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss the impact of the proposed Republican Medicare and Medicaid cuts on American families and the health delivery system as a whole.

The American people have heard a great deal of rhetoric from the Republicans about how Medicare must be cut to save the trust fund.

The Republicans want you to believe that they are being forced to make drastic cuts in your Medicare benefits because the system is about to collapse. But the first thing I want to say to you tonight is that the Republican Medicare cuts have nothing whatsoever to do with saving the Medicare trust fund.

We can all agree that health care costs in general and Medicare costs in

particular must be contained to assure long-term security for our Nation and its senior citizens.

In fact, if the Republicans were to be totally honest, they would tell you that the real problem for Medicare comes in 2010 when the first of the baby-boomers enter the program and Medicare enrollment expands dramatically.

The Republican Medicare cut proposal does nothing to confront the real Medicare solvency problem.

In the short run, we can and should stabilize the Medicare trust fund and assure that we can keep our promises to the American people, but this is nothing new. The stability of the Medicare trust fund has always required attention.

In the mid-1970's, the Medicare trust fund was due to expire in 2 years. The same problem recurred in the early 1980's. A 7-year window for the trust fund is about average.

We have always moved quickly and responsibly to keep the trust fund solvent. Under a Republican majority, this will be very difficult, but Democrats are committed to preserving Medicare without breaking our commitment to senior citizens and their families.

In trying to understand these Medicare cuts ask yourself, Why are the Republicans making such drastic and painful cuts? Can't you save Medicare without hurting older Americans?

The answer is yes. But the Republicans need to cut \$270 billion out of Medicare so that they can pay for their tax cuts to the well-off and balance the budget by an arbitrary date they picked from a campaign booklet.

They need \$270 billion from Medicare to pay for a \$245 billion tax cut. They are simply using Medicare as the bank to pay for tax cuts and deficit reduction.

The Medicare trust fund problem is not making these cuts happen. You do not need to take \$270 billion out of Medicare—as Republicans propose to do—to save the trust fund.

It is hard to fully understand the magnitude of the cuts proposed by the Republican majority in this Congress. Republicans have proposed cutting substantially more funds from Medicare in the next 7 years than the program spends for its entire costs in 1 year.

Republicans want to limit the rate of growth for the program that provides health insurance to the oldest and the sickest in our population to a rate of growth per person that is almost one-half of the rate of growth per person for the private insurance industry.

The private health insurance industry provides insurance primarily to people that are younger and healthier than the Medicare population. Yet, private premiums and payments still will be almost double the funding provided for the health insurance for the Nation's elderly under the Republican proposal.

I put this chart up here because the blue is for the expected Medicare

voucher, and this is the cost, the green is what it costs in the private sector. Each year you can see that the private sector is going up much faster than the voucher is, and that is what is written into their proposal. Senior citizens' out-of-pocket expenses are estimated to increase by at least \$3,500 per person under the Republican proposal. Each Medicare beneficiary will have less health care and fewer benefits as the number of Medicare beneficiaries grow, while the dollars shrink, all to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy and a budget tied to Wall Street instead of Main Street.

Now, as people are thinking about this, they really have to think, how will these cuts be achieved? The strongest possibility promoted by the Republicans is to issue vouchers to senior citizens to buy insurance. But the kicker is that the value of the voucher won't be enough to pay for an adequate insurance policy. Senior citizens will have to pay for the difference between the value of the voucher and the cost of the insurance policy. By the year 2002, the cost of private insurance is expected to be 18 percent more than the Medicare voucher is worth.

That is really what this chart is all about. They start out easy on people. They give them the amount of money that an actual insurance policy would cost in 1995. The next year they give them a little less than it would cost, and by the year 2002, you can see that the voucher will be worth \$6,500, and they estimate that the cost of an adequate policy to cover what is necessary will be \$7,600. Now, that is \$1,200 that the senior citizen will have to come up with out of their own pocket because Medicare itself will not cover the cost.

□ 2145

The result will be that seniors will be forced into the most restrictive HMO's. Contrary, and I say again, contrary to the Republican rhetoric, the vouchers will not be used to give seniors more choice. They will not have more choice because they will not have the money to buy an adequate policy. They will have to buy the cheapest policy possible and if it is adequate or inadequate, that does not make any difference to the Republicans. All they want to do is save the money and force a tax increase on senior citizens of \$1,200 a year.

Underfunded vouchers will lead to a loss of choice. They will be used to take away the free choice of provider, the ability to decide which physician you want to see, which hospital you want to be in. You are going to be in an HMO, a managed care operation that will tell you, "This is the doctor you can see. This is the hospital you must go to."

In the present Medicare program, senior citizens have the maximum choice. They can go to any doctor, any hospital they want. Under the Republican plan, if seniors cannot afford the difference, if they cannot come up with

the difference between what the voucher gives them and what the actual cost is, they will have to go without health care or they will buy an inadequate policy.

Remember, when the Republicans are ratcheting down the value of the Medicare voucher, they are doing nothing to control costs. They are simply holding down the cost of the voucher each year, but they are not doing anything anywhere in this Congress to control the overall costs.

So the costs will continue to go up at a much faster rate. The gap between the voucher and the health insurance price will be even bigger over time.

Just for a second, think about who Medicare beneficiaries really are. They are senior citizens, over 65, and they are the disabled in this country who need medical care. You do not get on Medicare as a disabled person unless you have a chronic illness and need the care; you have had kidney disease and have had the need for dialysis, you need care, so if you are 45 years old and you are on a Medicare program for dialysis, you are there because that is how we are paying for it in this country.

An increasing number of people in this country are over 85 years old, and the overwhelming majority of people on Medicare have an income of under \$25,000 a year. You are thinking about somebody making \$25,000 a year having to come up with an additional \$1,200 to buy an adequate policy. It is these people that the Republicans want to throw into the water to swim alone with an underfunded voucher through the private insurance market.

Young healthy workers, for heaven's sakes, have great difficulty assessing their health insurance options even with the help of employers and with personnel counselors in their businesses. Senior citizens will have none of these advantages as they try to select the policy that will give them the greatest protection, provided they can pay for it and can overcome the subtle strategies of the health insurance industry to direct the less healthy customers away from their companies.

Imagine if your father is, let's say, going to be 90 years old. He has had a heart attack, he has had a stroke, he has some skin cancer, he has a few problems, and he goes out with his little voucher in his hand looking for an insurance company that is going to want to take him. How many insurance companies are going to run out and meet him in the street and say, "Come on in, sir, we want to sell you insurance"?

They do not want these senior citizens who have illnesses. They want young, healthy people, so they are going to try and pick off the healthy seniors and let the sick ones, the ones who have got chronic illnesses—as you get old, that is kind of what happens to you—those people are going to be excluded from the system.

If the Republicans have their way with these cuts in Medicare, they will

be moving from a system of guaranteed health insurance for the elderly and disabled to a health insurance lottery for those who can afford it. Whether this policy will be adequate for you or not is going to be sort of luck. Guaranteed health coverage for senior citizens will become a distant memory.

It is bad enough on senior citizens, but it is even worse when you think about it because imagine the families, the children and the grandchildren of these senior citizens. When they find out that Mother or Father or Grandma and Grandpa have not got adequate care, what are they going to do? They are going to say, "Well, sorry, Ma, too bad"? Of course not. They are going to have to reach into their pocket and pay the difference for Mom and Dad. That is what is going to happen.

For 30 years in this country there are people my age, 58 years old, and younger, who have never one time had to think about the health care of their parents. With the Republican proposal, they are going to be forced, we are going to be forced, me and everyone else younger than me is going to be forced to think about how they pay the difference for their mother and father or their grandparents in this system.

The Republicans really want to put that obligation back on the plates of young families. For 30 years, families have not had to choose between Grandma's medical bills and whether they could send a child to community college. But if this Republican budget and cuts in Medicare passes, American families will be forced to face that decision.

It is not just senior citizens and their families that will be affected. The entire health care system rests on Medicare. It is the major source of funding in many respects in our system. Major community providers, the hospitals, doctors, nurses and so forth will be severely compromised.

In my district in Seattle, these hospitals get as much as 60 percent of their revenue from Medicare and Medicaid. With cuts of the kind of magnitude suggested here, they simply will not be able to maintain the same level of services to any patient, not just to Medicare patients, but because they lose the Medicare revenue, they are going to have to drop the level of care that they can offer across the board.

Academic medical centers. We are very proud in this country, we have the best medical research and the best medical education in the world. We brag about it. But the fact is that the funding for medical schools is from the Medicare program. Medicare assumes a disproportionate burden of the cost of training new physicians and the burden of the higher costs of academic health centers.

With cuts of this magnitude, academic health centers will not be able to continue training the same number of highly competent physicians. The ability of academic health centers to provide our most sophisticated treatment

and care will be greatly diminished. Many hospitals will not survive.

I have a letter from the head of the Harbor View Hospital in Seattle, and he closes by saying this:

Harbor View is the only Level One trauma center in the State of Washington serving a 4-State area. The magnitude of these cuts is so huge that it presents a doomsday scenario for Harbor View.

They expect to lose \$125 million a year out of this proposal.

So it is not just senior citizens. It is not just their families. It is not just the medical schools. It is the very highly trained and very highly sophisticated trauma centers in this country.

Many hospitals, particularly rural hospitals, will not survive this kind of budget. Everyone's access to health care will be reduced, particularly in the rural areas.

As hospitals try and make up the revenues lost through Medicare and Medicaid cuts, the private insurance rates are going to skyrocket if you do not have them adequately funded for the senior citizens who are there.

The bill will be passed to a senior citizen who does not have the money. They are only making \$25,000. If they have not got the money, it becomes a bad debt for the hospital. The only way the hospital can get that bad debt taken care of is to put it over onto the people who are buying private insurance. That is called cost-shifting. You shift from people who cannot pay to the people who are paying. If you reduce Medicare, private insurance rates in this country will go up.

Medicare cuts for tax cuts and balanced budget politics will rob the middle class of much of the economic security as well as the health care security. We need to protect the entire American family, old, young, middle-aged, and the quality and stability of American health care, by opposing the Medicare cuts that the Republicans are offering.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], for some comments that she has.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank and appreciate the very salient and focused commentary of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT], and reasoned explanation to the American people.

The reason why we have taken the time to study this issue, I think we are all grappling with trying to clear away the smoke and mirrors and focus on reality. Clearly I think that when we begin to capture the numbers, we can reach out to the American people, particularly the 18th Congressional District in Houston where I come from, and really highlight \$270 billion in cuts in Medicare, as the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. Speaker, this is really sort of a surgical procedure that does not leave the patient in better condition but eliminates their limbs. I am just simply confused. If we are trying to protect seniors and talk about a better

health care system, and I would venture to say with your history that that is something that we are all prepared to come to the table to talk about, how we can get better health care for all of our citizens, we would certainly be responsible if we decided to come to the table in a bipartisan manner to deal with that issue.

This is not a health care issue as the Republicans have put it forward. This is a cut issue simply to get some money to give some folks a tax cut. It hurts my community, because basically there are a large number of seniors in that district, a large number of seniors who in fact depend upon their Medicare, as well as working-class families who for the first time are gratified by the good health of their parents, many in the African-American community that have been able to maintain the high blood pressure, keep it under maintenance, other kinds of illnesses that have plagued those in my population or in the African-American population in particular.

Certainly this question goes beyond racial groups, but certain illnesses that have now been able to be maintained because seniors have had access to preventative health care now may shoot up. What you will find out in a district like mine, and I cite mine particularly because there are a number of individuals, poor individuals there, you will find them now in the public hospital system, not there for maintenance but there because they have had a stroke or they have had some other catastrophic results of not being able to take care of themselves. Then that working-class family, maybe the bus driver and the school teacher or whatever combination, then will find mom or dad back home with them, needing to be able to be covered by whatever extra dollars or pennies, I might add, that that working family would have to be able to spend on that elderly.

Let me cite for you just an example, spending a lot of time on this issue, because I really want to get the facts from those who are the beneficiaries right now, besides my parents. We have a hospital that is one of the oldest community hospitals in the State of Texas, Riverside General Hospital, and I took the time to visit with their nurses and their doctors and their patients.

I might add, those soldiers on the battlefield in these community hospitals, anyone who thinks that they are getting a killing financially, that they are making a real profit, even the physicians that practice there or the nurses that work in those hospitals, they have another think coming. They are dependent on Medicare, not just to keep doors open but to serve that base of population, frankly, that I would tell you would not go anywhere else. They do not know about going to the sophisticated medical center in our variety of communities. They know about that community-based hospital that gives that special care.

They gave me the facts that their doors would be shut. They were not there trying to push survival as a hospital, "My job is on the line." They were not really focusing on that. They were talking about the real need of being able to reach these seniors, one, to help them with preventative health care, but as well to be accessible to them where they were not frightened to come into a hospital setting. A lot of our seniors are individuals who say, "I have been healthy all my life and a hospital is not where I would want to be."

□ 2200

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. So Riverside Hospital would be impacted with a great negative impact.

And then, I walked in my community just this last week on one of the older sections in fourth ward and I met seniors there 80 and 86 years old living at home by themselves. Those individuals have a great need for Medicare, but they also are the same individuals that if those premiums went up—I understand we may be looking at \$110 and numbers going beyond that—would be the ones choosing whether they have to eat or needed to eat over medication, other health needs. These are the seniors that would be relegated to the horrible stories of dog food or cat food that we have heard.

These seniors are 80 and 86 years old. You made a very good point. They are living longer. What are the Republicans telling us about people living longer? I know they are not advocating anything that would undermine this good news that we have our seniors living longer, but yet, when we talk about this issue of slow growth, which, by the way, someone asked me, what does that mean because that certainly sounds like we are being really responsible? It means eliminating people. It means that you are talking about a whole pool of people the most sickly and the most needy possibly being eliminated.

So I am convinced that we are headed in a very treacherous direction and I am a little bit incensed that we don't have the real facts, for Medicare is being attacked, for it now is a fact of life. Our seniors are living longer. And so when they argue that the system is crumbling because we have had massive abuse and fraud, there is not a person that I have chatted with that does not want us to clean up anything that needs to be cleaned up, and as responsible legislators, I think we should do that. But I think the real key is whether or not we are looking to solve the problem or whether or not we are using smoke and mirrors to frighten people to then make these major cuts and leave in the lurch, if you will, the public hospital system, small community hospitals, and again, not to keep their doors open for keeping them open's sake, but because they serve populations that are in need.

And what we will do with the public hospital system is basically break it because all those people will be headed in that direction, and from that direction as well, the support of their family members will be required for them in terms of their health care.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding and I would only ask as we proceed with this that we do it in a manner that reflects responsibly on our challenge that is to ensure good health care for our citizens, for Americans, but as well, to not disrespect what seniors have done in their work life, in their commitment to this country and the real need that they have for good health care.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I want to thank my colleague. You have raised a very, very important point that I did not emphasize enough because as a physician, I sometimes forget it. The health care system in this country has worked. The average age when they started Social Security for a man at death was 59 in 1935. Today the average age is almost 80. It is around 77, something like that. So we are talking about extending people's life-span by some 20 years since that period of time, largely because of programs like the Medicare program.

And the major thing you are talking about I think that is so important is the whole issue of prevention. What we had before, everybody gets health care in this country. When you are sick, when you are really sick, they call the ambulance and drag your body in and there you are in the emergency room. Everybody gets health care at that point. But that is at the wrong time in the most costly way possible.

What Medicare has made possible for seniors is to have preventive care; that is, to monitor the blood pressure, to monitor the glaucoma, to monitor all the things that have been problems in the past and wind up in these serious debilitating episodes like strokes. We spend millions of dollars on strokes that can be prevented with some blood pressure medication that is monitored on a regular basis, and Medicare has made that possible.

Now, what the Republicans are proposing is that each year seniors would have to come up with more money out of their pocket to buy the same health care that they now have under the Medicare program. The voucher value would be less than the actual cost. In 1996, the average cost to a senior citizen would be \$67. You say, well that is not very much, so what is the big deal? The next year it is \$254. The next year, \$447.

What the Republicans are trying to do is slide this in in the first year where it isn't going to cost them any more. They will get the same thing for the voucher cost, but by the fourth or fifth year, you will be up to \$645, and by the year 2002, it will cost you almost \$1,140 a year per person more for the same health care benefit you have today and it will all come out of your pocket.

Now, if you think about people who, when you are working regularly and you get a paycheck, you don't think about, well, you know, \$67. I mean, I probably could squeeze and make it. But when you are a senior citizen living on a fixed income on a social security check, you are talking about people who are going to have trouble simply making it, much less coming up with this additional amount of money out of their pocket. And I believe that what is happening here that people fail to understand, and in these early years it looks pretty good, but the further out you get, you can say, well, I won't be here in 7 years. But some more and more people are going to be here and they are going to catch the brunt of this.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Yes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. That chart is instructive because wouldn't you say as a physician that what we begin to do is create a chilling effect for those who have to make choices to begin now to not put medical assistance, preventative medicine, making sure they are keeping up with their health needs so that they can stay healthy? It begins to be on the second tier of their needs or their ability to pay, then the third tier, then the fourth, then just simply: I can't go to the doctor.

It is a chilling effect because they have to make real choices, and you mentioned something else. Seniors, I love them because they represent history and wisdom, but they also, I think, are somewhat stubborn sometimes. They get a friendship with a physician because they trust them and they have confidence in them. And this physician guides them along to keep them healthy. All of a sudden, we deny them choice. We make them second class, third class citizens.

They have gotten used to this physician who has been able to follow their history, and we are telling those in the Medicare system that that is not an option for them. It creates an amazing chilling effect, I believe, for good health care. And when I was trying to make the point on the hub hospital system, which we need to emphasize, all that chilling effect winds up with the bulk of those individuals that have not seen physicians now come by ambulance with a stroke in cardiac arrest, with possible need for an amputation if they are diabetic, whatever these ailments are, and this costs of course all communities, all races of people you will find using the public hospital system because they just haven't been able to go to the doctor and now they are in an ambulance coming. I am frightened about that.

And lastly, I am frightened about us saying to those working class families, in addition to the possibility of the responsibility for their parents, scaring them in terms of what will happen to them as they reach the age needing Medicare. Rather than addressing this

issue in a manner that responds to good health reform and provides for a legacy or a future for these families today, we are again giving, I think, falsehoods about what really needs to be done so that Mr. 35-year-old or Miss 35-year-old will be protected in the next 20 or 30 years.

It is not accurate that they need cuts of \$270 billion in Medicare. That is not helping Mr. and Mrs. 35-year-old. Let it be known that that is helping the tax cuts of 1995 for individuals making over \$200,000. I want to help Mr. and Mrs. 35-year-old. That is the commitment that we should make, and I want to help Mr. and Mrs. 65, 70, 80, 86, these numbers of seniors that are now living to that age. That is how we should bring those two together on a serious proposal of dealing with Medicare and its longevity, not the \$270 billion cuts that does not help Medicare's longevity. It helps the current plan to give tax cuts.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I think you raise again that issue, and I think it doesn't—we don't say it often enough. We are all in one family, and it is easy sometimes for people who are younger to somehow think that this is not affecting them, that what is going to happen, well, that is the Medicare program, that is for old people, but the fact is that it has been lifting the burden off the younger people and they are suddenly going to wind up with it suddenly being dropped down on them without them being aware, unless they begin paying attention.

That, I think, is our biggest job as Members of Congress is to educate people about the fact that Medicare, although it has as its clients the disabled and the senior citizen, it is also a part of the economic security of the 35 year old. And sometimes young people sort of miss that. They don't see the connection because in their lifetime they have never had to do it.

I remember when I was much younger, my grandmother and grandfather back in the 1950's did not have Medicare, and the way my father and the uncles took care of it was every Sunday when they went to my grandmother's house, they would slide a ten dollar bill under the plate. My grandmother was too proud to ever ask for money but when she picked up the dishes after lunch, she picked up 50 bucks around the table.

That is how the subsidy was done in those days, and what this is going to do is drive that same system back on every family to look at their mother, their father, their grandparents and say, how are we going to take care of them? We can't just walk away from them, and that is, I think, why this is not just a senior citizen question, but it is a family question. And I think that you bring that well when you talk about that it isn't just Mr. and Mrs. 65; it is also Mr. and Mrs. 35.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. You remind me, as I have reminded you to remind me, of my grandmother as well and the good times at that time in the 1950's

was that she could do something with \$50 or so that is left. I think if we began to look realistically of what that will mean for this time and this range of cost, we are realizing that that is not what will be possible for these working families and these individuals in this 35 year range, and we will also need to point out for any accusations that are made against this system that we do want to make work.

There is a lot of cost containment already going on in Medicare, and many of the providers are aware that we must be judicious in how we cost out the particular procedures or services. That is where we need to focus, not to scare people with the fact that it is to be ended and at the same time tell them that they need \$270 billion in cuts.

And so your point is very well taken. We could have done that in years past and managed and survived. I think now with catastrophic illnesses and just the recognition of the cost, the legitimate cost of providing care in a hospital, we realize that that would be so extreme a burden. I have heard tell that there is a possibility of families going bankrupt trying to take care of a loved one who has come upon illnesses, and certainly if there was no coverage like Medicare for that senior, what could be expected for families who are trying to make ends meet and then be faced with the needs of their loved ones, of which they would want to be able to support.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I hope that all the Members in the Congress let their constituents know they have to let the Congress know no on vouchers for Medicare. Vouchers in the Medicare system are guaranteed to be inadequate. That is what it is all about. That is how they are saving money, and people need to let their representatives know. I hope they will all call them, write them letters, tell them that they want to keep the kind of security that they presently have under the Medicare program. Thank you very much for your help.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Thank you.

□ 2215

SUPPORT HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 80, LEGISLATION CALLING FOR A CESSATION OF FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE SOUTH PACIFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] for up to 22 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, just weeks ago, French President Jacques Chirac announced that France will abandon its 1992 moratorium on nuclear testing and explode eight more nuclear bombs in the South Pacific beginning in September. Chirac said that the nuclear explosions will have no "ecological consequences," and described his decision as "irrevocable."

After detonating at least 187 nuclear bombs in the heart of the South Pacific, France's intent to resume further nuclear poisoning of the South Pacific

environment has resulted in deep outrage and alarm in the countries of the region, as well as with the world community.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support legislation I introduced recently, House Concurrent Resolution 80, which recognizes the environmental concerns of the people of Oceania and calls upon the government of France not to resume nuclear testing in French Polynesia's Moruroa and Fangataufa Atolls.

In a broad showing of bipartisan support, 15 Members of Congress have joined me as original cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 80—including the ranking member of the House International Relations Committee, the Honorable LEE HAMILTON; the chairman and ranking member of the Asia-Pacific Affairs Subcommittee, the Honorable DOUG BERUTER, and the Honorable HOWARD BERMAN; and the chairman and ranking member of the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee, the Honorable CHRIS SMITH and the Honorable TOM LANTOS.

I want to express my deepest appreciation to these gentlemen, as well as to other distinguished senior members of the House International Relations Committee—including the Honorable JIM LEACH, the Honorable GARY ACKERMAN, the Honorable JAY KIM and the Honorable DANA ROHRBACHER—for their strong support of this measure. I also want to thank members from districts touching the Pacific that have joined us as original cosponsors, including the Honorable ROBERT UNDERWOOD of Guam, the Honorable PATSY MINK and NEIL ABERCROMBIE of Hawaii, the Honorable NORMAN MINETA from California and the gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable PETER DEFAZIO. The distinguished Member from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDWARD MARKEY, must also be commended for his leadership in the field of nuclear nonproliferation and support of legislation opposing France's nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, like a wild boar on the ocean waves, or a "bulldozer" as described by his mentor, the late President Georges Pompidou, or a mad aberration of 21st century thought, French President Chirac's so-called decision and insistent denial of consequence is what novelist Bernard Clavel called the Shame of France.

Mr. Speaker, we all know nuclear bombs have only one purpose. They were created to destroy every living plant and animal, including humans. The result is they annihilate everything. The people of France know this. The government of France knows this. Mr. Chirac knows this. We all know why France explodes its bombs in French Polynesia and not in France. The leaders of France do not want to subject their homeland to this danger, if they have a choice.

Historically, the people of the Pacific have had little choice. Nuclear nations,

including France and the United States, have consistently deemed Pacific islanders and their way of life expendable. For example, in 1954, on Bikini atoll the United States detonated the "bravo shot," a 15-megaton thermonuclear bomb over a thousand times more powerful than the nuclear bomb dropped on Hiroshima, Japan. Marshall islanders residing on nearby Rongelap and Utirik atolls justifiably believe they were used as "guinea pigs" and test subjects for United States nuclear radiation experiments conducted during this period.

After almost three decades of French nuclear testing in the South Pacific, French Polynesia's Moruroa atoll has been described by scientists as a "Swiss cheese of fractured rock." Moruroa and its sister French test site at Fangataufa are water-permeable coral atolls on basalt, now contaminated in the worst way similar to the crisis at the Chernobyl nuclear plant. Leakage of radioactive waste from the underground test sites to the surrounding waters and air has been predicted, and is inevitable. Epidemic-like outbreaks in surrounding communities have already resulted, but symptoms including damage to the nervous system, paralysis, impaired vision, birth abnormalities, and increased cancer rates among Tahitians, in particular. It is no wonder that the French Government has kept medical records at Moruroa a top secret and has not even permitted long-term follow-up study of the local indigenous or Tahitian workers who were subjected radioactive contamination.

Yet, Chirac, like so many other leaders of nuclear nations, insists that nuclear tests are harmless to the environment. As reported by the National Resources Defense Council in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, "the five declared nuclear powers have acknowledged conducting a total of 2,036 nuclear tests since 1945." of this total, 942 of the tests have been conducted within the continental United States, 710 in Russia/Kazakhstan, and 306 atomic explosions conducted by the United States, Great Britain, and France on Pacific islands and atolls.

It is interesting to note that although France has detonated over 200 nuclear bombs in the past 35 years, not one of these bombs has been exploded on, above, or beneath French soil. Mr. Speaker, in the truest form of colonial aggression, France, instead, has exploded almost all of its nuclear bombs in its South Pacific colony, after being driven out of Algeria, a former possession also used a nuclear testing dump.

France currently has the world's third largest stockpile of nuclear bombs in the world. But Chirac told reporters on the eve of his first presidential trip abroad that his decision to explode eight more nuclear bombs in the South Pacific was crucial to ensure the reliability and security of the country's nuclear weaponry. I made this decision, Mr. Chirac states, "because I

considered it necessary in the higher interest of our nation."

Whatever happened to the higher interest of some 170 non-nuclear nations?

I say to the military establishment of France and to the President of France, if exploding eight more nuclear bombs is so crucial to ensure the security of your country's weaponry, explode your eight nuclear bombs under the Arc de Triomphe and along the rural and farm areas of France, and see if the citizens of France will support you in the higher interest of your nation.

Mr. Speaker, the peoples of the North and South Pacific want nothing to do with nuclear weapons. They know firsthand the horrors of nuclear testing and have agreed amongst themselves to keep their part of the planet nuclear-free. Isn't it ironic that it is among these people that France is about to explode 8 nuclear bombs—one nuclear bomb explosion a month—with each detonation up to 10 times more powerful than the nuclear bomb that was dropped on the city of Hiroshima 50 years ago? Incidentally, this is not happening by the choice of the 28 million men, women, and children of a European world power playing the role of colonial master to the detriment of peaceful citizens on the other side of the world.

When is enough, enough? Two hundred-plus nuclear explosions, with almost all in South Pacific waters, apparently is not enough for France. Mr. Chirac wants eight more. So what about the rest of the world? I suspect that the military establishments of every nuclear power want to perform more tests to ensure the reliability of their nuclear arsenals. But the fact is, all of the nuclear powers, except China, have given up this benefit and stopped testing programs in the interest of making the world a safer place to live.

Government after government after government, in a firestorm of international outrage, have spoken out in opposition to France's resumption of nuclear testing. Demonstrations involving tens of thousands of protestors have taken place in French Polynesia, and around the globe. The United States, Russia, Japan, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Switzerland, Indonesia, Malaysia, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Mexico, Australia, New Zealand, Fiji, and the 12 other island nations which comprise the South Pacific forum have condemned France's decision to resume nuclear testing, noting that it would be a major setback to relations between France and the international community.

Two months ago, the United States, France, and the major nuclear powers promised over 170 non-nuclear nations that the nuclear powers would exercise utmost restraint with regard to nuclear testing and would work toward a comprehensive test ban treaty. Despite reservations, these commitments were

accepted at face value by the non-nuclear nations, which make up the vast majority of the countries of the world, and it was only with the support of the non-nuclear nations that permanent extension of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty was gained.

Weeks later, the French Government now sends the message that in the name of national interest, it is more than willing to undermine the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and impede good faith negotiation of a genuine comprehensive test ban treaty.

Not only does France send the message that world peace takes a back seat to national security paranoia, but it now sends the message that, as a nuclear nation, it shamelessly, shamelessly, Mr. Speaker, deems expendable the welfare and the fragile marine environment of 28 million men, women, and children living in the Pacific region.

Nuclear bomb explosions constitute the ultimate rape of a people. The welfare of the South Pacific's 28 million people should not be the sacrifice paid in the name of France's paranoia and hypocritical policy concerning nuclear deterrence. For France to disregard its moral responsibility to the non-nuclear nations and world community is the epitome of actions taken by a colonial master against its subjects, and it is about the ugliest form of colonial aggression taken by France against the indigenous people of Tahiti.

"It is regrettable that France has given in to out-dated arguments," respected French oceanographer Jacques Cousteau said. "Great wars are of the past. The struggle for peace is carried out first and foremost through education and the restoration of morality. Today's wisdom makes it necessary to outlaw atomic arms."

Cousteau's sentiments were echoed by former French President Francois Mitterand, who in condemning Chirac's testing decision, recently stated, "The time has come to put an end to the nuclear armaments race." Cousteau and Mitterand's statements reflect how controversial Chirac's nuclear policy is domestically in France. French public opinion polls show an overwhelming 70 percent, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to resumed nuclear testing.

Today, on trial of broken treaties and irrevocable decisions, with the United States still in flux on nuclear testing while promising to negotiate a comprehensive test ban treaty, the question now on the table for non-nuclear nations is: "Do we depend on nuclear nations to restore morality through treaties and bans, or do we call on the good people of France and the United States to hold their governments accountable for violations of international disarmament agreements?"

"If men were angels," James Madison wrote in *The Federalist Papers*, "No government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on govern-

ment would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the Government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself."

In light of Mr. Chirac's irrevocable decision, and in consideration of opinion polls documenting Jacques Cousteau as the leading popular figure in France, I would again urge Mr. Cousteau to lead the good people of France in the fight to oblige its government to control itself. As the world's preeminent guardian of the environment, his place in history dictates that Mr. Cousteau play a greater and more forceful role in preventing this travesty against the health and welfare of the 28 million men, women and children who live in the Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, this planet has already been ravaged by more than 2,036 nuclear bomb explosions. It is time that we stop the madness. I would urge most strongly that Paris reconsider its decision to resume nuclear bomb explosions in the South Pacific and would urge the citizens of the world community to take up the fight in holding nuclear nations accountable for the violent rape and utter destruction of non-nuclear nations, peoples, and the environment—until angels govern men.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, I would invite our colleagues to cosponsor House Concurrent Resolution 80 and join us in sending a strong message of support for the peoples of Oceania and in opposition to France's resumption of nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues and my fellow Americans, a photo shot of a nuclear bomb explosion that was detonated on the Moruroa Atoll in French Polynesia.

Mr. Speaker, the photo of the nuclear explosion—I must confess—is a very pretty one—but very, very deadly. You see Mr. Speaker, modern warfare is no longer something where there is honor to fight hand-to-hand combat—at least combatants meet on the field of battle to fight.

You see Mr. Speaker, nuclear bomb explosions don't just kill human beings—nuclear bomb explosions do not ask for permission to kill just soldiers and sailors—Mr. Speaker, nuclear bomb explosions literally vaporize human beings—you're not even going to have to find many bodies even to give the deceased decent burials.

Mr. Speaker, this photo is an example of what nuclear explosions are like when the Government of France will resume exploding eight more nuclear bombs beginning in early September of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am making this appeal to my colleagues in the House and to all my fellow Americans who love to sail in the Pacific—who can appreciate the concerns of some 28 million men, women, and children who live in the Pacific—to write and call the officials of the French Government that explod-

ing eight nuclear bombs in the coming months is bad policy, and President Chirac should wake up, and he should come to his senses and stop this madness—stop this insane and inhuman practice of exploding nuclear bombs not only against the fragile environment of the Pacific Ocean but anywhere else in the world.

What a sad commentary on France's upcoming celebration of Bastille Day on July 14—how absurd and stupid can President Chirac be, Mr. Speaker, when 70 percent of the people of France are against nuclear explosions—and yet the President of France has totally disregarded this concern. Let's stop this madness, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following article from the July 12, 1995 Washington Post:

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 1995]

WHY NOT ATOM TESTS IN FRANCE?

France's unwise decision to resume nuclear testing was an invitation to the kind of protests and denunciations being generated by Greenpeace's skillful demonstration of political theater. But even before Greenpeace set sail for the test site, several Pacific countries had vehemently objected to France's intention of carrying out the explosions at a Pacific atoll. The most cutting comment came from Japan's prime minister, Tomiichi Murayama. At a recent meeting in Cannes the newly installed president of France, Jacques Chirac, confidently explained to him that the tests will be entirely safe. If they are so safe, Mr. Murayama replied, why doesn't Mr. Chirac hold them in France?

The dangers of these tests to France are, in fact, substantial. The chances of physical damage and the release of radioactivity to the atmosphere are very low. But the symbolism of a European country holding its tests on the other side of the earth, in a vestige of its former colonial empire, is proving immensely damaging to France's standing among its friends in Asia.

France says that it needs to carry out the tests to ensure the reliability of its nuclear weapons. Those weapons, like most of the American nuclear armory, were developed to counter a threat from a power that has collapsed. The great threat now, to France and the rest of the world, is the possibility of nuclear bombs in the hands of reckless and aggressive governments elsewhere. North Korea, Iraq and Iran head the list of possibilities. The tests will strengthen France's international prestige, in the view of many French politicians, by reminding others that it possesses these weapons. But in less stable and non-democratic countries, there are many dictators, juntas and nationalist fanatics who similarly aspire to improve their countries' standing in the world.

The international effort to discourage the spread of nuclear weapons is a fragile enterprise, depending mainly on trust and goodwill. But over the past half-century, the effort has been remarkably and unexpectedly successful. It depends on a bargain in which the nuclear powers agree to move toward nuclear disarmament at some indefinite point in the future, and in the meantime to avoid flaunting these portentous weapons or to use them merely for displays of one-upmanship. That's the understanding that France is now undermining. The harassment by Greenpeace is the least of the costs that these misguided tests will exact.

□ 2230

CONSTITUENT FEEDBACK
REGARDING THE NEW CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the opportunity to have this hour this evening to have a discussion with our constituents and, really, Americans all across this country. I have three other colleagues who are here this evening and we are all going to be talking during the course of this hour, whatever time of the hour that we take up this evening. We wanted to let the American public know what types of things that we have been hearing as we have been back in our district.

For example, we spent about the last 10 days prior to this Monday in districts all over this country talking with regular people in our districts to see what they thought about what we were doing, what suggestions that they had, and what kind of modifications they would like to see made in this, the people's House.

I happen to be from the first district of Ohio, which in essence is the city of Cincinnati and some of the western suburbs. ROB PORTMAN is in the eastern part of the city in some of the eastern areas; I have got basically the west side of town.

I ran, I am a freshman; I was just elected this past November. The people really spoke overwhelmingly, I think, all across this country and said they were not particularly pleased with what had been going on here in Congress. They wanted a change.

Mr. Speaker, I talked to a lot of people before I ran for Congress last year to find out and I asked a basic question. I said, "If you were in Congress, what would you do?" And there were other Members who were running all over the country and they asked basically the same question and we all talked last year and we wrote down a document and we all signed our names to it, telling the American public if we had a majority of Republicans in Congress, what we would do. We told them up front what we would do.

And that is what we have been about for the past 6 months, is delivering on what we told the American public we would do if we had a majority. We do have a Republican majority here in the House for the first time in my lifetime. I am 42 years old. I was born in 1953. And the last time there was a majority of Republicans here in the House was in 1952.

I think the main thing we were told that we heard over and over again is we have got to balance this budget. I heard that over and over again. And what people said. They said, balance the budget; not by raising taxes, but by cutting spending and that is what we are trying to do.

And I heard, and I want to be real clear about one thing in particular, be-

cause I heard some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the liberal Democrats, they talk about one issue in particular and that is Medicare. And they keep saying that we have some kind of plan to cut Medicare. That is absolutely not true. I want to make very clear tonight we have absolutely no intention of cutting Medicare.

In fact, our projections are that we are going to increase Medicare spending from \$4,800 a year to \$6,700 per year per Medicare recipient. So there is absolutely no plan to cut Medicare.

However, the President's own people, his own trustees council, indicated that if we do not do something about Medicare, it is going to go broke by the year 2002. We want to save Medicare. We want to preserve Medicare, and we are absolutely committed to doing that.

So the scare tactics that quite frankly we have heard were the liberal Democrats here in Congress, not all Democrats, but the liberal Democrats in Congress are trying to scare senior citizens all over the country by saying that we have a plan to cut Medicare.

I want to make clear that we have absolutely no plan to cut Medicare, but we do need to balance this budget and we are going to do it by cutting spending, not by raising taxes.

And one of the reasons I think we absolutely should not raise taxes is because the American family is just overburdened with taxes. Taxes are too high in this country.

Around the time when I was born, around 1950, the average American family paid 5 percent of what they made to Washington in the form of Federal taxes. Now it is 25 percent. So the average American family's taxes to Washington have gone up from 5 percent to 25 percent in the last 40 years. That does not count the State taxes and city taxes. We have got to do something about that.

Mr. MANZULLO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHABOT. I certainly will. At this time, I will recognize three of my esteemed colleagues in Washington tonight. First of all, I would like to introduce the gentleman from Illinois, DON MANZULLO.

Next we have WALTER JONES who is from the great State of North Carolina and I have a particular fondness for the State of North Carolina, because my mother was born and raised in Charlotte, North Carolina.

We also have, tonight, RON LEWIS who is from the State over the Ohio River from my State, the State of Kentucky. At this time I yield to my good friend from Illinois, DON MANZULLO.

Mr. MANZULLO. Thank you, STEVE. When you talk about the tax burden growing from approximately 5 percent to 25 percent in Federal taxes, there is a chapter in the official U.S. budget called the generational forecasts. That states, because of the nearly \$5 trillion national debt, that if dramatic changes are not made in the manner in which

this country spends money, that by the time every child born after 1992 goes into the work force, he or she will be paying in local, State, and Federal taxes, between 84 and 94 percent of his or her income in taxes. This is astonishing. It is absolutely unbelievable.

I mean, this is a part of the official budget. I mean the Democrats, you know, CBO prepared this. The Republicans, everybody looks at it and says, this is incredible.

We have to do something about it. And yet, you know STEVE, there are 10,000 programs in this country—10,000 that are run. Every program has a constituency and every program has its own special interests.

And one of the things that I noticed is that whenever I go to cut a program, some Federal bureaucrat in Washington calls somebody back in the district that I represent, gets them on the telephone, and the conversation goes something like this: "Congressman MANZULLO?" "Yes, ma'am." "This is so-and-so." "Uh-huh?" "I live in the district you represent." "Yes, ma'am?" "I am a Republican and a Conservative and I voted for you." "Yes, ma'am." "And I really believe that we have got to cut this budget because taxes are too high, the American people are tired of all the spending."

And then comes the long, pregnant pause followed by the word "but," which is underlined, italicized and emboldened with the comma behind it followed by three ellipses. "But . . . let me tell you about this program which is an investment."

And it goes on and on and the American people realize that every single one of these programs, every single one, I will give an example. I sit on the Committee on International Relations with you, STEVE, and we found out that the American taxpayer pays \$30 million a year to bring over 6,000 high school students for the former Soviet Union on a cultural exchange.

You think about that. There are about 19 different agencies in this Government spending about \$2.5 billion on all these agencies. In fact, there are universities in this country that are getting incredibly large grants for the purpose of bringing over journalists from Latvia and Estonia and teaching them about fairness in journalism. I wonder who their professors would be. But all this at a cost of billions of dollars.

And I moved, and you voted for that measure in the Committee on International Relations, I said, "Let us do away with these Fulbright scholarships. Let us do away with all of them. Most of the programs are good. Bringing over these Russian kids, that is a fantastic program, but we cannot afford it."

So we lost in committee and came back and came up with an amendment and ended up being able to knock off \$20 million in spending. I was editorialized saying "Well, we have got to cut

spending, but Mr. MANZULLO who is involved in trade issues should understand the necessity of keeping these cultural exchanges."

Everybody says cut somebody else's program, except mine. And I bet you gentleman have had the same things happen.

Mr. CHABOT. That is right. And just to clarify as far as voting for the measure, we voted for the measure to cut, not to fund the program.

Mr. MANZULLO. That is right. We moved to cut it.

Mr. CHABOT. Now, we would like to turn to the gentleman from North Carolina, WALTER JONES. What have you been hearing in your district back home and what do you think the people are thinking now?

Mr. JONES. STEVE, when I have been home, I have seen people on a daily basis speaking to groups and senior citizens in the 19 counties that I have the privilege to serve. I can tell you that what we are doing in the new Congress is helping to rebuild the trust that the citizens and the voters have lost because the past Congresses were not listening to them.

I can honestly tell you I get so upset when I am on the floor, as a member of the theme team, to hear the other side, particularly the liberals, trying to scare the senior citizens. And as I said, and everyone has been saying since we started talking about the Medicare trust fund, that we have no other alternative. We want to protect and save and guarantee for the future needs of our senior citizens.

I do not know how in the world they can continue to say that when you go from, 1995, from roughly \$4,700 to the year 2002 to \$6,300 that that is a cut. But I can honestly tell you that back home the senior citizens that I have had a chance to talk to really understand what we are trying to do and they support us.

So I can say that in the 6 months that we have been here I have been home every weekend but one. Every time I went home I was having the opportunity to meet and to speak with people. And I can tell you, frankly, that as long as we stay focused, we keep trying to balance the budget by the year 2002, then I think every day that we are here in the Congress as a new majority we are helping to rebuild the trust that has been lost.

Mr. CHABOT. I think those are excellent, excellent points, WALTER. And something in particular that you said about Medicare and the fact that the liberal Democrats up here in the Congress have been scaring senior citizens about alleged cuts that are nonexistent, but they keep talking about them.

Senator PAUL SIMON, who is a Democrat, said that the greatest threat to Social Security and Medicare is this huge debt. The fact that the budget is not balanced. That is the greatest threat to both Social Security and Medicare.

That is why it is absolutely critical that we balance this budget. We have

got an almost \$5 trillion debt that we have got to finally balance. And that is what we are about.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHABOT. I will certainly yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, RON LEWIS.

□ 2245

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. I would like to just emphasize the scariest thing about the Medicare situation is that the liberals seem to want to just put their head in the sand and say there is no problem and trying to scare senior citizens by saying that we are going to cut Medicare, that we are going to cut it and give the money to the wealthy, which is the furthest thing from the truth.

The truth is, as has been mentioned here tonight, that the President's advisory group, the task force on Medicare, has said that Medicare will be broke by the year 2002 and that next year it will start to go on that downward slide, that downward path to bankruptcy.

So we are being responsible and we are going to save Medicare. We are going to protect it. We are going to make sure that it is going to be secure and that we are going to make it strong for the senior citizens that are coming on in the years ahead.

As I said, the scariest thing is for our friends on the other side of the aisle, the liberals, talking about the conservatives, there are those that really know that we have to do something and are involved in that. But some of the things that we heard tonight, that Medicare is not in trouble, that we can go on the way that we are going and there will be no problem, the fact is, it is going broke. And we are responsible and we are going to do something about it. And even the President, the other night, after denying it for quite some time, in his budget plan said that we needed to do something about Medicare.

I am glad to see that he is willing to admit it now. If we can work together, then we can save it, we can protect it and we can strengthen it and provide for our senior citizens.

Again, there are no cuts. We are going to be moving from \$4,800 to \$6,700 per beneficiary by the year 2002. That is an increase in anyone's book. We have to slow the growth.

Same thing with the budget. We are going to be spending more money over the next 7 years. We are slowing the growth so that we can reach a balanced budget and have a strong financial future for our children and our grandchildren.

It is important. We have to start now. We cannot wait 7 years. We have to do it now. And the American people, the people in my district, I have 23 counties, and I have been through all those counties. And the people are telling me, you are doing the right thing. Keep on going; do not let up. We want to see a balanced budget; we want to see a strong future for our children.

And I just wanted to mention something else. We keep hearing that we, the Republicans, are trying to take money from the poor and give to the wealthy. We are giving, we are trying to give to the family a \$500 tax credit, and we are trying to provide a capital gains tax cut so that we can infuse into the economy a tremendous amount of money that is going to help everyone and is going to allow for job growth. It is going to allow for a stronger economy. It is going to allow actually for more money to be coming into our Federal Treasury. It will help us balance the budget.

Mr. JONES. I would like to add to the point the gentleman made. The election last year, the people said we want less government, less taxes, and they realize, as you just stated and the gentleman from Illinois, that we must balance the budget.

The average family in America today will spend more on paying taxes than that same average family will spend on clothing, housing or food. And yet, the other side keeps saying that the Republican Party only cares about the rich. Again, I want to make this clear, we care about the working man and woman in this country, and that is why I think every day we are helping to rebuild that confidence that I mentioned earlier.

One other point that the gentleman from Kentucky made reference to, the Medicare board of trustees, which includes three of Clinton's own cabinet members, released a report last April stating that the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund, part A, will be bankrupt in seven years. If that is allowed to happen, more than 37 million Americans will lose their hospital insurance. That is why this Republican majority is working so hard to do what we can to ensure and to protect the Medicare Trust Fund.

And we will do it, because the American people sincerely believe what we are saying and they want to see us protect the Medicare Trust Fund. And I believe that we have got the support of the majority of the senior citizens.

Mr. MANZULLO. When I was a young college student, age 20, thinner, dark hair, I worked for the House of Representatives, for the Member that represented the district in which I have lived my entire life. I was 20 years old. That was at the time that Medicare passed. It was 1965, I believe.

And the original cost of Medicare for 17 million people was, I think, \$2.5 billion. And the number of recipients has doubled today, but it now costs \$140 billion a year for Medicare. And the estimates as to what Medicare would cost in 1993, the estimates that were made back in 1965, I think it was estimated to cost about \$9 billion. And it costs in excess of \$100 billion. So these projections are just way totally off.

It is due to many things. People are living longer. The cost of medical technology has risen and things of that nature.

And as I travel my district, I do not know about the district that you gentlemen represent, I start over on the river, Mississippi River and represent a county by the name of Jo Daviess County, which is heavy in tourism, number one in hay production in the state. Next county is Stephenson County where the Freeport doctrine was debated, the Lincoln-Douglas debates. That county has the highest milk production and a third of all the dairy cattle in the State of Illinois live in Stephenson County and they eat all the hay that comes from Jo Daviess County.

Next to that county is Winnebago County that has over 1,000 factories, incredible, over 1,000 factories. This is the county that led the nation in unemployment in 1980. We lost 100 factories and 10,000 highly skilled jobs, but it is now the tool and die center of the world, fastener center of the automotive industry.

Below that is Ogle County, a little factory there, Eaton Corporation, makes most of the cruise controls for Chrysler Corporation. And it is just a beautiful town, a beautiful county. In fact, we live outside of Egan, a town of 42 people where the Leaf River converges into the Rock River, the Leaf River Valley converges into the Rock River Valley and that makes part of the Mississippi Basin.

Then you go eastward and Boone County picks up Belvidere where Chrysler makes the Neon and then to the east of that is McHenry County, which is the fastest growing county in the state. It has to be one of the most diversified congressional districts in the area, probably the United States. It is one of the leading export districts.

As I travel that district, I just love to walk the districts. You walk the areas and sometimes you stop at somebody's house and knock on the door and go in there and exchange howdies or you go into the business district.

Everybody is saying the same thing: Continue the revolution that began in November of 1994. Do not get downtrodden. Do not get disheartened because sometimes the press will come after you because you are trying to balance the budget.

Everybody has this sense of awesome corporate responsibility that we have got to do something and something big in order to save this nation.

I had the opportunity, as many of you did, to speak at the Fourth of July events. I spoke at the prayer breakfast in Rockford, incredible driving rain storm. It was unbelievable. It was buckets of water were pouring down. And people were out there in the gazebos and with the umbrellas. Fortunately, there was not any lightning going on.

I could tell just looking at the people, look at the people, especially in mid-America, they are standing there with their little kids, and they are turning out in the rain to hear their Congressman talk about why this country is great.

I quoted James Flexnor who had written a book called *The Indispensable Washington*, the life of George Washington. In fact, it served as the text for the three series that were made about the life of Washington. And he said something very remarkable.

He said, for the first time in history people gathered together and set about to prove that people could rule themselves. It had never been done before. Never before in American history had that been done. And now 219 years have come and gone since the scribes got together and penned their names to that Declaration of Independence.

You know, it takes speaking at the Fourth of July celebration to make you realize how magnificent the American people are and how willing they are to give and how willing they are to go along with the programs and how willing they are to say, we are willing to go the extra mile in order to balance the budget because it is worth it for the kids in this country.

Mr. CHABOT. From what I am hearing here from all three of my colleagues, it sounds like the people, even though our districts may be a little bit different, they are all four in different states, the people are I think essentially giving us the same message. They are saying the same thing; that is, to move forward with what you are doing, do not stop. Do not look back, just keep moving forward.

I think the people of this country are ahead of this Congress. I think we need to keep following that direction. That direction is to balance this budget, again, not by raising taxes but by cutting spending. That is what we have to keep doing.

Again, when you look at the taxes, the average American family is sending 25 percent of their taxes here to Washington. But when you add it to the State and local and all those taxes, it is 40 to 50 percent of the average American family's money goes in taxes. And that means the lifestyle that they have and that their children have is not as good as it should be. You have many fathers and many mothers that are working. They want to give the best life, the best education to their kids they possibly can. But they have to give too much of their money to the Government. That is what we have to turn around.

The good thing is, we can reduce the level of taxes, we can do that and we can still balance this budget. And the liberal folks on the other side of the aisle said it could not be done. They said that, you cannot balance the budget and cut taxes at the same time.

We have proven that it can be done. We passed a budget resolution just a couple of weeks ago which balances the budget by the year 2002 and cuts taxes. And most of those tax cuts go to middle-class Americans. They do not go to the wealthiest people in this country, although we have heard it time and time again, from the liberals on the other side of the aisle. Seventy-five

percent of the tax cuts go to people who make less than \$75,000 a year.

I think that is important, because that is really what we are about. We are for relieving the overburdened taxpayers of this country and balancing this budget so their children can have a better standard of living than they did. I think that is what all Americans want.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. As you said, with local, State and Federal taxes, the average family is paying 40 percent of their income into taxes. And that can increase, with the hidden taxes, up to around 50 percent or more. Thirty-eight percent of our gross domestic product is consumed by government. And the one common theme that I heard all through my campaign and through my visits back home to the district has always been, government is too big.

The American people feel the burden of too much government, too many taxes. And if we would have seen the Clinton health care plan go through last year, it would have pushed us over 50 percent of our gross domestic product that would be used by the Government. That would have put us into the socialism category.

We have to start moving in the other direction. We have to reduce the taxes, give the families their money back. So many times money that comes into the Federal Treasury is talked about as the Government's money.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. It is the family's money, it is the worker out there that produces products, that puts in the time and the hours. It is their money, and we need to give it back to them.

I think sometimes the liberals think that when we give tax breaks, tax cuts, that that money just stops somewhere out there, that it never goes any further. In fact, it goes out into the economy and it is spent and it is used and it produces, and it allows the money to grow. We have seen that many times before.

President Kennedy, in his administration, he cut taxes and we saw an increase in revenue into the Federal Treasury. Ronald Reagan, he cut taxes; we saw an increase in the Federal Treasury. There are many examples in State government where taxes were cut and there would be an increase in the Federal Treasury. Because people use that money to better their own circumstances a lot better than some bureaucrat here in Washington can do.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield for just moment.

Mr. CHABOT. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. You touched on a point that I wanted to pick up on. One theme throughout this campaign, when I was campaigning for Congress, people were telling me, we are working longer and harder and taking home less, and that is exactly what the gentleman said.

The American family and retired people who have worked, are working

hard and have worked most of their lives and want to save and try to invest, under the liberal Democrats of the past as the majority party, and they have penalized people for saving and investing. Again, the average working man in my district feels that he and she are finally being represented in the Congress by people that will listen to them.

That is something that the gentleman from Ohio said a while ago. We finally have a Congress that is listening to the people, and that is going to make the difference in the success of this new 104th Congress, because again, as we go home, we continue to hear it. People will stop me in a grocery store and say, WALTER, or Mr. JONES, or Congressman, we like what you are doing. These are the people that work hard every day trying to do for their families and finally, they are getting some relief from Washington, thanks to the new majority.

Mr. CHABOT. That is right. I think again, something that the gentleman touched on that is important, is that we are working for all Americans, whether they be poor, whether they be middle class, whether they be better off, and I think what we have to be careful of is that many of the liberals are trying to divide people, to put them into certain categories. That is why we keep hearing over and over again, the Republicans just want to cut spending on poor people or seniors or whatever to give tax cuts to the wealthy.

That is just not true. As we said before, the tax cuts, 75 percent of the tax cuts go to middle-class people. We should not be dividing Americans, we should not be scaring senior citizens. All Americans are going to have to work together in order to solve the problems that we have.

Mr. MANZULLO. One of the things that really amazes me as I hear our colleagues of the liberal persuasion say well, we cannot afford a tax cut. You stop to think about it, to whom does the money belong? The money does not belong to the government, the money belongs to the people. It is the people's money, and the tribute that they pay to support some basic government services should be in the area where they can still have enough to afford to keep their family.

Let me give you an example on this capital gains. A good friend of mine several years ago, they bought a house in the suburban Chicago area. The price of houses went up and they made some money on their house.

Being wise and frugal, they moved to an other city. Not that it was wise and frugal to move from a Chicago suburb, but they were leaving the area. So being wise and frugal, they invested in a house; they downsized to a house that they could afford. They ended up paying capital gains taxes on that money, even though during the period of time they owned it, inflation crept up, which was not figured into capital gains; there is no indexing going on. It

took away more and more of their money, and now they sold their home again because they are having a very difficult time finding work in the Rockford area and are moving elsewhere. Now they have to pay capital gains tax again on this house that they bought just a few years ago.

These people have no money. They are living, they are living on borrowed capital. By selling their home, they are trying to get a fresh start, and when people tell me that capital gains tax are for the rich, that is a bunch of nonsense. Because it is hard working people in this country that are the beneficiaries of an appreciation of value in their homes, and they are trying to move somewhere or downsize to another house and they get penalized because of that. This is the only nation in the world that has a confiscatory high capital gains tax. It does not make sense, and it is not the wealthy that are being hit.

There is something else, the way the Democrats figure the rich. They are saying well, the rich will gain so many dollars in taxes. Let me give you an example. Let us say a person is of substantial means. That person has a building that he or she wants to sell, but under the present capital gains tax structure, he may have to pay \$50,000 in capital gains. I mean it just does not make sense to sell the building. I mean we are talking about a purchase of, maybe the sale of a \$200,000 building. So by cutting the capital gains tax in half, he or she might want to sell it.

Then the Democrats say well, you just gave a \$25,000 break to the rich. That person wasn't going to sell the property in the first place, because the capital gains tax was too high. I would rather have \$25,000 now come into the Treasury than money that may come somewhere down the line. What is that person going to do? He turns over that property, gives \$25,000 as opposed to \$50,000, which he may never give, to the Government for taxes. Whenever a building is sold, generally another one is built, because he or she is going to go out and build another building.

The person that comes in and buys that building, do you know what they are going to do? They are going to remodel it. I mean this incredible type of solid growth takes place.

If you analyze the capital gains tax structure since the 1950s, there are about five epochs in there where whenever capital gains taxes were reasonable, that the economy grew; I am sorry, that the actual amount of money that came into the Treasury increased each year by between 5 and 7 percent. Since 1986 when capital gains taxes were increased, each year the Federal Treasury sees 2.1 percent less dollars coming in in capital gains taxes.

So if you want less money to come in to the Treasury, raise capital gains taxes. If you want more actual dollars coming in, decrease capital gains taxes. It is so simple. It is the biggest

boost; I mean this is real growth. This is not make believe government jobs, this is not Americorps, this is not some government give-away, this is actual sales taking place.

Do you know what? Just look at it. A building sells, you have a realtor involved, you have a title company involved, you have an attorney involved. Even down to the guy that sells flowers, because a lot of people do not realize that whenever there is a real estate transaction, at least back home, it is customary to send flowers to the new buyer of a building or of a home. It is a mushrooming that takes place in the economy, because the taxes are cut.

Mr. CHABOT. Speaking of taxes, I am sure, as I am sure all three of you gentlemen have had town meetings, back in my community I have spoken before a lot of different groups, and one thing that comes up time and time again is how confusing it is when people have to fill out their income taxes, how really the whole system is kind of a mess and needs to be changed.

To kind of give the folks that may be watching C-SPAN a heads-up on what is happening here in Congress, there seems to be two schools of thought that I see up here right now about how we ought to change the tax law. One has been proposed by Congressman DICK ARMEY who is the majority leader here. Most people have probably heard of it, and that is the flat tax. Congressman ARMEY has suggested that rather than have a whole lot of deductions and the confusing tax forms that we all have to fill out every year, that we just have a straight flat tax of 17 percent or thereabouts, which would certainly simplify the system.

Many, many people in my district think that is a good idea. In fact, back in Cincinnati, we have two principal newspapers, the Cincinnati Enquirer and the Cincinnati Post. There are some others, but those are the two major papers. The Cincinnati Enquirer a while back had people give their opinions about the flat tax, and it was overwhelming that people basically liked the idea that they could fill out their tax on basically a postcard and send it in.

The other concept is what Congressman BILL ARCHER, who is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is pushing, and that is to basically eliminate the IRS altogether, eliminate income taxes altogether and substitute some sort of consumption tax, like a sales tax. So no income taxes at all; a sales tax in its place.

Both of those ideas, it may be some years as we deal with these two issues, but I have a feeling that there is going to be a momentum built up here in the Congress to support one plan or the other. So those that might be watching this at home now, I would like them to really follow these issues and be thinking about this in talking with their Member of Congress to let them know what they think about these plans. I think both plans are very interesting. I

think both would be better than what we have now. But I can't really predict which one is going to win out.

□ 2310

Mr. JONES. If I could ask the gentleman, do you think that this true tax reform, whether it is the flat tax or consumption tax, would even be discussed in the U.S. House of Representatives if it were not for the Republican majority?

Mr. CHABOT. That is an excellent question. I do not think there is any way that we would be seriously considering this at all. Perhaps people might talk secretly in the hallways about it in the old days, but we certainly would not be talking about it on the floor of Congress.

Just think of that concept, eliminating the IRS, income taxes, altogether, and substituting something else that would be much more simple, many would argue fair, or really the chance of having a flat tax. The fact that we are talking about these things now, I think, is pretty unprecedented in this House. I think it is very encouraging, because I think the system that we have got now is just a mess.

Just think of the number of hours that the average American spends filling out their tax forms and sweating about it or paying somebody else, whether it be H&R Block or whatever, paying somebody else to do them for them. It is just a mess and something we are going to have to change.

We are all going to have to give a lot of thought to this and talk to the people back home to see what they think is the best plan, but I think we do really need to change what we have got now.

Mr. JONES. I can honestly say that it is a hot topic back in my district and has been for the last 6 months. You might also find this of interest. I have had at least two CPA's to tell me that they would like very much to see a much simpler and fairer system. We do have a great deal of support throughout this country in my opinion.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. I just wanted to say, it is a new day when this Congress is talking about tax cuts, talking about tax reform. When we look back over the history of this Congress for the last 40 years, it has been tax-and-spend and big growth in government.

I just want to go back for a second and go back to the capital gains tax and give an example. I talked to a farmer that was really thrilled about the possibility of a capital gains tax cut because he told me—and this, if the liberals want to call him rich, I do not think he would agree with them—because he told me he would like to sell his farm. He is an elderly gentleman. He wants to retire.

He would like to sell his farm and retire, but if he sells his farm, by the time he pays the taxes, the capital gains tax, and by the time he pays the debt on it, then he has nothing. This is

not my idea of a wealthy person. To hear the rhetoric from the other side about tax breaks for the wealthy, when I am in my district, I am seeing people that need tax breaks.

Mr. MANZULLO. Do you know how many people earn about \$100,000 in this country? Two percent. It is 2 percent. That is the national figure that was calculated for the district that I represent. Somehow I hear all this rhetoric, as you say, talking about the wealthy. We are talking about people mainly earning under \$75,000 a year.

It is a lot more expensive here on the East Coast than it is back where I live in northern Illinois. Out here a house is double the amount, and it presumes that both husband and wife have to work in order to pay the mortgage on a house.

When I go to town meetings, we have like open houses. We let the newspaper know that from 7 to 10 on an evening, that Congressman MANZULLO is going to have an open house and you can stop by. We will run anywhere from 150 to 200 people who will stop by the office, have cookies and coffee, and sit there and discuss the issues. Those that have particular problems can meet with our legislative aides in private rooms there.

One of the things that I like to do whenever I am with these groups, I say, let me ask you a question here: How many of you live in a household where both you and your spouse work? There is about half to 60 percent who raise their hands.

I said, do you realize that one of you is working solely to pay taxes? Just one of you. One of you is working just to pay taxes. Every day, every year, the Tax Freedom Day just gets moved back and back and back and back. I just wonder, how long can a nation endure, how long can this republic be free when the tax burden continues to grow and grow and grow and grow?

I shudder to think about that. I think what we talked about earlier, about the tax burden, about these babies now that have a guaranteed tax rate of between 84 and 94 percent.

We had a vote here on the floor a couple of days ago. I cannot remember exactly what it was but somebody said, well, we owe it to such and such to fund this program. I said, "We owe it to the children of this country not to fund this program and to cut back on the spending."

They said, "Well, we had a contract with such and such a group." I said, "And I have got a covenant with my children and with the people that I represent in the 16th Congressional District of Illinois."

We represent the babies and those not even born yet. I mean, we have to make decisions that are going to impact the lives of those who have not even been thought of being born yet.

Mr. JONES. I think each one of us know this figure that I am going to share with the viewers, but if we do not balance the budget, a child born today

that lives to be 75 years of age, she or he will have a responsibility of \$187,000 to pay on the interest on the debt. That is how important it is that we balance the budget.

Mr. MANZULLO. That is just the interest on the national debt, not the total amount of the debt.

Mr. JONES. Just the interest.

Mr. CHABOT. Like the gentleman says, that is only the interest. The scary part about this whole thing of debt and how large it has gotten, that interest on the debt within a couple of years, we are going to be paying more just on the interest on that debt than we are for our entire military expenditures.

Just think of that, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Pentagon, all those things, you can imagine all the ships we have, all the soldiers, all the planes, et cetera, how much that costs.

The spending on the interest on the debt will be more than the whole military. I mean, that is just a mind-boggling figure. We have got to do something about it.

Mr. MANZULLO. We are talking about what we learned back home over the Fourth of July recess. Just prior to that break, I met with a group of university presidents. One of the Democrats in the group said, "Oh, the Republicans are destroying student loans. They're ending student loans."

He went on and on and on and on and on. That is an outright, bald-faced lie. That is the only way I could say it. One of the university presidents said, "We have got to protect student loans, this isn't right."

Afterwards, I talked to him. I said, "Doctor, let me ask you a question. Does your university have a business school?" He said, "Yes."

I said, "Do you teach in the business school that interest begins to accrue from the time that the person gets the money, not 4 years later," as is how the student loan program is presently run. He said, "That's correct."

I said, "Do you realize that a college graduate earns at the minimum \$600,000 more in his lifetime than a noncollege graduate? He said, "I understand that."

I said, "And do you also realize that all the Republican plan says is this: That if a college student borrows \$30,000, which is the maximum amount of money, and beings to pay it back 4 years after he gets the initial amount, that the additional amount he is going to pay is 55 cents a day in interest until that is paid off"? That is a cup of coffee.

□ 2320

Mr. MANZULLO. I said, now, you tell me to my face that that is going to keep somebody from enrolling at your school. And he couldn't answer that question. And I said, what the Republicans are trying to do is to save that college trust fund so there is more money in it, and the more money that

is in that trust fund, the more money there is to spread around to kids who want to go to school and the more interest that comes in. That spreads the pot out. I said, that is all we are trying to do. We are not trying to destroy it.

So we always meet with these incredible arguments that we are trying to destroy, cut out and hurt and be cruel to college students. The farthest thing from the truth.

Mr. CHABOT. You know, I have to mention one other area that I wanted to touch on because it is something that I keep hearing back in my district, and that is the fact that one area that I think we really have wasted a lot of money, at least previous Congresses have wasted a lot of money, is in the area of welfare payments where much of the money that has been spent has been counterproductive.

You know, the area of welfare was something where it was supposed to be temporary help for the truly needy, and this was something back during the depression, back during the 1930's when it started. It had the best of intentions, to really help people who needed that help.

Unfortunately, over the past 60 years, far too often, rather than temporary help, it has become a permanent way of life. And I have had a number of people that have said we did the right thing here in the House when we did what President Clinton said he wanted to do back when he ran for President, and that is change welfare as we know it, and that is what the Republicans in the House did.

Now, the Senate is working on that piece of legislation and hopefully they will be acting upon that soon. But I just think that the way welfare has been run in this country for the past 60 years has wasted billions and billions and billions of dollars and much of it has encouraged people unfortunately to stay on welfare and not get off.

People that are on welfare, I believe very strongly, ought to work for their welfare check and they ought to be in jobs programs, in education programs so that they can get off welfare, and welfare should be temporary. It shouldn't be something permanent. We have got third and fourth generation of people who basically just assume that that is how you get by, that people just get welfare every year. We got kids that grow up in homes all over this country that never see an adult in the home go to work, and so that is an example of a program that truly needs to be changed.

And it is funny, I was in three senior citizens homes last week in one day talking with seniors and I was hearing that from an awful lot of seniors. One thing they really objected to was the fact that there were so many people taking advantage of the welfare system.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHABOT. I will yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. We have had the great society in place for 30

years, the welfare system. There has been \$5 trillion spent. There are more people in poverty now than when that started. Five trillion dollars down the drain and more people on welfare, more people that are—well, let's look at the statistics. The highest crime rate in the world, more teenage pregnancies, more poverty. I mean, it hasn't worked. And you are exactly right. The help is to be temporary, not an ongoing thing, and let's look at our debt. We are \$5 trillion in debt. We spent \$5 trillion in 30 years to try to solve the poverty problem.

Mr. MANZULLO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. MANZULLO. I don't know if the gentleman has read Martin Alaska's book of the Tragedy of American Compassion. It should be a textbook, and in that book he talks about sometimes simply by giving people money, you can really hurt them in the long run. And he talked about early in this country when the role of the churches and the synagogues recognized that it was the primary responsibility of the people, not the government, to take care of those who were involved in poverty. Obviously there are exceptions to everything, people that are disabled or handicapped, obviously our hearts go out to them and it is a matter of priorities to make sure that they are in fact taken care of, and he talked about the wood piles in the bigger cities where men who are unemployed would come to work. They would come to get food, but they were always expected to go out back and chop up wood, which of course was used for heating, and there was nothing demeaning about it because they needed wood to keep the facilities going, and the men willingly would cut the wood because they knew it was short term and there were duties for the women to do that were also on welfare, and the whole purpose of that was that the churches and the synagogues that administered the welfare program wanted to make sure that the people never got used to a life-style where everything was given to them because that robs them of their incentive.

And we have a welfare advisory board back home, some of the most fantastic people in the world, a couple of women on welfare themselves. And you know, one of the startling things I found out, completely changed my mind, revolutionized my mind as it was going on, do you know who wants off welfare the most? It is the recipients. They realize they are trapped. They realize they are trapped, and most of them—I mean, these are not the stereotypes of people who are, you know, the stereotype that we see of the welfare recipients. It is not that. Most are single moms who are desperately trying to break that cycle and to get some schooling done and to get off that welfare roll. So they are willing to do it, and they just need the right tools to be able to break that cycle.

Mr. CHABOT. And I think that the people that are ultimately the victims of this welfare trap is those children.

Mr. MANZULLO. That is right.

Mr. CHABOT. Because they see a check comes from the Government every month and just assume that is the way people get by, the Government sends a check every month, and it just doesn't work that way. And you know, the thing that is unfair also is where does that money come from that is going to the welfare recipients? It is coming oftentimes from hard-working, middle-class people, oftentimes through both the mom and the dad in the home. Both have to work, just as you said before, DON, to pay their taxes. And where are a lot of those taxes going? Unfortunately, to failed programs like the welfare system in this country.

Mr. MANZULLO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHABOT. I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman from Ohio feel as I do that as we begin to tackle the welfare reform which we passed on the House side and hopefully the Senate will follow suit, but we are also looking to work closer with the States to take over the welfare program because we think the States can do a better job, a more efficient job than the Federal Government has done? Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. CHABOT. I do agree, and as a matter of fact, as the gentleman from North Carolina understands completely, much of the money is block granted to the States. Some of the most creative programs that we have had in the area of welfare has come at the State level, at some of the governors—my governor in Ohio, Governor George Voinovich, has been a leader in welfare reform, and what they are trying to do is to wean people off, to break that mind-set where people just assume that the Government supports people on welfare basically from cradle to grave.

People need to realize that it is basically their own responsibility, people are responsible for their own lives, and if they depend upon the Government, both they and their children are going to have, over their life-span, a much less standard of living than they will if they work for themselves.

Mr. MANZULLO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHABOT. Yes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Our colleague, Congressman WELDON, is in your freshman class from Florida, was quoted in the Washington Times about a conversation he had with a constituent. This constituent was talking to some young people, and recalled the following story. He asked them, he said, what do you want to do when you grow up? One said a fireman. What do you want to be when you grow up? One said a policeman. What do you want to be when you grow up? He said, I want to collect checks. Isn't that sad?

Mr. CHABOT. It is.

Mr. MANZULLO. What a sad commentary.

Mr. CHABOT. I realize that our time is drawing to a close and I just want to thank DON MANZULLO from Illinois and WALTER JONES from North Carolina and RON LEWIS from the great State of Kentucky for this colloquy here this evening.

I think it has been very helpful for all of us and hopefully very insightful to those that happen to be watching this evening.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. DREIER] at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1977, THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 104-184), on the resolution (H. Res. 187) providing for the consideration of H.R. 1977, Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1976, THE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 104-185), providing for the consideration of H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Miss COLLINS of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today from 10 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., on account of medical reasons.

Mr. HEFNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. LONGLEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 6:15 p.m., on account of personal reasons.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 7 p.m., on account of attending a funeral.

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. WISE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WELLER.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. MARTINI in two instances.

Mr. BAKER of California.

Mr. HORN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WISE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EVANS.

Mr. GUTIERREZ.

Mr. ORTIZ in two instances.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. HILLIARD.

Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. RUSH.

Ms. NORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHABOT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. DEFazio.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, July 13, 1995 at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1180. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of July 1, 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 104-94); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1181. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Aeronautical Systems Division at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1182. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Japan, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1183. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Japan, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1184. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense articles and services sold commercially to Australia (Transmittal No. DTC-43-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1185. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-85, "Industrial Revenue Bond Forward Commitment Program Authorization Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1186. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-89, "HIV Testing of Certain Criminal Offenders Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1187. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-88, "Child Support Enforcement Temporary Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1188. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-90, "Juvenile Curfew Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1189. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-91, "District of Columbia Board of Education Fees for Adult, Community, and Continuing Education Courses Temporary Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1190. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general for the period ending March 31, 1995, and the Secretary's semiannual report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LIGHTFOOT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2020. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 188. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-185). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PRYCE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 187. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-184). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. DIXON):

H.R. 2017. A bill to authorize an increased Federal share of the costs of certain transportation projects in the District of Columbia for fiscal years 1995 and 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OLVER (for himself, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2018. A bill to amend section 5112 of title 31, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue platinum bullion coins and to mint and issue more than one version of gold bullion coins at the same time; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DELAY, Mr. COX, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. FURSE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FRAZER, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 2019. A bill to allow patients to receive any medical treatment they want under certain conditions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT:

H.R. 2020. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CREMEANS:

H.R. 2021. A bill to release restrictions imposed on the use of certain real property conveyed by the Secretary of the Interior to Lawrence County, OH; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCHALE (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BEILINSON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ORTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. VISCLOSKY):

H.R. 2022. A bill to require the partial application of the antitrust laws to major and minor league baseball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUG (for himself, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. HASTERT, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 2024. A bill to phase out the use of mercury in batteries and provide for the efficient and cost-effective collection and recycling or proper disposal of used nickel cadmium batteries, small sealed lead-acid batteries, and certain other batteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (by request):

H.R. 2025. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 as regards the National Park Service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. CREMEANS introduced a bill (H.R. 2023) to provide for a land exchange between the Ironton Country Club of Ironton, OH, and the Secretary of Agriculture involving Wayne National Forest; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. TUCKER, Mr. REED, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 127: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 218: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 263: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 264: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 390: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 436: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 573: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 580: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 709: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 743: Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

H.R. 763: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 863: Mr. FROST, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 883: Mr. TORRES, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 958: Mr. FORBES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 1005: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1020: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1023: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 1073: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 1074: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 1114: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1154: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1161: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 1289: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1333: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 1459: Mr. RUSH, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1504: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Ms. PRYCE.

H.R. 1539: Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FARR, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1540: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1573: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1588: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1594: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1675: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 1713: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 1768: Mr. MCKEON and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.

H.R. 1774: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1821: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1856: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 1866: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 1876: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 1909: Mr. SALMON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KING, and Mrs. SEASTRAND.

H.R. 1945: Mr. DAVIS and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1955: Mr. MORAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1965: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1972: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1980: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. FARR and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. DEUTSCH and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. FROST, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HOKE, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. FOX.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BISHOP.

H. Res. 36: Mr. PALLONE.

H. Res. 39: Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. EVANS.

H. Res. 174: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 530: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1976

OFFERED BY: Mr. HOKE

AMENDMENT No. 13: Page 57, line 15, strike "\$291,342,000" and insert "\$161,540,000".

Page 57, line 17, strike "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$16,417,000".

Page 58, line 10, strike "\$236,162,000" and insert "\$131,833,000".

H.R. 1976

OFFERED BY: MR. ZIMMER

AMENDMENT No. 14: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 726. DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—A trust fund known as the "Deficit Reduction Trust Fund" (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Fund") shall be established in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) CONTENTS.—The Fund shall consist only of amounts contained in the deficit reduction lock box provision of any appropriation Act. Such amounts shall be transferred to the Fund as specified in subsection (c).

(c) TRANSFERS OF MONEYS TO THE FUND.—Within 10 days of enactment of any appropriation Act which has a deficit reduction lock box provision, there shall be transferred from the general fund to the Fund an amount equal to that amount.

(d) USE OF MONEYS IN THE FUND.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amounts in the Fund shall not be available, in any fiscal year, for appropriation, obligation, expenditure, or transfer.

SEC. 319. DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DOWNWARD ADJUSTMENTS.—The discretionary spending limit for new budget authority for any fiscal year set forth in section 601(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as adjusted in strict conformance with section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, shall be reduced by the amount of budget authority transferred to the Fund for that fiscal year under section 2(c), as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. The adjusted discretionary spending limit for outlays for that fiscal year and each outyear as set forth in such section 601(a)(2) shall be reduced as a result of the reduction of such budget authority, as calculated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget based upon such programmatic and other assumptions set forth in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the conference report on that bill. All such reductions shall occur on the same day that the amounts triggering the reductions are transferred to the Fund.

(b) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "appropriation bill" means any general or special appropriation bill, and any bill or joint resolution making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations.

SEC. 320. DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATION MEASURES.

(a) DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX PROVISIONS.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"DEFICIT REDUCTION LOCK-BOX PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

"SEC. 314. (a) Any appropriation bill that is being marked up by the Committee on Appropriations (or a subcommittee thereof) of either House shall contain a line item entitled 'Deficit Reduction Lock-box'. The dollar amount set forth under that heading shall be an amount equal to the section 602(b)(1) or section 302(b)(1) allocations, as the case may be, to the subcommittee of jurisdiction over the bill of the Committee on Appropriations minus the aggregate level of budget authority or outlays contained in the bill being considered.

"(b) Whenever the Committee on Appropriations of either House reports an appropriation bill, that bill shall contain a line item entitled 'Deficit Reduction Account' comprised of the following:

"(1) Only in the case of any general appropriation bill containing the appropriations

for Treasury and Postal Service (or resolution making continuing appropriations (if applicable)), an amount equal to the amounts by which the discretionary spending limit for new budget authority and outlays set forth in the most recent OMB sequestration preview report pursuant to section 601(a)(2) exceed the section 602(a) allocation for the fiscal year covered by that bill.

"(2) Only in the case of any general appropriation bill (or resolution making continuing appropriations (if applicable)), an amount not to exceed the amount by which the appropriate section 602 (b) allocation of new budget authority exceeds the amount of new budget authority provided by that bill (as reported by that committee).

"(3) Only in the case of any bill making supplemental appropriations following enactment of all general appropriation bills for the same fiscal year, an amount not to exceed the amount by which the section 602(a) allocation of new budget authority exceeds the sum of all new budget authority provided by appropriation bills enacted for that fiscal year plus that supplemental appropriation bill (as reported by that committee).

"(c) Whenever a Member of either House of Congress offers an amendment (whether in subcommittee, committee, or on the floor) to an appropriation bill to reduce spending, that reduction shall be placed in the deficit reduction lock-box unless that Member indicates that it is to be utilized for another program, project, or activity covered by that bill. If the amendment is agreed to and the reduction was placed in the deficit reduction lock-box, then the line item entitled 'Deficit Reduction Lock-box' shall be increased by the amount of that reduction.

"(d) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider a conference report that modifies any Deficit Reduction Lock-box provision that is beyond the scope of that provision as so committed to the conference committee."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents set forth in section 1(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 313 the following new item:

"Sec. 314. Deficit reduction lock-box provisions of appropriation measures."

SEC. 321. CBO TRACKING.

Section 202 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) SCOREKEEPING ASSISTANCE.—To facilitate compliance by the Committees on Appropriations with section 314, the Office shall score all general appropriation measures as passed the House of Representatives and as passed the Senate and have such scorecard published in the Congressional Record."

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. ANDREWS

AMENDMENT No. 50: Page 12, strike lines 4 through 8.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. BASS

AMENDMENT No. 51: Page 47, line 25, insert before the period the following:

: *Provided*, That the Forest Service shall make a priority emergency purchase of the Bretton Woods tract within the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. CRANE

AMENDMENT No. 52: Page 72, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 73, line 15.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. DEAL

AMENDMENT No. 53: Page 17, line 5, strike "\$114,868,000" and insert "\$119,412,000".

Page 72, line 19, strike "\$82,259,000" and insert "\$77,715,000".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. HUTCHINSON

AMENDMENT No. 54: On page 16, line 25, delete \$37,934,000 and insert \$34,434,000.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT No. 55: Page 45, line 24, strike "\$1,276,688,000" and insert "\$1,263,234,000".

Page 47, line 5 strike "\$120,000,000" and insert "\$114,980,000".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AMENDMENT No. 56: Page 94, after line 24, insert the following new section:

Sec. 318. None of the funds made available to the Forest Service by this Act may be used for the construction of roads, or the preparation of timber sales, in roadless areas of 3,000 or more acres in size.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. KLUG

AMENDMENT No. 57: On page 44, after line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 115. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act in fiscal year 1996 shall be obligated or expended to accept or process applications for a patent for any mining or mill site claim located under the general mining laws or to issue a patent for any such claim."

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT No. 58: Page 17, line 21, "\$14,300,000" and insert "\$29,300,000".

Page 18, line 25, strike "\$686,944,000" and insert "\$671,944,000".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. MICA

AMENDMENT No. 59: Page 18, line 25, strike "\$686,944,000" and insert "\$574,056,000".

Page 19, line 2, strike the comma and all that follows through "1997" on line 5.

Page 19, line 9, strike the colon and all that follows through "1996" on page 20, line 14.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. NEUMANN

AMENDMENT No. 60: Page 12, strike lines 4 through 8.

Page 12, strike lines 21 through 25.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. PARKER

AMENDMENT No. 61: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Energy in implementing the Codes and Standards Program to plan, propose, issue, or prescribe any new or amended standard.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The aggregate amount otherwise provided in this Act for "DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—Energy Conservation" is hereby reduced by \$12,799,000.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. PARKER

AMENDMENT No. 62: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Energy in implementing the Codes and Standards Program to plan, propose, issue, or prescribe any new or amended standard.

July 12, 1995

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 6915

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. SKAGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 63: Page 43, strike lines 13 through 18, and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. SKAGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 64: On page 56, line 3, strike "\$552,871,000, and in lieu thereof insert \$567,871,000; page 56, line 10, strike "\$133,946,000 and in lieu thereof insert "\$148,946,000"; on page 56, line 17, strike "\$107,446,000" and in lieu thereof "\$120,446,000"; and on page 56, line 18, strike

"\$26,500,000" and in lieu thereof insert "\$28,500,000".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. TIAHRT

AMENDMENT NO. 65: Page 55, line 5, strike "\$384,504,000" and insert "\$220,950,000".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. TIAHRT

AMENDMENT NO. 66: Page 56, line 3, strike "\$552,871,000" and insert "\$364,066,000".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. UNDERWOOD

AMENDMENT NO. 67: Page 34, line 24, strike "\$69,232,000" and insert "\$64,652,000".

Page 34, line 24, strike "\$65,705,000" and insert "\$61,125,000".

Page 37, insert before the colon at the end of line 7 the following: ", and \$4,580,000 for impact aid for Guam under section 104(e)(6) of Public Law 99-239".

H.R. 1977

OFFERED BY: MR. UNDERWOOD

AMENDMENT NO. 68: Page 37, insert before the colon at the end of line 7 the following: ", and \$4,580,000 for impact aid for Guam under section 104(e)(6) of Public Law 99-239".