



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1995

No. 137

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EVERETT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 6, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable TERRY EVERETT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

With gratitude for the traditions we share, in appreciation for the values we hold dear, and with acknowledgment of the contributions of those who have gone before, we begin this day with all the opportunities and responsibilities before us. O gracious God, creator of life and author of every good gift, we ask Your blessing upon each of us asking that You would give us the grace to be the people You would have us be and do those good things that honor You and serve people whatever their need. May Your good spirit, O God, that is with us in all the moments of life, be with us and every person, 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 North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] will lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BALLENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1977. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2002. An act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2020. An act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2020) "An Act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SHELBY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. KERREY, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 1977) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GORTON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MACK, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. REID, and Mrs. MURRAY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 2002) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes", requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. REID, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 227. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide an exclusive right to perform sound recordings publicly by means of digital transmissions, and for other purposes;

S. 369. An act to designate the Federal courthouse in Decatur, Alabama, as the "Seybourn H. Lynne Federal Courthouse", and for other purposes;

S. 734. An act to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building to be constructed at the southeastern corner of Liberty and South Virginia Streets in Reno, Nevada, as the "Bruce R. Thompson United

□ 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

H8539

States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes;

S. 895. An act to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the level of participation by the Small Business Administration in certain loans guaranteed by the Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 965. An act to designate the United States Courthouse for the Eastern District of Virginia in Alexandria, Virginia, as the Albert V. Bryan United States Courthouse;

S. 1076. An act to designate the Western Program Service Center of the Social Security Administration located at 1221 Nevin Avenue, Richmond, California, as the "Francis J. Hagel Building", and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 395) "An Act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Energy to sell the Alaska Power Administration, and to authorize the export of Alaska North Slope crude oil, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. JOHNSTON, and Mr. FORD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93-415, as amended by Public Law 102-586, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, after consultation with the Democratic leader, announces the appointment of James L. Burgess of Kansas to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, effective July 5, 1995.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 102-246, the Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, appoints Adele C. Hall of Kansas to a 5-year term to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 83-420, as amended by Public Law 99-371 the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. MCCAIN to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93-642, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. BOND and Mr. BAUCUS to be members of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation Board of Trustees.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 194(a) of title 14, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. PRESSLER, ex officio, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Mr. ASHCROFT, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and Mrs. MURRAY, at large, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1295(b) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101-595, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. PRESSLER, ex officio, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and Mr. LOTT, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 5, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate:

1. Received on Monday, August 7, 1995 at 2:00 p.m.: that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1225.

2. Received on Thursday, August 10, 1995 at 1:25 p.m.: that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 535, H.R. 584, H.R. 614, and H.R. 2077.

3. Received on Friday, August 11, 1995 at 5:05 p.m.: that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2108 and H.R. 2161.

Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause IV of rule I, the Speaker pro tempore signed the following enrolled bill on Friday, August 11, 1995:

H.R. 2161, to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until October 1, 1995, and for other purposes;

And the Speaker pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills on Thursday, August 17, 1995:

H.R. 535, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas;

H.R. 584, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a fish hatchery to the State of Iowa;

H.R. 614, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Minnesota the New London National Fish Hatchery production facility;

H.R. 1225, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt employees who perform certain court reporting duties from compensatory time requirements applicable to certain public agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2077, to designate the U.S. post office building located at 33 College Avenue in Waterville, ME, as the "George J. Mitchell Post Office Building"; and

H.R. 2108, to permit the Washington Convention Center authority to expend revenues for the operation and maintenance of the existing Washington Convention Center and for preconstruction activities relating to a new convention center in the District of Columbia, to permit a designated authority of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for the preconstruction activities relating to a sports arena in the District of Columbia and to permit certain revenue to be pledged as security for the borrowing of such funds, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 29, 1995.

Re Wright v. Wright.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my Office has been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

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

Sincerely,

SCOT M. FAULKNER,
Chief Administrative Officer.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 30, 1995.

Re Cheryl Oliver and Everett Oliver v. Dr. Coolidge Abel-Bey, Dr. Geddis Abel-Bey, Booth Memorial Medical Center and Dr. Gary Markoff.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my Office has been served with a subpoena issued by the Supreme Court, County of Bronx, State of New York.

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

Sincerely,

SCOT M. FAULKNER,
Chief Administrative Officer.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE ROBERT S. WALKER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROBERT S. WALKER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 11, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has been served with a subpoena for the production of documents by the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for Lancaster County in connection with a civil case.

After consultation with the office of the General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Cordially,

ROBERT S. WALKER.

CAL RIPKEN AS ROLE MODEL FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, in one of the greatest moments in baseball history, Cal Ripken of the Baltimore Orioles will break Lou Gehrig's record for playing in the most consecutive games.

I applaud his discipline, his dedication, his desire, and perhaps most importantly, his service as an outstanding role model for the youth of America.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Cal Ripken serves as a role model not only for millions of kids across the United States but also for the Members of this Congress.

We too are on the verge of accomplishing great things. In the coming weeks we will have the opportunity to pass a budget that will finally begin to put America's fiscal house in order.

I urge my colleagues to have the discipline, have the dedication, have the desire. Be a leader in this country. Pass a balanced budget.

A DAY FOR THE HISTORY BOOKS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this is a day for the history books. Sometimes history sneaks up on us. Sometimes we have 2,130 baseball games to watch as a preface to history.

We in Maryland, of course, are incredibly proud, but that pride is shared with all Americans and, indeed, all peoples of the world who love responsibility, who love and admire courage, who love and admire people who have their priorities correct.

This morning, on this day of history, Cal Ripken, Jr., took the hand of his

little girl, Rachel, and took her to school. Today, a day of history, we honor two of the greatest Americans who have ever graced this Nation, Lou Gehrig and Cal Ripken, Jr.; two individuals, as the previous speaker indicated, who personify what we believe is good in people, not boastful, not self-interested, but dedicated to the values that all of us hold dear.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the House will be doing at 5:30 or 6:30 or 7:30 or 8:30 tonight, but I would hope that every American not privileged as I will be to be at Camden Yards, will be watching their televisions, listening to their radios as we celebrate one of the great accomplishments in sport, the 2,131st consecutive game to be played by Cal Ripken, Jr.

I know there will be tears in my eyes as I exult with all America on this historic accomplishment by a good and decent fellow citizen.

OUR PROMISE AND OUR CHOICE

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, this fall is about a promise and a choice. The promise is to balance the budget. The choice is whether or not we keep our word.

How many Members of this body, from both sides of the aisle, campaigned on a promise of fighting for a balanced budget? How many have stated, "Of course, I'm for the concept of a balanced budget."

On January 26th of this year, for the first time ever, this House passed a balanced budget amendment. Three hundred members voted for it. Of the 132 who voted against it, virtually all expressed their strong support for the idea of a balanced budget.

Well, in the coming weeks, push will come to shove. Members of this House will have a real choice. Will you keep your word? When given the opportunity, will you vote to balance the budget? I know I will.

LOBBY REFORM AND GIFT BAN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, with the House resuming its work today, the time is now for action on lobby and gift reform.

There are Members, both Democrat and Republican, who are eager to obtain immediate reform on this subject. But unfortunately, we have been stymied by an indifferent and intransigent House Republican leadership.

It took a bipartisan effort in the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats working together, to approve real gift and lobby reform. Yet the only response to that action from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GING-

RICH] has been, "Well, maybe next year."

Let us act now to plug the loopholes in the 50-year-old lobby registration law and do something about those who come to this House bearing gifts or perhaps merely bearing golf junkets for the Members to obtain influence. Before we act on all of the other business, let us have an up-and-down vote on lobby reform and gift ban.

FISCAL DISCIPLINE AND RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to report back to my colleagues some refreshing news. Even while areas of my district remain under water due to excess flooding, the enthusiasm for the momentum for change in Washington has not subsided in Florida.

Americans in my district are taking it upon themselves to get through these rough times they are having with Mother Nature. They expect no less from us here who deal with meeting the many challenges with good governance in Washington. The constituents I spoke with over the recess remain committed to the message they sent last November: Fiscal responsibility, fiscal discipline.

They realize there are going to be tough choices in the coming months. Yes, there does exist a certain level of concern on some issues. However, they are asking, demanding that we make those tough choices inherent in saving and strengthening Medicare, reforming welfare, balancing the budget, ensuring a successful future for our kids and grandkids.

My constituents know those floodwaters are going to go down. They also know this Congress is committed to stopping the flood of red tape and overspending we have experienced in this Nation in the past years.

THE RANDY WEAVER CASE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation says their hands are clean in the Randy Weaver case. The FBI said they never gave a shoot-to-kill order. The FBI said they never shred documents. The FBI said they did not mean to shoot Mrs. Weaver right between the eyes.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree. I say the FBI is lying. In fact, if the FBI is not lying, why did the FBI agree to give \$3.5 million to Randy Weaver to get this thing to go away?

Folks, the truth of the matter is in America the people are supposed to govern, and the sad fact is, ladies and

gentlemen, the government is beginning to govern and Congress has little, if any, control over the FBI, the ATF, and IRS.

Shame Congress. Clean hands? My assets.

WHAT I LEARNED ON SUMMER VACATION

(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, we might entitle this, "What I Learned on Summer Vacation." The fact is, going back home, we reorient ourselves to the great and good common sense of the American people.

Did I hear uniformity among the constituents of the Sixth District of Arizona? Of course not. Good people can disagree, but overwhelmingly the people of the Sixth District of Arizona told me, "Stay the course, stick to your principles, work hard to reform this government."

Indeed, we have heard today already broad bipartisan consensus, and so in that spirit of bipartisanship, I extend my hand to my friends on this side of the aisle, saying the problems we confront are too great for politics as usual.

Let us get about the business of governing America.

FIRST LADY DESERVES OUR PRAISE

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the First Lady deserves credit, first for going to China, and second for speaking out so forcefully for human rights and women's rights.

The First Lady spoke out eloquently against forced abortions and forced sterilizations and other women's rights abuses common in other countries, such as rape, mutilation, and domestic violence. She also stressed the importance of women to families and the need for setting new standards for women's health, economic welfare, family planning, and the status of women in general.

Mr. Speaker, the First Lady showed guts and commitment in China, and she deserves our praise.

Mr. Speaker, the First Lady has worked continuously on issues related to women, children, and families for the past 25 years. This week she has combined her skills and experiences with the role of diplomat.

Amidst tenuous United States-Chinese relations, the First Lady has walked a fine line in Beijing—balancing the urgent need for women's rights and the administration's policy of constructive engagement with China.

Mrs. Clinton has successfully pointed out the need for a forum of openness of free speech in Beijing. Her remarks underscore the magnitude of the U.N. Women's Conference

and the need for responsible behavior by every member of the international community to confront the oppression that afflicts millions of women.

With the assistance of the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright, Mrs. Clinton has laid the important groundwork for continued dialog between Secretary of State Christopher and the Chinese Foreign Minister in their upcoming meeting.

Hillary Clinton deserves our gratitude for her efforts which engage China while steadfastly advocating the need for advances in human rights which are necessary for China's genuine integration in the international arena.

OUR COMMITMENT TO GET THE JOB DONE

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that today the House Republicans are ready to finish the job we started 8 months ago. We are ready to balance the budget for the first time in a generation, to help save this country for our children and our grandchildren, and we are ready to pass a plan that will protect, preserve, and strengthen Medicare for our senior citizens.

We are willing to take the heat on this controversial issue to save a broken system that three, I repeat, three of President Clinton's own Cabinet secretaries say needs to be dealt with immediately. We are ready to pass a plan that will help end our country's welfare system that creates poverty, dependency, destitution, breaks up families, and discourages people from working.

We are committed to ending a system that has created debt and has rewarded inefficiency.

We are not afraid to take on the special interests and the status quo here in Washington. In fact, the only ones interested in preserving the old ways are the defenders of the old order who live and breathe inside Route 495 in Washington, DC, and if we learned anything during this August recess, it is that the American people want us to stay the course and continue with this revolution in 1995.

PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS OF ALL PEOPLE

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, sadly, just before we left for recess, the President of Zimbabwe, Robert Mugabe, engaged in an unjustified wholly prejudicial attack on gay men and lesbian citizens of his country.

The attack was in sharp contrast to the leadership of, for instance, Nelson Mandela, who has included in the Constitution of South Africa, with the sup-

port of that country, protections against discrimination.

I am very pleased to say that at the request of myself and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] about 70 Members of this House have joined in sending a letter to Mr. Mugabe objecting strenuously to his bigoted attack on people who simply have a different sexual orientation, noting that this kind of denunciation of people who are decent citizens is contrary to the respect for human rights that we had hoped Mr. Mugabe would show.

I am including at this point in the RECORD the letter and the list of signatures, as follows:

His Excellency ROBERT MUGABE,
President, Harare, Zimbabwe.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We were distressed to read your attack on people who are gay and lesbian.

As Members of Congress dedicated to protecting the human rights of all people, we believe that you are gravely mistaken in your denunciation of people based on their sexual orientation and your assertion that they should be excluded from the protection of their "individual freedom and human rights."

When individuals are mistreated by government because of some basic characteristic of their nature, human rights are violated. Attacking decent individuals who are fully respectful of the rights of others, who are productive and responsible citizens, but who happen to be gay or lesbian is wrong. As strong supporters of the struggle of the people of South Africa against the oppressive, dehumanizing apartheid system, we welcomed the inclusion in the Constitution of South Africa of recognition that discrimination based on an individual's sexual orientation is wrong. We strongly urge you to re-examine this issue and to follow the example of the new government of South Africa in respecting the human rights of all people.

BARNEY FRANK,

Member of Congress,

MAXINE WATERS,

Member of Congress.

COSIGNERS OF THE LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROBERT MUGABE OF ZIMBABWE

Neil Abercrombie, MC; Xavier Becerra, MC; George Brown, MC; Ronald Delums, MC; Lloyd Doggett, MC; Anna Eshoo, MC; Elizabeth Furse, MC; Steven Gunderson, MC; Alcee Hastings, MC; Steny Hoyer, MC; Patrick Kennedy, MC; Zoe Lofgren, MC; Edward Markey, MC; Marty Meehan, MC; George Miller, MC; Joseph Moakley, MC; Eleanor Holmes Norton, MC; Frank Pallone, MC; Jack Reed, MC; Martin Sabo, MC; Charles Schumer, MC; Gerry Studds, MC; Melvin Watt, MC; Sidney Yates, MC; Gary Ackerman, MC; Howard Berman, MC; William Clay, MC; Norman Dicks, MC; Richard Durbin, MC; Sam Farr, MC; Sam Gejdenson, MC; Luis Guterrez, MC.

Sheila Jackson-Lee, MC; Tom Lantos, MC; Nita Lowey, MC; Jim McDermott, MC; Carrie Meek, MC; Norman Mineta, MC; James Moran, MC; John Oliver, MC; Nancy Pelosi, MC; Lucille Roybal-Allard, MC; Bernard Sanders, MC; David Skaggs, MC; Edolphus Towns, MC; Henry Waxman, MC; Thomas Barrett, MC; Sherwood Boehlert, MC; Peter DeFazio, MC; Julian Dixon, MC; Eliot Engel, MC; Thomas Foglietta, MC; Henry Gonzalez, MC; Jane Harman, MC; Maurice Hinchey, MC; Eddie

Bernice Johnson, MC; John Lewis, MC; Carolyn Maloney, MC; Cynthia McKinney, MC; Kweisi Mfume, MC; Patsy Mink, MC; Jerrold Nadler, MC; Major Owens, MC; Charles Rangel, MC; Bobby Rush, MC; Patricia Schroeder, MC; Louise Slaughter, MC; Nydia Valázquez, MC; Lynn Woolsey, MC.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MOTOR SPORTS PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, as you know, North Carolina is the home of professional auto racing and it is on behalf of thousands of North Carolinians and millions of NASCAR, NHRA, and INDY racing fans across America that I introduce the Motor Sports Protection Act today.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton is waging war on the tobacco family. He has threatened the livelihood of thousands of tobacco farmers across the South and he is now on the verge of destroying professional automobile racing as we know it.

The Funderburk bill, which Richard Petty says all race fans can rally around, will stop Bill Clinton before he crosses the finish line. It prevents Big Brother agents from slapping advertising restrictions on the tobacco sponsors of pro racing. Mr. Speaker, each NASCAR alone pumps over \$2 billion into the southern economy. Racing fans are hard-working, law-abiding Americans. They deserve better than to be used as pawns in Bill Clinton's shell-game. Lets send him a message right now: Bill Clinton keep your hands off racing.

Support the Funderburk Motor Sports Protection Act

WOMEN STILL TREATED AS SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations owes the women of the globe a great apology.

Every 10 years there is an international U.N. Women's meeting, and the United Nations could have cared less about what the host did to make this meeting as inconvenient and as awful as possible. In fact, the Secretary General of the United Nations could not even bother to come. He predicted he was going to have a fever all 12 days that this meeting was going to be going on.

Now, the message that sends to all countries is that the United Nations is putting this on only because it is politically correct, but they do not really care, and the Secretary General cannot really bother to come.

I find that tragic, and I am very grateful the First Lady went and tried

to put together anything that we could, because these issues are very, very critical.

There will not be another international meeting for 10 years, and to have allowed China to play with it this way is outrageous.

I think the House leadership owes American women also an apology, because the delegation sent from this body to the women's meeting could not have a woman chair. A woman could only be a cochair. They had to send a male along, too, and one who does not have a good record on women's issues.

I find that very troubling, and the message from all of this is, "Women, our time still has not come yet." When will be treated as first-class rather than the second-class citizens the United Nations relegated us to as we see this meeting in Beijing proceed?

□ 1220

CAL RIPKEN, JR.'S MANY ACHIEVEMENTS

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in tribute to a constituent whose achievement is the talk of the Nation.

Tonight Cal Ripken, Jr., a native of Aberdeen, MD, will play his 2,131st consecutive game with the Baltimore Orioles, breaking a longstanding record held by the legendary Lou Gehrig. It is fitting that Cal is the only player ever to accomplish this feat, because he uniquely represents the qualities for which Lou Gehrig will always be remembered—sportsmanship, fair play, and sheer love of the game.

Fans across the Nation have started calling Cal the Iron Man. But endurance is only one aspect of his success. He was Rookie of the Year in 1982; MVP in 1983 and 1991; and played in 13 consecutive All-Star games. He has hit more home runs than any shortstop in major league history.

Despite his fame, Cal Ripken takes precious time before and after every game to sign autographs, pose for pictures, or simply to chat with his fans—the way Babe Ruth, Lou Gehrig, and Jackie Robinson once did. At a time when many fans are disillusioned by the big-business approach to baseball, Cal's sincere passion for the sport reminds us of a time when baseball was what it was always meant to be—a game.

I urge all my colleagues to join with me and the citizens of Maryland as we salute Cal Ripken, Jr. His accomplishment is a timely illustration of what is best about our national pastime.

NOW 71 PERCENT OF AMERICANS DO NOT TRUST REPUBLICANS TO HANDLE MEDICARE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, over the August break, I had a chance to meet with my constituents to discuss the Republican plan to cut Medicare in order to finance a tax cut for the wealthy. The people I represent want me to bring a message back to the Republican leadership: Medicare is a trust fund, not a slush fund.

Now, I know that my Republican colleagues were also back home trying to sell themselves as the true protectors of Medicare. But, the American public isn't buying this GOP makeover. The public is skeptical about the sketchy GOP plan that claims private insurance companies will offer seniors more for less. With such fantastic claims, it's no wonder that a recent poll found 71 percent of Americans have little trust in the House Republicans to handle Medicare.

For 30 years Republicans have wanted to privatize Medicare. In fact, the current majority leader has said that he would have no part of Medicare in a free world. Does that sound like a party that wants to protect Medicare?

THERE IS MORE TO DO

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, this 104th Congress now moves forward from the Contract With America. And, "move" must be the operative word.

The lesson learned in our August recess is that the public wants action not words. Everywhere I went, men and women said, "Congressman, we'd sooner have you moving ahead * * * even if the path is rough and you stumble occasionally * * * don't let Congress just stand there."

America bought in to our program. They approve our commitment to a balanced budget. They like cutting back the bureaucracy. They commend term limits.

Most of this we delivered in this House. Yet, there is more to do here on the Hill, and I urge the Senate to heed the call.

Let us get down to business, but let us make sure it is dealing with unfinished business, not business as usual.

REPUBLICANS TAKING THE CARE OUT OF MEDICARE

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my mother, Seroy Engel, and the millions of mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers throughout our Nation whose lives depend on Medicare. In the next few weeks this legislative body is going to have to make some tough decisions. The question will be will we let the Republicans take the care out of Medicare. I say, "No."

In 1965, Medicare was established to demonstrate that this Nation cares about its senior citizens, that it cares whether or not they receive medical treatment, and, ultimately, that it cares whether they live or die. In 1965, only 46 percent of America's senior citizens had health coverage. Today, 99 percent of American seniors are covered for medical expenses.

Today we are at a crossroads. We must decide if we will break our sacred oath to millions of Medicare recipients by forcing them to pay more for less care, wait longer for personal care, and have less control over who provides that care.

There is a fundamental question that we must ask ourselves when the Republican leadership asks you to cut \$270 billion from Medicare to pay for a tax break for the wealthy: Will we vote to take the CARE out of Medicare? Will we vote to take the care out of Medicare?

That, Mr. Speaker, is the question we must all ask ourselves.

This Congressman says "No."

MAJORITY OF AMERICANS SAY REPUBLICAN MAJORITY IN CON- GRESS IS GOOD FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess I heard the same message over and over again, and that is we need to move forward, we need to be bold, we need to dare to make differences that the Democrats have refused to make for the past 40 years. I bought a book, "A Tribute to Robert Kennedy," and I read one of the most moving speeches, his 1966 speech in Johannesburg. Bobby Kennedy said:

The future does not belong to those who are content with today, apathetic toward common problems and their fellow man alike, timid and fearful in the face of new ideas and bold projects. Rather it will belong to those who can blend vision, reason and courage in a personal commitment to the ideals and great enterprises of American Society.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot be content with a status quo. We have got to save Medicare, we have got to balance the budget, and we have got to reform welfare. That is what the Republican Party has talked about doing for the past 8 months. The American people in every poll that is cited agree with us. We have to move forward. Fifty-three percent of Americans believe that the Republican majority in Congress is good for America. Only 33 percent oppose. Sixty-five percent believe that we need to reform Medicare in a very important manner. Mr. Speaker, that is what we are here to do.

I ask the Democrats in this body to heed the words of Bobby Kennedy, to dare to make a difference, dare to reform this Government, and dare to push America into the 21st century stronger than what it was when it left the 20th century.

WE CANNOT LET THE SENIORS OF THIS COUNTRY DOWN

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I accept that challenge that we have just heard from the other side of the aisle, but I will tell my colleagues what I have run into in my series of meetings in my district in Louisville, KY, over the last 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, in 10 separate meetings from one part of the community to the other I heard the same thing. What I heard was a reflection of fear, a reflection of the concern on the part of the seniors who, yes, say we do need to make some small changes to keep our system afloat. "But what changes are being proposed," I have been asked. "What changes will we see from Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican plan?"

Mr. Speaker, we do not know yet. That is the disappointment of this August break. We need to make sure we preserve the benefits, as they are expected by the seniors of this country, and not let them down when it comes to their health care.

HOLD THE LINE ON FEDERAL SPENDING BEFORE IT GOES THROUGH THE CEILING

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Treasury, the new debt ceiling that Congress approved in 1993 will be reached sometime in October. The debt ceiling was \$4.9 trillion. We are currently borrowing, and we are currently borrowing \$4.6 trillion. So, we are going to reach that debt limit. This means that the Government's ability to borrow additional money will be exhausted by November, and the House and Senate will be asked to increase the debt ceiling for the 78th time since 1940.

Since I and other fiscal conservatives of both parties firmly believe that we should put our fiscal house in order by making sure we are irrevocably committed to balancing the budget before increasing the debt ceiling, we are facing a potential cash-flow problem. That is because in next year's budget we are calling for a borrowing of about 10 percent, and revenues coming into the Federal Government only account for about 90 percent of that required spending. So that is going to mean a cash-flow program, it is going to mean prioritizing spending.

As an enthusiastic supporter of the effort to use the debt ceiling to achieve a balanced budget, I have joined with 160 members of the Debt-Limit Coalition to pass legislation that will eliminate the deficit within 7 years.

Later this month, Congress will present the President with a historic

package of spending and tax cuts that will achieve that goal. If he vetoes this bill and does not present a credible alternative, we will be compelled to use the pending debt-ceiling vote to force the issue of the Federal Government's out-of-control spending.

Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD the next 3½ paragraphs, and I conclude by saying now is the time to hold the line on Federal spending before it goes through the ceiling.

Some critics of the Republican budget-cutters, many of whom are those who helped get us into the Federal debt morass, say that cutting spending on social programs is mean-spirited and cruel, and that this is only designed to put pressure on the President and force him to take the blame for shutting down the Government.

But there is ample precedent for Congress using the debt limit as leverage to resolve budget battles, including 1985 during the debate of the Gramm-Rudman balanced budget act and in 1990, when the Democratic Congress used the looming debt ceiling to force President Bush to raise taxes.

So this isn't a partisan issue. It's an American issue. As a dairy farmer and former Michigan legislator, I have persistently advocated tax cuts and spending restraint. Now is not the time to back off. Now is the time to hold the line on Federal spending, before it goes through the ceiling. Thank you very much.

REMINDING OUR YOUNG GENERATION THAT FREEDOM DOES NOT COME EASY

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, 14 Members of the House of Representatives went to Pearl Harbor this last week to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the V-J victory. We were led by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

As my colleagues know, it is good that we have these celebrations to remind our young generation that really freedom does not come easy at all. Many Americans sacrificed their lives for this country, and, Mr. Speaker, over 50 percent of the Americans living today and most of the people in this Chamber today were born after World War II. So we have to let them know of the problems we had back 50 years ago. Over 400,000 young Americans, 18 and 19 years old, did not come home. We cannot forget them.

LET US DO WHAT WE ARE PAID TO DO

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I spent the August recess crisscrossing the State of Illinois from Chicago to Carbondale meeting with a variety of

different people, asking them what was on their mind and what they were concerned about. The one thing that came through loud and clear at every meeting with every group was the fact that they are beginning to feel that working families in this country, the middle class of America, the backbone of this country, are falling behind. Husbands and wives are both working hard, playing by the rules, beating their heads against the wall, pushing their credit cards to the limit, worrying about paying for the kids' education, worrying about their own health care, worrying about whether that pension is going to be around.

Mr. Speaker, I thought to myself as I worked across the State that, when I come back to Washington, each day as we sit up here and debate the important issues I am going to try to hold those issues against that basic concern that I heard across Illinois. What is it we are doing on this floor of the House of Representatives that will respond to that?

Frankly, I do not think cutting Medicare benefits responds to those concerns, putting an additional burden on senior citizens and their families. I do not think the idea of tax breaks for people making over \$150,000 a year makes any sense at all with our budget deficit, and that does not help the working families. Cutting back on education? Heck, most of those families are praying that their kids will qualify for a Federal college student loan. It is their only ticket to get that higher education and have an opportunity, and yet on this floor we are talking about cutting those opportunities.

So I hope in the weeks ahead we really can address this in a bipartisan fashion. I hope we can all be sensitive to the concerns of what has really been the strength of America now for 50 years, the strongest, most vibrant and growing middle class in the world. I hope we all are not taking pride in the politics of Washington. I hear people almost boasting about a train wreck that may occur. "We may close down Government," they are saying with some level of pride. We should not be proud of that fact. Democrats and Republicans ought to sit down together and work out the problems. That is what we were sent here to do, and that is what we are paid to do.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). 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 California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

RESTORING PUBLIC TRUST THROUGH LOBBY REFORM

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

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the House will be given the opportunity to move forward on the most dramatic reform of this institution in the way it does business that will be considered this year. Unfortunately it has not been allowed to be considered prior to now in a serious way, and by that I am talking about an effort to reform the rules under which this House operates with regard to lobbying and lobbyists. Today on the legislative appropriations bill conference report that comes back a motion will be made to not approve; that is, to vote against the previous question. We hope that that motion to oppose the previous question will be successful; that is, that it will be defeated, the previous question will be defeated, and, as a result, we will then bring up a rule which will allow consideration of a proposal to prohibit the receipt of gifts by Members of the House of Representatives from lobbyists and also a provision to regulate the way in which lobbyists go about their business in this institution.

About 5 weeks ago the United States Senate took up this matter and passed it. It did so with dispatch, and now in the United States Senate it is against the law for a Member of the Senate to accept a gift in excess of \$50 or a gift in excess of \$100 from any individual source in any one year. It is a proposal that does not go as far as many of us hoped, but it goes a long way. It is a dramatic change and takes us in the direction of many of the State legislatures who have already grappled with this matter and already imposed rigorous requirements on their own members, leaving now the House of Representatives of the United States as the only remaining bastion of freebies for its Members from the lobby.

My view is that the vast majority, the vast preponderance of the Members of this institution, do not accept and are not affected by this kind of activity in any respect whatsoever. But it is incumbent upon us to instill in the public a strong sense of confidence in this institution, and the reports over the last few years have Members flying across the country, and taking free golf vacations, free ski trips, free junkets of various types from groups that are interested in lobbying this House to enact legislation in their favor are disturbing to the public, and rightfully so.

Today, if the previous question on the rule is defeated, we will take up the House Concurrent Resolution 99 as an amendment to the legislative appropriations bill, which would, as the Senate did, say that no Member of the House will be able to accept a gift with a value of greater than \$50 in terms of meals and entertainment or any type of gratuity and no more than \$100 annually, \$100 annually from any single

source. Gifts of less than \$10 will not count toward that \$100 limit, but anything over \$10 will count toward that.

The effect of that will be to put an end to the grossest abuse of, in my view, the public trust and put an end of the activities which have gone on here for 200 years, and gradually, and I think to this date, to some extent fatally injured the public's view of this institution. There are many exceptions to this. It is written in a way as to be reasonable so that Members of Congress can go about the representational activities as normal human beings. They will be able, of course, to take a meal at a public gathering, to take a meal when they are making a speech to a group and so forth, and minor acceptance of small things that are really part of a social gathering will not be affected in any way whatsoever.

□ 1240

It will state that these abuses of the public trust, these abuses of this institution's prerogatives, have gone on in a much heralded fashion, particularly in these new magazine shows on television which will no longer be permitted.

Well, as I said, this is not all that we had sought. You know, this House passed legislation much stronger than this in the last Congress, twice. First the bill passed, and then the conference report passed. Unfortunately, it was filibustered to death in the Senate at the very last minute and killed before it could take action.

Today we are on the verge of making history again, and there really can be no objection to what we are trying to do. All we are trying to say is the kind of activity that the public disagrees with, and rightfully so, is not going to be allowed anymore of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1-minute speeches here today we heard a lot of talk about what Members found when they went home. I guarantee you the one thing that would have been unanimous in every town meeting in the country is that Members of the House of Representatives should be allowed to take free meals, free tickets, free trips, free vacation, and free golf from the very people that are hired to come here and influence the outcome of legislation in this place.

Today we have an opportunity to do the public's will. We have an opportunity to vote against the previous question on the rule and the conference report on the legislative appropriations bill to allow a rule to come up that allows us to take this matter up. It is simple. Protestations that we have heard in the past from some leaders in this institution that somehow or another we do not have time to deal with this matter; to the contrary, we have plenty of time to deal with the matter. We do not even need to take a lot of time. Vote no to the previous question today. Let this come up. Cast a vote for the American people and for the integrity of this institution.

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

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

PRIORITIZING APPROPRIATION MEASURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to really question what we are doing today by bringing up legislative appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, when I was home this weekend, people were going crazy saying, what do you mean there is going to be a train wreck? There is going to be a huge train wreck and all sorts of people who are Federal employees may be asked to be furloughed forever, who knows for how long; to go without pay, and benefits could be cut off. We are going to look so silly, because never has Congress, in the entire history I remember, been so late in dealing with the 13 funding bills that are absolutely essential. Here we are, it is September, the money runs out September 30, and not one bill has been passed.

Mr. Speaker, the shocker is, guess who is not going to be hurt by this train wreck? Us. This is the imperial Congress in spades, and this is wrong. Because the only bill of those 13 bills ready for action today and ready to move to the President's desk is the legislative appropriations.

Think how that looks to the American people, that while we could not get around to doing the other 12 bills, and while we are later doing these bills than any other Congress in history, and that this country may look very, very silly as we go through all of these throes of shutting down Government and all of the costly additions that we know that costs. I had the Government Accounting Office do a study on how much that cost the last time we did it, and we did it just for a few days. Well, it ended up costing almost a half a billion dollars. For a country with the kind of debt we have, that is a stupid way to spend money.

So here we are, Mr. Speaker, a Congress who has not gotten its work done on time, who has not done any of the 13 bills, but today, we are going to take up our pay, our staff's pay, and the pay of the other body, because heaven forbid, we would not want to be hurt by this train wreck that is coming. This is the way we untie ourselves from the rail.

Now, the prior gentleman gave a very good speech down in the well talking about the gift ban. That is another reason that I think that we are taking this up with such haste today, because we do not want to deal with the issues around the gift ban. We have dealt with them before, we know what they are,

this House has passed them before. But if we can hurry this thing through as the very first thing that is done in this body, just as people are getting off planes and coming back, they will not realize that they have just exempted themselves from the act that is going to fall on folks, and that we do not have to deal with the ugly issues because people are not informed and will not know to vote no on the previous question and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, the people in my district came to the rally yesterday because I introduced a bill saying, I want to change the rules of the House so that we never pass the funding for the House and the Senate until we have passed the funding for every other branch of Government. This running up and saying, exempt us, keep us out of the way, is wrong, and we ought to change that rule.

Now, I know that putting this resolution in today is not going to work, because you already have it on the schedule and here it is, boom, boom, gone, over. But we really have to say that in an era where the people were promised reform, this was going to be a different Congress and so forth, we look like the most imperial of the imperial Congresses.

In my district there are many, many people who work for the Federal Government, and I think after the Oklahoma bombing, many Americans realize, these people look just like their neighbors. We should stop calling them bureaucrats and curl our lip as we do it. These are families that live in our communities that are trying to make ends meet. As I introduced this at a rally, they all said yes. They could not believe that we would have the audacity to take ourselves out of this train wreck and to do it as the first order of business when we came back.

They also went on to ask all sorts of questions which I could not answer, were they going to be impacted, what about their children in school, what about their mortgage payment, how long were they going to be furloughed, would they get back pay? And to all of those questions I had to say, "You know, I do not know, because Congress has not finished its work on any of the 13 bills. But the good news is, today we will have finished work on our pay."

That did not go over well. They like my new rule. I cannot get it passed at this late date. I just cannot believe the brazenness of our doing this first, taking care of ourselves first. I hope every Member of this body thinks about how this is going to look, if we rush in here after the break, and the first thing we make sure of is that we take care of ourselves, and then we go on to let everybody else dangle out there in all of this anxiety of which agencies will be chopped, which ones will not, who will be on furlough, when will people be called back.

Think of what we would say if another country's parliament did this. Think of what we would say if we

watched France or Germany shut down because they could not act. Well, that is what they are going to say about us.

I certainly hope we do not do this today. I urge Members to get on the resolution. But, better yet, vote "no" today, and let us get on with dealing with the rest of the business before we put ourselves first. That is not reform, that is the same old business, only even worse. I have never seen that happen before.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution that requires Congress to consider and pass all other appropriations before voting on the legislative branch appropriations.

This year Congress has not finished any of the 13 appropriations bills. Never has Congress been this derelict. My bill is needed to force Congress to act responsibly rather than playing politics by threatening to shut down the Government. It will prevent what has been called the train wreck.

If Congress isn't tied to the tracks, then they are much freer to play fast and loose with everyone else's lives.

It is outrageous that the first appropriations bill to pass is funding for Congress. The message this sends to every household in America is that we will take care of ourselves but everyone else is nonessential.

The imperial Congress is alive and well. If you thought the Republicans were reformers, you're wrong. This shouldn't surprise most Americans. It is always the little guy who gets the raw end of the deal when Congress plays politics.

Shutting down the Federal Government wastes money. In 1991 the General Accounting Office estimated that as much as \$607.3 million was wasted during the 3-day 1990 Columbus Day shutdown. In my district a shutdown will cost \$10 to \$15 million a day.

The rest of the world will laugh. Imagine what Americans would say if another country shut down their government because their parliament failed to pass funding bills.

Oklahoma City showed us our neighbors are Federal workers trying to do the best job possible. Playing politics with their lives while exempting Congress and their staff from any pain is the most demoralizing act imaginable.

Stop the book tours and get to work on the huge backlog of appropriations bills. And don't pay yourselves until you do. That's what my bill proposes. Please back it.

A MESSAGE FROM CONSTITUENTS

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I also was home this weekend and also for the entire month of August, and being home for the entire month of August, it really hit me about what is wrong with Washington, DC. There is such a disconnect between the inside-the-beltway-mentality and out-side-the-beltway-mentality that I found it absolutely staggering.

No sooner had I left Washington, DC, and touched down in my district than I started hearing day in and day out that people in my district and, in fact, my

friends and colleagues from across America, continue to report that Americans want us to move and act on the mandate that was handed to us on November 8, 1994, and that mandate is to balance the budget, to cut taxes, to cut spending, to cut regulations, to cut out bureaucracies, and make sweeping changes that will reform the welfare state and change the welfare state, where we stop encouraging reckless behavior and we start encouraging productivity and hard work.

I held 30 townhall meetings and had over 100 other meetings and countless TV and radio talk shows. Again, the clear message, the resounding message that I heard time and time again, was make something happen in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, up here when you are in Washington, if you talk about just cutting the increase of spending on a Federal program, they call you a radical. They say that it is going to have a devastating impact; that you are out of touch with America.

Let me tell you something: You ain't out of touch with America when you talk about radically downsizing the Federal Government. You are out of touch with lobbyists, you are out of touch with special interest groups, you are out of touch with bureaucrats, and you are out of touch with a national press corps that still does not get it, that still believes that the unprecedented congressional landslide on November 8, 1994, was a fluke, and somehow it is just going to go away.

Let me tell you something: It ain't going away. It is here to stay. Americans do not trust the Federal Government to micromanage every single part of their lives.

One year ago President Clinton sent Congress home, and when they came back, they brought in the message, "Your health care reform bill is dead on arrival. Americans do not want socialized medicine."

Well, let me tell you something: We came home to our districts this time, and the American people came to us, and they are not saying that you are moving too fast; they are saying that you are not moving fast enough. They say make something happen.

Now, we have made quite a bit of progress. The Wall Street Journal and congressional historians say that this Congress has done more in 8 months than any other Congress since Reconstruction, since the 1870's, in over a century. We are not the imperial Congress that we were a year ago when the Democrats ruled this House, when Tom Foley was Speaker of the House. This Congress passed the Shays Act, so now Congress has to abide by the same laws as the rest of the country has to abide by. This Congress cut committee staff by one-third. This Congress passed term limits on committee chairmen so we do not have little empires inside of this Congress. This Congress passed term limits on the Speaker of the House. This Congress passed a ban on

proxy voting. And this Congress, I am sure, will have no problem with also passing a ban on lobbyist gifts, if it comes up at the appropriate time and place.

We have a challenge before us. I really think you would be hard-pressed to find a time in recent American history where this Congress was going to deal with as many important issues as we will be dealing with in the next 1 or 2 months.

We have an opportunity to do something this Congress has not done in 40 years: balance the budget. We have an opportunity to save Medicare. The trustees say it is going bankrupt. Almost half of the Congress is sticking their head in the sand and saying "Let's just hope it goes away," and the other half is daring to make a difference. Let us dare to make a difference on Medicare and save senior citizens from the pain that they will experience if we do nothing.

Let us pass tough welfare reform. Forget what the lobbyists and special interests say. Americans want tough welfare reform. We cannot be cowards; we have to be bold. We have to step forward and make a difference with the mandate that was given to us.

I will once again quote Bobby Kennedy, who in 1966 in Johannesburg, South Africa, said, "The future does not belong to those who are content with today, apathetic toward common problems and their fellow man alike, timid and fearful in the face of new ideas and bold projects. Rather it will belong to those who can blend vision, reason and courage in a personal commitment to the ideals and great enterprises in American society."

Today I make that commitment to make a difference, to make something happen, and boldly move into the 21st century with the values that created this country and Republic over 200 years ago.

THE GIFT BAN AND LOBBYING REFORM PROVISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is a House that is in need of repair. After decades of withstanding the heavy reins of special interests, lobbyists and gifts, our House has truly suffered. Our structure is not sound, and this once great institution is in danger of collapse. Today in fact, and my colleague who spoke a minute ago, I would say to him that today, we have an opportunity in this House. We have a historic opportunity to begin to rebuild this institution by passing gift and lobbying reform.

I think if there is anything that the American people want to see is that the Congress of the United States begins to live their lives the way working middle-class families in this country have got to live their lives. The Amer-

ican public strongly favors banning gifts from lobbyists to Members of Congress, and so do I. Perks and privileges demean this institution and every single person who serves here. That is not why we were elected to these offices. We are here to do the people's work, and we are well compensated for that. We do not need free vacations, free frequent flyer miles, free gifts, or free meals to sweeten the deal. Those working middle-class families that I talked about a moment ago, they are not getting anything free. They are paying and paying and paying. They are not able to keep their heads above water, and they are frightened to death of what is going to happen to themselves and to their families. For the first time in this country, that American dream is no longer there. Families are concerned that their kids are not going to get the same benefits and the same advantages that they have had.

We do need to enforce disclosure by lobbyists. The American people have the right to know what legislation these groups are attempting to influence and how much money they are spending on those efforts. I remind my colleagues that it has been the House that has traditionally led lobbying and gift reform efforts in the Congress. It is high time that we tackle these issues and join our colleagues in the other body in implementing serious gift and lobby reform. Some of us have already instituted a no-gift policy in our offices, because we feel so strongly about this. I can speak from experience; it is not that difficult to just say no to lobbyists.

Because the Republican leadership has repeatedly told us that the schedule for this season is full, this vote today will probably be our last chance to pass lobby and gift reform this year. Let us seize the opportunity to limit the influence of special interests on Congress once and for all. Let us take a definitive step to really reforming this institution.

So I urge my colleagues today to join me and others who are speaking here this morning to join us in this effort to defeat the previous question on the rule in order that the American people know once and for all that we are serious about repairing this House of Representatives. It is time to shore up these walls, to rebuild this institution. Let it be reflective of the people's interests, and not reflective of the special interests.

SUPPORT LOBBY REFORM

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in strong support of lobby reform measures which have already been adopted by the other body. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] for calling this special order to address this very

serious matter which should be a legislative priority in this House, because as you have just heard from the gentleman from Connecticut, it strikes at the very heart of what reform is supposed to be all about.

One of the first statements I made on this House floor last January was a support of House Resolution 40, which seeks to ban gifts to Members and staff from lobbyists and lobbying firms. This legislation would ban all meals, entertainment, travel, legal defense fund contributions and other gifts. It would get at the question of these weekend junkets to so-called charity tournaments.

I have personally pledged to follow the provisions of this gift ban whether or not it passes, and I have been doing so. The gift ban that 47 other Members and I have signed is far more stringent than the other body's proposal, and I still hope that other Members of this body will follow our lead by signing the gift ban. However, adopting the other body's proposal would be a strong first step, and it would tell the American people that we are serious about reforming the way the Congress operates, and that we are serious about restoring accountability to this House.

□ 1300

Our counterparts in the other body have taken appropriate action and have passed the much needed gift ban and lobbying reform measures which ban gifts to Members and staff. However, as of today, the House has not voted to limit the value of gifts that a Member or staff can receive to \$100 a year. This House voted not to limit individual gifts, including meals, to \$50. This House has voted not to prohibit Members from accepting free travel to charity events such as golf and ski trips.

This House has not voted to narrowly define exactly what constitutes a lobbyist and require lobbyists to receive at least \$5,000 from any one client to register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate. These are things that this House has not done but needs to do.

In his State of the Union Message, President Clinton stated that what we do not need is a law for everything, and I agree with that, but, Mr. Speaker, today we have been given clear and convincing evidence that not all Members will take these actions voluntarily. I think, therefore, that we must enact proper legislation for those who are unwilling to do it on their own.

The time is long overdue for the House to pass real lobbying reform and gift ban measures and restore the people's trust in this body. The legislation passed in the other body is a strong first step and we should follow that example. I hope that this afternoon, when the amendment is offered, it will be ruled in order. I hope that with the rule not including the opportunity to offer this amendment, that the rule will be defeated. Now is the time for

meaningful lobbying reform and gift ban, and I hope that we can take this time to do it.

INFLUENCE OF LOBBYISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is quite invigorating to see Members of Congress coming back from time in their districts. It is as if they have gotten a breath of fresh air of reality every once in a while. And I guess that is the best thing about Members of Congress going back to their districts. They leave the stifling air of Washington, where people start believing their own lies, and they go and really touch base with the real people who make this country operate, not those of us that stay within the beltway.

I have to say, though, it is sort of interesting to see how fired up Members are at this time and then watch how it tapers off. I was quite interested in the gentlewoman from Colorado stating that somehow this Congress is not moving its budget agenda along quick enough, and that how previous Congresses had done it so much more quickly. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wish to point out that the fact is, yes, previous Congresses have moved along the budget, but when you move garbage fast, it is still garbage. An unbalanced budget is an unbalanced budget.

We may be taking a little more time because we are doing something that has not been done in too long a period, and that is we are going to have a balanced budget design for the next 7 years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about influence of lobbyists here in Congress. But I was here a year ago, and now I am here as a Member of Congress, and there is a big difference, and I want the members of the public to understand. You watch what is said and talked about here on the floor, but it is what happens off this floor that you really have to be aware of.

Those of you that are in the gallery, if you come down on this floor now you do not see the floor lined with lobbyists, you do not see Members of Congress having to run a gauntlet of influence peddlers trying to get to a Congress Member before they vote because the new majority, the new Republican majority has done what the Democratic majority refused to do for 40 years: Tell the lobbyists to get off this floor and leave it for legislation.

So all this talk about reducing the influence of lobbyists I think sounds great on the floor, but actions speak louder than words. And for those who want to come to Washington to see the difference, as a citizen I was shocked at how many lobbyists were on this floor a year ago. And as a legislator I am proud of what NEWT GINGRICH and the

leadership with Mr. ARMEY has done to make sure we straighten this out.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an edition of Surfer Magazine that was given to me by a surfer, \$35. It was a gift because they wanted me to read the environmental issues that surfers are concerned about. At the same time, a political action committee can donate almost \$10,000 to me politically every cycle. For the minority, the Democratic Party, to sit and say they want to limit the influence of lobbyists and special interests by talking about what kind of gifts we can take, when they are actively protecting the right of special interest groups to load money up into political action committees and drop thousands of dollars on us that an individual could not do, I think is really cynical.

I will leave this challenge to the new minority: That if you really wanted to limit the influence of special interest groups, let us support the Wamp Congress Act, ZACH WAMP's proposal, which means a political action committee can only give as much as an individual can give.

Let us empower individuals to influence Congress as much as we empower the political action committees and the special interest groups. Let us have the guts to really talk about it. You talk about the donation to this Member, but the fact is that \$10,000 around being pumped into a Member has a hell of a lot more influence than what anything we are talking about. I do not play golf, so I am not worried about this issue, but I do worry about the influence of political action committees.

I call on you to join with Members on both sides of the aisle in limiting the level of contributions that political action committee can make, and make it equal to what an individual citizen of the United States can make to a Member of Congress. Let us raise the individual contribution to \$2,000 for an individual and let us lower the political action committee's contribution to \$2,000, and then we can talk about what kind of influence the political action committees and the lobbyists have on this Congress.

We have cleared this floor of the lobbyists, let us clear the air. Let us not be self-righteous at this time and talk about a contribution from a surfing magazine. Let us talk about the thousands of dollars that political action committees pump into our campaigns, and let us all work together to limit that and encourage individual contributions, individual influence, not lobbyists' influence, not PAC influence.

LOBBY REFORM AND A GIFT BAN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to accept the challenge of the

last speaker, the gentleman from California. If he does not see enough lobbyists on the floor of this Congress or at the edges of this Congress, it is because in too many cases this new Republican Congress, instead of moving along fast enough, has moved along too slowly and has actually turned over the operation of some of the key parts of this Congress to the lobbyists.

In one case, in which I personally observed, the staff attorney for our committee was unable to respond to questions from members of the committee without turning over his shoulder and getting the answers from the lobbyists for the bill that was under consideration.

In one committee, the new Republican majority staff actually turned over computers, paid for with public expense, to the lobbyists who were writing the legislation. In another committee, a Republican lobbyist actually took the dais along with the Members of Congress that were considering the measure.

In fact, it has gotten so bad, a recent column in the Wall Street Journal was entitled "Special Interest or Feasting at the Congressional Trough." It is because we have not made enough progress in controlling lobby domination of this Congress and continued to not have sufficient change in this Congress that it is important today that opportunity has actually knocked a second time.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the leadership, to the continued leadership of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], who spoke a few minutes earlier, we will have an opportunity today to consider again lobby reform and a gift ban. The first time that opportunity knocked at this Congress was that old Congress last year, and the Congress responded at that time in a bipartisan response, almost a three to one vote, in favor of a gift ban backed by Congressman BRYANT.

Today we will have an opportunity to consider a similar measure as opportunity knocks a second time. It is time that this Congress accepted that opportunity; and, indeed, Members on both sides of the aisle have said they want a gift ban. In October 1994, last year, on "Meet the Press." then-Congressman NEWT GINGRICH said, I quote, "I am prepared to pass a bill that bans lobbyists from dealing with Members of Congress in terms of gifts."

Unfortunately, Mr. GINGRICH did not say when he was prepared to pass that bill, but the when should be now. It should be today.

Since 1994, the Senate has, this summer, approved the very type of gift ban measure that it killed last year. It has approved a measure to plug the loopholes in an almost 50 year old lobby registration act, and it has approved a gift ban that is quite similar to that that Congressman BRYANT offered last year. It is long past time, in view of that Senate action, for this House to

act and send a message to those who come bearing gifts and bearing golf junkets, that things have really, in fact, changed in this Congress.

It is time to let the people back home, whom we represent, know that our standard of integrity is high and that we are committed to seriously and diligently working to support the public interest, not just the interest with the person who has got the largest charge limit on their gold card.

Yes, Congressman GINGRICH said he was prepared to pass a gift ban, but where is Speaker GINGRICH on this issue? Well, we need look no further than the words again on "Meet the Press" in July, just after the Senate passed the measure this summer of the Republican majority leader DICK ARMEY, and he said, and I quote:

I intend to get a gift ban as soon as we can, but we are going to attend to the Nation's business first. When we have an opportunity, when there is room on the schedule, I want that up, but I am not sure I will find time this year.

I would submit that the gentleman has got the priorities all backward. How is it that we are ever going to get to a fair consideration of the Nation's business unless we have reformed our lobby and gift provisions to assure that the Nation's business is really the business of the people of this country rather than the special interests who have enjoyed too much power here in the Nation's Capital.

Yes, these Republican leaders talk and talk of gift ban and lobby reform, but it seems that all we hear is the whistle of some day. Some day over the rainbow they will get around to really taking action and doing something about meaningful gift ban and lobby reform. I believe that we do not need to go down the yellow brick road with them. What we need to do is to act today, and we will have an opportunity this evening, a second opportunity to do something about the gift ban.

As a new Member of this House, I am committed to constructive change, and my main complaint about the Republican majority, when it comes to the way this House operates, is not that they have changed too much the operation of the House, but they have changed too little. They have never really gotten to grips with the matter of campaign finance reform, lobby reform, or gift ban reform. They are setting the agenda. There is no reason that those items could not have been considered. Indeed, some of us sought to have them considered on the very first day of this Congress.

The time for action is now on meaningful gift ban and lobby reform. Let us get about the public's business.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. WISE. Welcome back, Mr. Speaker. First day of Congress everybody is back. Kind of like the first day of school, bringing your book bag, your pencils, your agenda, our schedule for the upcoming semester, but there is one problem. You look at the schedule and the schedule does not reflect what you may have heard in the district about what people think ought to be done.

You know, while I was home and participating in town meetings, and particularly a lot of talk shows, there are two questions that came up a lot. Why is there going to be a train wreck, and when the train wreck comes on October 1, because the Federal budget has not been approved and the 137 appropriation bills have not been approved, what is going to happen? That is No. 1. And No. 2 is, when is there going to be some real congressional reform?

Two questions: Why is there going to be a train wreck and when is there going to be true congressional reform?

What is going to be the first bill that this House takes up today to deal with that? It does not deal with the train wreck and it does not deal with congressional reform. The one bill that is going to pass and get sent to the President is a bill that keeps Congress operating. To heck with the rest of the Federal Government, to heck with law enforcement, to heck with the veterans, to heck with sending out the Social Security checks, the heck with health care, the heck with all of that. Keep Congress operating. Keep the Congress budget intact. That is the bill that is being brought to the floor today by the Republican representative illusionary leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I think that people think that Congress ought to stand in line with everybody else, and then if there is going to be a shutdown in Government, Congress ought to be affected in the same way that everybody else is, not putting itself ahead. However, that is bad enough, but if we could make it better, at least attach lobby reform.

I have been interested to hear some of the new Members from the other side of the aisle come down and talk about how they felt lobby reform was important or was not important. They failed to point out that last year lobby reform passed on this House and, as I recall, twice in a bipartisan majority, and sent over to the Senate where it was filibustered by Republican Members.

Let us give the Senate credit this time. They passed lobby reform about a month ago, 98 to zip. That is right, 98 to zero: lobby reform, banning gifts from lobbyists, reining in and stopping the free trips, the junkets and those types of things. They passed it.

What about this House of Representatives? They will not let it be on this

bill. If we are going to vote, to put Congress first and make sure Congress does not have to shut down and take the same lumps that the rest of the Federal Government and the rest of the public does, at least give the public lobby reform. Let us vote on lobby reform today. It is very easy and it is very, very simple. Ban the trips, ban the gifts, ban the free meals.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the lobby reform pledge. I have voluntarily taken on and agreed to abide by the provisions of the lobby reform package, even though it is not the law. This House can do the same thing today. Therefore, I would just call upon the Republican leadership and the Speaker, first of all, to schedule something else. Get some other bills moving that mean something to the public besides Congress' appropriation.

The second thing: If we are going to bring Congress' appropriation to the floor today, please put lobby reform on it. End the free trips, end the junkets, end the meals, end the guests, end the bad perception. Bring some reform to this Congress.

Finally, third, if I could just get time for one more, Mr. Speaker, could we do campaign finance reform? We have heard a lot of talk about it. There was a great handshake out there in New Hampshire 8 to 10 months ago; but how about real campaign finance reform to make it easier for challengers? I voluntarily agreed to limit the campaign spending that I do. I voluntarily take the voluntary campaign pledge that our Secretary of State in West Virginia issues every election season. Congress, though, ought to be willing to pass this for the entire country, and so make it easier for challengers, make it easier for the public, and make sure that the money chase ends.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just urge the Members today, do not make the first thing Congress does when it comes back into session to pass its own bill for its own appropriation to feather its own nest. If we are going to do that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge, please let us have lobby reform: End the trips, end the junkets, end the free meals, and finally begin to restore some faith in this congressional system, and particularly, in this House of Representatives.

COMMENDING HILLARY CLINTON AND MADELEINE ALBRIGHT FOR STRONG STATEMENTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS DURING THE U.N. FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this very important day. I rise to commend First Lady Hillary Clinton and our Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Madeleine Albright, for the strong statements

that they made at the U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women. Mr. Speaker, I rise as one who opposed Beijing as the venue for this important conference. I still think it was a most unfortunate choice.

I rise as one who does not think that the United Nations has been strong enough in enforcing its own rules in terms of open participation for women in the conference. The United Nations did not do enough, whether we are talking about the accreditation of women from Taiwan and Tibet, or women who are concerned about women's and human rights in those countries. The United Nations did not do enough in regard to people that the Chinese just did not want into that conference because their countries recognize Taiwan; for example, the representatives from Niger.

However, Mr. Speaker, what I really want to call to the attention of our colleagues are the strong statements made by the two leaders of our delegation. I strongly supported a high-powered delegation to the Beijing conference. I strenuously opposed the attendance by First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton. I did so because I thought it was not possible for her to attend the conference and make the strong statement that she made.

Indeed, Hillary Rodham Clinton's statements, are the strongest statements made on human rights in China, in Asia, and in the world by this administration to date. I am very, very proud that the women of the Clinton administration are taking such a strong stand on this very important issue.

The First Lady, in Beijing, very courageously stood up and broke the silence on sterilization and forced abortions in a country where that is the policy. Therefore, I say in the spirit of commendation to the First Lady and to Ambassador Albright that when they said they would not mince words when they went to China, that they would make the statements that would be necessary, they, indeed, did. I commend them for that.

It is shameful, I think, that such an important conference on the rights of women and the economic future of women and families was held in a country with such an appalling human rights record. The strong statements of these members of the U.S. delegation made it clear that our Nation must not waiver from its commitment to personal and political freedom to equal rights and equal opportunity.

The First Lady, in her remarks, was eloquent in her defense of the principles of women's rights and human rights, and she spent a great deal of her time talking about how advancing women's rights would strengthen families throughout the world. She emphasized how that strengthening families, building families, was what was important in strengthening societies throughout the world.

The First Lady reaffirmed and supported the conference's main themes of economic and educational opportunity, health care, and protecting women against violence. Again, the First Lady and the Ambassador did not mince words of protest over repression, ignorance, abuse, and torture while the Chinese Government looked on. We have been told that the Chinese Government has not reported on the First Lady's speech, but we do know that the word will get out.

As one who has opposed the First Lady's attendance, I want to commend her for her outstanding courage for breaking the silence on human rights in China, for breaking the silence on sterilization and forced abortion in China. There are many in this body who opposed the conference itself. I do not include myself among them, because I believe that the conference is a very important one. I think that some of those who opposed the conference and opposed the First Lady's attendance did so because of China's forced abortion policy.

I look forward to working with those colleagues, as some of us have been working together in the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations of the Committee on Appropriations and in other committees of this House, to improve the lot of the women in the world by improving their health. The First Lady talked about women's health, she talked about violence against women, she talked about child survival, she talked about the spread of AIDS and how rapidly it is spreading among women in the developing countries.

I look forward to continuing my work with our colleagues on this subject, and certainly working with the Clinton administration on those areas where more common ground has now been laid by the First Lady, and where more opportunity has been presented by this very important conference which called attention to these issues.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to place into the RECORD the two statements, by First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton to the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, and the remarks before the World Health Organization, as well as the statement of our Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador Madeleine Albright. She was a great participant in the conference, she represented our country very excellently, as she always does. I am very pleased to put Ambassador Albright's very strong statement on human rights, indeed, basic freedoms for all people, men and women, in the RECORD of this Congress.

The material referred to follows:

AMBASSADOR MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT, U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS—REMARKS TO THE FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN

BEIJING INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CENTER, BEIJING, CHINA, SEPTEMBER 6, 1995

Honored guests, fellow delegates and observers, I am pleased and proud to address this historic conference on behalf of the United States of America.

My government congratulates the thousands who have helped to organize the conference, to draft the Platform for Action, to inform the world about the subjects under discussion here and to encourage wide participation both by governments and NGO's.

We have come here from all over the world to carry forward an age-old struggle: the pursuit of economic and social progress for all people, based on respect for the dignity and value of each.

We are here to promote and protect human rights and to stress that women's rights are neither separable nor different from those of men.

We are here to stop sexual crimes and other violence against women; to protect refugees, so many of whom are women; and to end the despicable notion—in this era of conflicts—that rape is just another tactic of war.

We are here to empower women by enlarging their role in making economic and political decisions, an idea some find radical, but which my government believes is essential to economic and social progress around the world; because no country can develop if half its human resources are de-valued or repressed.

We are here because we want to strengthen families, the heart and soul of any society. We believe that girls must be valued to the same degree as boys. We believe, with Pope John Paul II, in the "equality of spouses with respect to family rights". We think women and men should be able to make informed judgments as they plan their families. And we want to see forces that weaken families—including pronography, domestic violence and the sexual exploitation of children—condemned and curtailed.

Finally, we have come to this conference to assure for women equal access to education and health care, to help women protect against infection by HIV, to recognize the special needs and strengths of women with disabilities, and to attack the root causes of poverty, in which so many women, children and men are entrapped.

We have come to Beijing to make further progress towards each of these goals. But real progress depend not on what we say here, but on what we do after we leave her. The Fourth World Conference for Women is not about conversations; it is about commitments.

For decades, my nation has led efforts to promote equal rights for women. Women in their varied roles—as moshers, farm laborers, factory workers, organizers and community leaders helped build America. My government is based on principles that recognize the right of every person to equal rights and equal opportunity. Our laws forbid discrimination on the basis of sex and we work hard to enforce those laws. A rich network of non-governmental organizations has blossomed within our borders, reaching out to women and girls from all segments of society, educating, counseling and advocating change.

The United States is a leader, but leaders cannot stand still. Barriers to the equal participation of women persist in my country. The Clinton Administration is determined to bring those barriers down.

Today, in the spirit of this conference, and in the knowledge that concrete steps to advance the status of women are required in every nation, I am pleased to announce the new commitments my government will undertake:

First, President Clinton will establish a White House Council on Women to plan for the effective implementation within the United States of the Platform for Action. That Council will build on the commitments made today and will work every day with the nongovernmental community.

Second, in accordance with recently-approved law, the Department of Justice will launch a six-year, \$1.6 billion initiative to fight domestic violence and other crimes against women. Funds will be used for specialized police and prosecution units and to train police, prosecutors and judicial personnel.

Third, our Department of Health and Human Services will lead a comprehensive assault on threats to the health and security of women—promoting healthy behavior, increasing awareness about AIDS, discouraging the use of cigarettes, and striving to win the battle against breast cancer.

And, as Mrs. Clinton made clear yesterday, the United States remains firmly committed to the reproductive health rights gains made in Cairo.

Fourth, our Department of Labor will conduct a grassroots campaign to improve conditions for women in the workplace. The campaign will work with employers to develop more equitable pay and promotion policies and to help employees balance the twin responsibilities of family and work.

Fifth, our Department of the Treasury will take new steps to promote access to financial credit for women. Outstanding U.S. microenterprise lending organizations will be honored through special Presidential awards and we will improve coordination of federal efforts to encourage growth in this field of central importance to the economic empowerment of women.

Sixth, the Agency for International Development will continue to lead in promoting and recognizing the vital role of women in development. Today, we announce important initiatives to increase women's participation in political processes and to promote the enforcement of women's legal rights.

There is a seventh and final commitment my country is making today. We, the people and government of the United States of America, will continue to speak out openly and without hesitation on behalf of the human rights of all people.

My country is proud that, nearly, a half century ago, Eleanor Roosevelt, a former First Lady of the United States, helped draft the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We are proud that, yesterday afternoon, in this very hall, our current First Lady—Hillary Rodham Clinton—re-stated with memorable eloquence our national commitment to that Declaration.

The Universal Declaration reflects spiritual and moral tenets which are central to all cultures, encompassing both the wondrous diversity that defines us and the common humanity that binds us. It obliges each government to strive in law and practice to protect the rights of those under its jurisdiction. Whether a government fulfills that obligation is a matter not simply of domestic, but of universal, concern. For it is a funding principle of the United Nations that no government can hide its human rights record from the world.

At the heart of the Universal Declaration is a fundamental distinction between coercion and choice.

No woman—whether in Birmingham, Bombay, Beirut or Beijing—should be forcibly sterilized or forced to have an abortion.

No mother should feel compelled to abandon her daughter because of a societal preference for males.

No woman should be forced to undergo genital mutilation, or to become a prostitute, or to enter into marriage or to have sex.

No one should be forced to remain silent for fear of religious or political persecution, arrest, abuse or torture.

All of us should be able to exercise control over the course of our own lives and be able to help shape the destiny of our communities and countries.

Let us be clear. Freedom to participate in the political process of our countries is the inalienable right of every woman and man. Deny that right, and you deny everything.

It is unconscionable, therefore, that the right to free expression has been called into question right here, at a conference conducted under the auspices of the UN and whose very purpose is the free and open discussion of women's rights.

And it is a challenge to us all that so many countries in so many parts of the world—north, south, west and east—fall far short of the noble objectives outlined in the Platform for Action.

Every nation, including my own, must do better and do more—to make equal rights a fundamental principle of law; to enforce those rights and to remove barriers to the exercise of those rights.

That is why President Clinton has made favorable action on the Convention to Eliminate Discrimination Against Women a top priority. The United States should be a party to that Convention.

And it is why we will continue to seek a dialogue with governments—here and elsewhere—that deny to their citizens the rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration.

In preparing for this conference, I came across an old Chinese poem that is worth recalling, especially today, as we observe the Day of the Girl-Child. In the poem, a father says to his daughter:

We keep a dog to watch the house,

A pig is useful, too,

We keep a cat to catch a mouse,

But what can we do with a girl like you?

Fellow delegates, let us make sure that question never needs to be asked again—in China or anywhere else around the world.

Let us strive for the day when every young girl, in every village and metropolis, can look ahead with confidence that their lives will be valued, their individually recognized, their rights protected and their futures determined by their own abilities and character.

Let us reject outright the forces of repression and ignorance that have held us back; and act with the strength and optimism unity can provide.

Let us honor the legacy of the heroines, famous and unknown who struggled in years past to build the platform upon which we now stand.

And let us heed the instruction of our own lives. Look around this hall, and you will see women who have reached positions of owner and authority. Go to Huairou, and you will see an explosion of energy and intelligence devoted to every phase of struggle. Enter any community in any country, and you will find women insisting—often at great risk—on their right to an equal voice and equal access to the levers of power.

This past week, on video at the NGO Forum, Aung San Suu Kyi, said that "it is time to apply in the arena of the world the wisdom and experience" women have gained.

Let us all agree; it is time. It is time to turn bold talk into concrete action.

It is time to unleash the full capacity for production, accomplishment and the enrichment of life that is inherent to us—the women of the world.

Thank you very much.

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON—REMARKS FOR THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION FORUM ON WOMEN AND HEALTH SECURITY

BEIJING, CHINA, SEPTEMBER 5, 1995

Thank you, Dr. Nakajima.

Dr. Nakajima, Dr. Sadik, Gertrude Mongella, delegates to the Fourth U.N. Conference on Women, and guests from all corners of the world, I am honored to be here

this morning among women and men who are committed to improving the health of women and girls everywhere.

I commend the World Health Organization for making women's health a top priority and for establishing the Global Commission on Women's Health.

I am proud that in the preparatory meeting for this Fourth World Conference on Women, the United States took the lead in highlighting the importance of a comprehensive approach to women's health. That approach builds on actions taken at previous women's conferences and the recent conferences at Cairo and Copenhagen, whose goals to promote the health and well-being of all people were endorsed by 180 nations.

Cairo was particularly significant as governmental and non-governmental participants worked together to craft a Program for Action which, among other things, calls for universal access to good quality reproductive health care services, including safe, effective, voluntary family planning; greater access to education and health care; more responsibility on the part of men in sexual and reproductive health and childbearing; and reduction of wasteful resource consumption.

Here at this conference, improving girls and women's health is a priority of the draft Platform for Action. It includes such goals as: Access to universal primary health care for all people—a goal not yet achieved in many countries, including my own. The promotion of breast feeding. The provision of safe drinking water and sanitation. Research in and attention to women's health issues, including: environmental hazards, prevention of HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, encouragement for adolescents to postpone sexual activity and childbearing, and discouragement of cultural traditions and customs that deny food and health care to girls and women.

Goals such as these illustrate a new commitment to the well-being of girls and women and a belief in their rights to live up to their own God-given potentials.

At long last, people and their governments everywhere are beginning to understand that investing in the health of women and girls is as important to the prosperity of nations as investing in the development of open markets and trade. The health of women and girls cannot be divorced from progress on other economic and social issues.

Scientists, doctors, nurses, community leaders and women themselves are working to improve and safeguard the health of women and families all over the world. If we join together as a global community, we can lift up the health and dignity of all women and their families in the remaining years of the 20th century and on into the next millennium.

Yet, for all the promise the future holds, we also know that many barriers lie in our way. For too long, women have been denied access to health care, education, economic opportunities, legal protection and human rights—all of which are used as building blocks for a healthy and productive life.

In too many places today, the health of women and families is compromised by inadequate, inaccessible and unaffordable medical care, lack of sanitation, unsafe drinking water, poor nutrition, insufficient research and education about women's health issues, and coercive and abusive sexual practices.

In too many places, the status of woman's health is a picture of human suffering and pain. The faces in that picture are of girls and women who, but for the grace of God or the accident of birth, could be us or one of our sisters, mothers or daughters.

Today, at least fifteen percent of pregnant women suffer life threatening complications and more than one-half million women

around the world die in childbirth. Most of those deaths could be prevented with basic primary, reproductive and emergency obstetric health care. In some places, there are 175,000 motherless children for every one million families. Many of those children don't survive. And of those who do, many are recruited into a life of exploitation on the streets of our world's cities, subjected daily to abuse, indignity, disease, and the specter of early death.

There must be a renewed commitment to improving maternal health. The WHO launched in 1987 a Safe Motherhood Initiative to halve maternal mortality by the year 2000. To reach that goal, more attention must be paid to emergency medical care as well as primary prenatal care. Providing emergency obstetric care is a relatively cheap way of saving lives—and along with family planning services is among the most cost effective interventions in even the poorest of countries.

The commitment of the WHO and its Global Commission on Women's Health to make childbearing and childbirth a safe and healthy period of every woman's life deserves action on the part of every nation represented here.

One hundred million women cannot obtain or are not using family planning services because they are poor, uneducated or lack access to care. Twenty million of these women will seek unsafe abortions—some will die, some will be disabled for life. A growing number of unwanted pregnancies are occurring among young women, barely beyond childhood themselves. As we know, when children have children, the chances of schooling, jobs, and good health is reduced for both parent and child. And our progress as a human family takes another step back.

The Cairo document recognizes "the basic right of all couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number, spacing and timing of their children and to have the information and means to do so." Women should have the right to health care that will enable them to go safely through pregnancy and childbirth and provide them with the best chance of having a healthy infant.

Women and men must also have the right to make those most intimate of all decisions free of discrimination, coercion and violence, particularly any coercive practices that force women into abortions or sterilizations.

On these issues, the US supports the provisions in the Beijing Platform for Action that reaffirm consensus language that was agreed to at the Cairo Conference about a year ago. It declared that "in no case should abortion be promoted as a method of family planning." The Platform asks governments "to strengthen their commitment to women's health, to deal with the health impact of unsafe abortion as a major public health concern and to reduce the recourse to abortion through expanded and improved family planning services."

Violence against women remains a leading cause of death among girls and women between the ages of 14 and 44—violence from ethnic and religious conflicts, crime in the streets and brutality in the home. For women who survive the violence, what often awaits them is a life of unrelenting physical and emotional pain that destroys their capacity for mothering, homemaking or working and can lead to substance abuse, and even suicide.

Violence against girls and women goes beyond the beatings, rape, killings and forced prostitution that arise from poverty, wars and domestic conflicts. Every day, more than 5,000 young girls are forced to endure the brutal practice of genital mutilation. The procedure is painful and life-threatening. It is degrading. And it is a violation of

the physical integrity of a woman's body, leaving a lifetime of physical and emotional scars.

HIV, AIDS, and sexually transmitted diseases threaten more and more women—and experts predict that by the end of this decade more than half of the people in the world with HIV will be women. AIDS, which threatens whole families and regions, demands the strongest possible response. Governments and the international community must address head-on the growing number of women who are being infected.

More than 700,000 women worldwide face breast cancer each year—and over 300,000 die of it. It's the leading cause of death for women in their prime in the developed world. In the time I speak to you today, 25 women around the world will die of breast cancer. In my own country, it is hard to find a family, an office, or a neighborhood that has not been touched by this disease. My mother-in-law struggled against breast cancer for four years before losing her battle.

Tobacco use is the number one preventable cause of death. Ninety percent of women who smoke began to smoke as adolescents—leading to high rates of heart disease, cancer, and chronic lung disease later in life.

As the WHO points out, we also need to recognize and effectively address the fact that women are far more likely to be exposed to work-related and environmental health hazards. Policies to alleviate and eliminate such health hazards associated with work in the home and in the workplace demand action.

Research also indicates that certain communicable diseases affect women in greater numbers. Tuberculosis, for example, is responsible for the deaths of one million women each year and those in their early and reproductive years are most vulnerable.

When health care systems around the world don't work for women: when our mothers, daughters, sisters, friends and coworkers are denied access to quality care because they are poor, do not have health insurance, or simply because they are women, it is not just their health that is put at risk. It is the health of their families and communities as well.

Like many nations, the United States brings to this conference a serious commitment to improving women's health. We bring with us a series of initiatives which represent the first steps to carrying out this Conference's Platform for Action.

We are continuing to work for health care reform to ensure that every citizen has access to affordable, quality care.

We are proposing a comprehensive and coordinated plan to reduce smoking by children and adolescents by 50 percent.

We are working to address the many factors that contribute to teenage pregnancy, our most serious social problems, by encouraging abstinence and personal responsibility on the part of young men and women; improving access to health care and family planning services; and supporting health education in our schools.

We are pursuing a public policy agenda on HIV/AIDS that is specific to women, adolescents, and children.

We are continuing to fund and conduct contraceptive research and development.

We are addressing the health needs of women through initiatives such as:

The National Action Plan on Breast Cancer—a public, private partnership working with all agencies of government, the media, scientific organizations, advocacy groups and industry to advance breast health and eradicate breast cancer as a threat to the lives of American women.

An Expansion of the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program—

which will ensure that women who need regular screening and detection services have access to them, and that those services meet quality standards.

The inclusion of women in clinical trials for research and testing of drugs or other interventions that probe specific differences between men and women in patterns of disease and reactions to therapy.

The special health needs of older women will be addressed through educational campaigns about osteoporosis, cancer and other diseases.

And the US is conducting the largest clinical research study ever undertaken to examine the major causes of death, disability and frailty in post-menopausal women.

Women's health security must be a priority of all people and governments working together. Without good health, a woman's God-given potential can never be realized. And without healthy women, the world's potential can never be realized.

So let us join together to ensure that every little boy and girl that comes into our world is healthy and wanted, that every young woman has the education and economic opportunity to live a healthy life; and that every woman has access to the health care she needs throughout her life to fulfill her potential in her family, her work, and her community.

If we care about the futures of our daughters, our sons, and the generations that will follow them, we can do nothing less.

Thank you for the work you do every day to bring better health to the women, children, and families of this world. Thank you for helping governments and citizens around the world understand that we cannot talk about equality and social development without also talking about health care.

Most of all, thank you for being part of this historic and vital discussion, which holds so much promise for our future.

FIRST LADY HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON—REMARKS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS FOURTH WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN

BEIJING, CHINA, SEPTEMBER 5, 1995

Mrs. Mongella, distinguished delegates and guests:

I would like to thank the Secretary General of the United Nations for inviting me to be part of the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women. This is truly a celebration—a celebration of the contributions women make in every aspect of life; in the home, on the job, in their communities, as mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, learners, workers, citizens and leaders.

It is also a coming together, much the way women come together every day in every country.

We come together in fields and in factories. In village markets and supermarkets. In living rooms and board rooms.

Whether it is while playing with our children in the park, or washing clothes in a river, or taking a break at the office water cooler, we come together and talk about our aspirations and concerns. And time and again, our talk turns to our children and our families.

However different we may be, there is far more that unites us than divides us. We share a common future. And we are here to find common ground so that we may help bring new dignity and respect to women and girls all over the world—and in so doing, bring new strength and stability to families as well.

By gathering in Beijing, we are focusing world attention on issues that matter most in the lives of women and their families: access to education, health care, jobs, and credit, the chance to enjoy basic legal and

human rights and participate fully in the political life of their countries.

There are some who question the reason for this conference. Let them listen to the voices of women in their homes, neighborhoods, and workplaces.

There are some who wonder whether the lives of women and girls matter to economic and political progress around the globe . . . Let them look at the woman gathered here and at Heirou . . . the homemakers, nurses, teachers, lawyers, policymakers, and women who run their own businesses.

It is conferences like this that compel governments and peoples everywhere to listen, look and face the world's most pressing problems.

Wasn't it after the women's conference in Nairobi ten years ago that the world focused for the first time on the crisis of domestic violence?

Earlier today, I participated in a World Health Organization forum, where government officials, NGOs, and individual citizens are working on ways to address the health problems of women and girls.

Tomorrow, I will attend a gathering of the United Nations Development Fund for Women. There, the discussion will focus on local—and highly successful—programs that give hard-working women access to credit so they can improve their own lives and the lives of their families.

What we are learning around the world is that, if women are healthy and educated, their families will flourish. If women are free from violence, their families will flourish. If women have a chance to work and earn as full and equal partners in society, their families will flourish.

And when families flourish, communities and nations will flourish.

That is why every woman, every man, every child, every family, and every nation on our planet has a stake in the discussion that takes place here.

Over the past 25 years, I have worked persistently on issues relating to women, children and families. Over the past two-and-a-half years, I have had the opportunity to learn more about the challenges facing women in my own country and around the world.

I have met new mothers in Jogyakarta, Indonesia, who come together regularly in their village to discuss nutrition, family planning, and baby care.

I have met working parents in Denmark who talk about the comfort they feel in knowing that their children can be cared for in creative, safe, and nurturing after-school centers.

I have met women in South Africa who helped lead the struggle to end apartheid and are now helping build a new democracy.

I have met with the leading women of the Western Hemisphere who are working every day to promote literacy and better health care for the children of their countries.

I have met women in India and Bangladesh who are taking out small loans to buy milk cows, rickshaws, thread and other materials to create a livelihood for themselves and their families.

I have met doctors and nurses in Belarus and Ukraine who are trying to keep children alive in the aftermath of Chernobyl.

The great challenge of this conference is to give voice to women everywhere whose experiences go unnoticed, whose words go unheard.

Women comprise more than half the world's population. Women are 70 percent of the world's poor, and two-thirds of those who are not taught to read and write.

Women are the primary caretakers for most of the world's children and elderly. Yet

much of the work we do is not valued—not by economists, not by historians, not by popular culture, not by government leaders.

At this very moment, as we sit here, women around the world are giving birth, raising children, cooking meals, washing clothes, cleaning houses, planting crops, working on assembly lines, running companies, and running countries.

Women also are dying from diseases that should have been prevented or treated; they are watching their children succumb to malnutrition caused by poverty and economic deprivation; they are being denied the right to go to school by their own fathers and brothers; they are being forced into prostitution, and they are being barred from the ballot box and the bank lending office.

Those of us who have the opportunity to be here have the responsibility to speak for those who could not.

As an American, I want to speak up for women in my own country—women who are raising children on the minimum wage, women who can't afford health care or child care, women whose lives are threatened by violence, including violence in their own homes.

I want to speak up for mothers who are fighting for good schools, safe neighborhoods, clean air and clean airwaves . . . for older women, some of them widows, who have raised their families and now find that their skills and life experiences are not valued in the workplace . . . for women who are working all night as nurses, hotel clerks, and fast food chefs so that they can be at home during the day with their kids . . . and for women everywhere who simply don't have time to do everything they are called upon to do each day.

Speaking to you today, I speak for them, just as each of us speaks for women around the world who are denied the chance to go to school, or see a doctor, or own property, or have a say about the direction of their lives, simply because they are women.

The truth is that most women around the world work both inside and outside the home, usually by necessity.

We need to understand that there is no formula for how women should lead their lives. That is why we must respect the choices that each woman makes for herself and her family. Every woman deserves the chance to realize her God-given potential.

We also must recognize that women will never gain full dignity until their human rights are respected and protected.

Our goals for this conference, to strengthen families and societies by empowering women to take greater control over their own destinies, cannot be fully achieved unless all governments—here and around the world—accept their responsibility to protect and promote internationally recognized human rights.

The international community has long acknowledged—and recently affirmed at Vienna—that both women and men are entitled to a range of protections and personal freedoms, from the right of personal security to the right to determine freely the number and spacing of the children they bear.

No one should be forced to remain silent for fear of religious or political persecution, arrest, abuse or torture.

Tragically, women are most often the ones whose human rights are violated. Even in the late 20th century, the rape of women continues to be used as an instrument of armed conflict. Women and children make up a large majority of the world's refugees. And when women are excluded from the political process, they become even more vulnerable to abuse.

I believe that, on the eye of a new millennium, it is time to break our silence. It is

time for us to say here in Beijing, and the world to hear, that it is no longer acceptable to discuss women's rights as separate from human rights.

These abuses have continued because, for too long, the history of women has been a history of silence. Even today, there are those who are trying to silence our words.

The voices of this conference and of the women at Hairou must be heard loud and clear:

It is a violation of human rights when babies are denied food, or drowned, or suffocated, or their spines broken, simply because they are born girls.

It is a violation of human rights when women and girls are sold into the slavery of prostitution.

It is a violation of human rights when women are doused with gasoline, set on fire and burned to death because their marriage dowries are deemed too small.

It is a violation of human rights when individual women are raped in their own communities and when thousands of women are subjected to rape as a tactic or prize of war.

It is a violation of human rights when a leading cause of death worldwide among women ages 14 to 44 is the violence they are subjected to in their own homes.

It is a violation of human rights when young girls are brutalized by the painful and degrading practice of genital mutilation.

It is a violation of human rights when women are denied the rights to plan their own families, and that includes being forced to have abortions or being sterilized against their will.

If there is one message that echoes forth from this conference, it is that human rights are women's rights. . . . And women's rights are human rights.

Let us not forget that among those rights are the right to speak freely. And the right to be heard.

Women must enjoy the right to participate fully in the social and political lives of their countries if we want freedom and democracy to thrive and endure.

It is indefensible that many women in non-governmental organizations who wished to participate in this conference have not been able to attend—or have been prohibited from fully taking part.

Let me be clear. Freedom means the right of people to assemble, organize, and debate openly. It means respecting the views of those who may disagree with the views of their governments. It means not taking citizens away from their loved ones and jailing them, mistreating them, or denying them their freedom or dignity because of the peaceful expression of their ideas and opinions.

In my country, we recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage. It took 150 years after the signing of our Declaration of Independence for women to win the right to vote. It took 72 years of organized struggle on the part of many courageous women and men.

It was one of America's most divisive philosophical wars. But it was also a bloodless war. Suffrage was achieved without a shot fired.

We have also been reminded, in V-J Day observances last weekend, of the good that comes when men and women join together to combat the forces of tyranny and build a better world.

We have seen peace prevail in most places for a half century. We have avoided another world war.

But we have not solved older, deeply-rooted problems that continue to diminish the potential of half the world's population.

Now it is time to act on behalf of women everywhere.

If we take bold steps to better the lives of women we will be taking bold steps to better the lives of children and families too. Families rely on mothers and wives for emotional support and care; families rely on women for labor in the home; and increasingly, families rely on women for income needed to raise healthy children and care for other relatives.

As long as discrimination and inequities remain so commonplace around the world—as long as girls and women are valued less, fed less, fed last, overworked, underpaid, not schooled and subjected to violence in and out of their homes—the potential of the human family to create a peaceful, prosperous world will not be realized.

Let this conference be our—and the world's—call to action.

And let us heed the call so that we can create a world in which every woman is treated with respect and dignity, every boy and girl is loved and cared for equally, and every family has the hope of a strong and stable future.

Thank you very much.
God's blessing on you, your work and all who will benefit from it.

THE B-2 BOMBER AND AMERICA'S READINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to address the House of Representatives in this special order on a very important issue that will come before the House tomorrow morning, tomorrow afternoon, when we consider the defense appropriations bill. Since 1980, I have been a strong supporter of the policy of former President Carter and Secretary of Defense Harold Brown in initiating the stealth bomber, the B-2 program.

In the gulf war, we saw with vivid evidence the effectiveness of stealth technology when it was decided to use the F-117's against the most heavily defended targets inside Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The F-117's, without the requirement for jammers and other support aircraft, were able to go in and attack the most heavily defended targets, using 2,000 pound precision-guided munitions. They were able to knock out those radars and surface to air missiles almost instantly, and come back without out pilots being shot down.

I believe that the B-2 bomber is just a bigger and better version of the F-117. It allows us to go five times as far and carry eight times as much conventional munitions and submunitions. With those same 2,000 pounds, it could carry 16, each of which would be independently targetable.

I think the most revolutionary thing about stealth technology is its capability against mobile targets. In a B-2 study that was done by Rand back in 1991, a simulation was used of Saddam Hussein's division, moving from Saudi Arabia into Kuwait. The B-2 was loaded up with sensor-fused weapons. Each B-2 could carry about 1,400 of these submunitions that looks like a puck with a parachute on top when dispensed. With Saddam's division coming

into Kuwait, three B-2's interdicted it, dropped the sensor-fused weapons, and were able to knock out 46 percent of the mechanized vehicles including tanks in that division. That, Mr. Speaker, is a revolutionary conventional capability.

The problem is that every study that has been done on the B-2 indicates that having only 16 of them is simply not enough. The Rand study and the study that was done by Gen. Jasper Welch, stated that somewhere between 40 and 60 are needed. I in fact asked General Powell what he recommended to Dick Cheney, and he said, "I recommended 50."

In my judgment, this is the most important defense decision we will be making in this decade. Seven former Secretaries of Defense wrote President Clinton urging him to procure additional B-2's. We have spent \$44.4 billion to develop the technology for the B-2 bomber. We are now able to get an additional 20 B-2's for about \$15.3 billion. In my mind, that is affordable. If we shut down the line, and if we come back to it in 5 or 10 years and say, "My gosh, we do not have the bombers we need for the future," it will cost \$10 billion just to open the line and we get nothing.

My judgment is that there is another important issue that has been missed by the press. That is the cost of the munitions on these planes. If we have standoff weapons, which the administration supports, on the B-52's and the B-1-B's, first of all, they have no utility against mobile targets. No. 2, is that they cost \$1.2 million per missile, because you have to have long-range missiles. They also cost about \$15 to \$20 billion for a load of them.

The cost of the weapons in the B-2 J-DAMS weapon is \$320,000 for 16 of them, and in my judgment, that is a major difference, one-fourth the cost of one cruise missile and a fraction of the cost of a load of missiles. In a few days of a major conflict, you could pay for the B-2 simply by having these less expensive weapons, either the sensor-fused weapon or the J-DAMS. I think that is a major difference. I also believe, if we had enough B-2's, the potential someday for a conventional deterrent.

What if we had been able to show Saddam that we had this capability and we could have avoided the gulf war? It cost us \$10 billion to move all our forces out to the gulf. Then it cost \$60 billion to prosecute the war, \$70 billion was expended.

□ 1330

The cold war is over, yet we still have threats out there. People say there are no threats. Saddam still exists. We have problems with Iran, we have problems with North Korea. And in each of those scenarios, there could be military divisions coming across the borders into a neighboring country.

In my judgment, having this long-range stealth bomber capability that can go in without any other support

aircraft with it, being able to attack mobile targets and also go after Scud launchers, that is a new capability that only the B-2 would have. To me this kind of revolutionary conventional capability is exactly what the country needs.

So I hope my colleagues tomorrow will defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] to take out the money for the B-2. I believe that this Stealth bomber is exactly what we need for the future, and I urge my colleagues to continue to support this important weapons system as we did on the defense authorization bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. THURMAN 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 gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. LOFGREN 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 Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 4 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 4 p.m.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR THE INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purposes of making an announcement.

The Rules Committee is planning to meet tomorrow, September 7, to report a rule for the consideration of H.R.

1655, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996.

The chairman of the Intelligence Committee has requested a rule which would require that amendments be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If this request is granted, and I believe it will be, amendments to be preprinted would need to be signed by the Member and submitted at the Speaker's table.

The amendments would still need to be consistent with House rules and would be given no special protection by being printed.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

It is not necessary to submit amendments to the Rules Committee or to testify as long as the amendments comply with the House rules.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 206

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forth the first of the 13 appropriations bills that has made it through the conference process. This rule is very simple—it merely waives points of order against the consideration of the conference report. Specifically, the rule contains waivers for three items that go beyond the scope of the conference, thereby waiving clause 3 of rule XXVIII. There are also a few legislative

items which necessitate a waiver of clause 2 of rule XX.

There was very little discussion at the hearing to grant the rule and I do not believe there should be much controversy surrounding it.

Before the district work period, I read press accounts that the President may be considering a veto of this conference report, not because he disagrees with any of its substance, but rather because it is the first of the necessary 13 spending measures to reach his desk, and he may, apparently, wish to protest against some other bills that he does not have substantive objections to.

I think that action by the President would be very unfortunate—but we need to proceed with the responsibilities that we have, like passing the appropriations bills. And with this bill we are setting the example of moving toward a balanced budget by reducing our own budget first. As a Member of Congress who serves on both of the Speaker-appointed committees, and in my role on the Committee on House Oversight, I am very proud of the reforms achieved in H.R. 1854 and retained in this conference report, based on the recommendations by House Oversight. We had some tough choices to make, but getting our own House in order and cutting our own budget was a necessary and important first step in the long and difficult road toward achieving a balanced Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall from the House's consideration of this bill in June, H.R. 1854 incorporates House Oversight plans to greatly reform the internal workings of the House of Representatives, and over the next few months alone, save the taxpayers \$7 million by streamlining operations. This bill is below the subcommittee's 602(B) allocation and is over 8 percent below last year's spending level. Additionally, H.R. 1854 eliminates, consolidates and reduces, and paves the way for the privatization of some functions that may be less costly when performed by the private sector.

I would like to commend Chairman THOMAS, Chairman PACKARD, Ranking Member FAZIO and of course Chairman LIVINGSTON, for their excellent work in bringing this conference report forward.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 206 is necessary to preserve the agreements reached in conference on legislative branch appropriations I urge adoption of both the rule and the conference report.

RULE FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT SPECIFIC WAIVERS INCLUDED IN THE GENERAL WAIVER

ITEMS BEYOND THE SCOPE OF CONFERENCE (CLAUSE 3, RULE XXVIII)

Amendment #10 adds new features to the Senate proposal for 60 days of severance pay for employees of the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), such as entitlement to health benefits. The House had no comparable provision.

Amendment #34 includes a provision directing the Public Printer to propose a

means to create cost incentives for publishing agencies, including Congress, to migrate from print-on paper products to electronic format. This is a different approach from that recommended by the House. There was no Senate provision on this subject.

Amendment #55 drops a Senate provision regarding reductions in facility energy costs. There was no comparable House provision. Then three new provisions were inserted as follows: (1) to specify the law enforcement authority of the House Sergeant at Arms, (2) to clarify existing authority of the Committee on House Oversight to consolidate representational allowances of House Members, and (3) to establish an account to pay settlements under the Congressional Accountability Act and to require that specified Congressional agencies submit proposals to reduce facility energy costs.

LEGISLATIVE ITEMS ON AN APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT (CLAUSE 2, RULE XX)—EXAMPLE

Amendment #10 establishes a new procedure for the phase out of OTA employees.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, while I may not agree with the priorities established in the conference report to accompany the fiscal year 1996 legislative branch appropriation, I support this rule. I will, however, oppose the previous question.

As we have in years past, the Committee on Rules has recommended a rule which waives all points of order against the consideration of the conference report. The Democratic members of the Rules Committee concur that these waivers should be granted.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the conference report is penny wise and pound foolish with regard to the continued existence of the Office of Technology Assessment. We all agree that every part of the Government needs to be carefully examined and subjected to cuts, it does not make a great deal of sense to me to abolish a congressional support agency which has provided us with invaluable information about science and technology. The work of the OTA has been supported on a bipartisan basis, and in fact, in July, the House voted 228 to 201 to continue the functions of this agency. Yet, the conference agreement contains a provision which terminates OTA. It is my view the abolition of such an information source is really counterproductive and the loss of this office will be one we in the Congress will live to regret.

Mr. Speaker, while I support this rule, I will support the proposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] to defeat the previous question in order to allow the House to consider lobby reform and a gift ban. As we all know, the Senate has now adopted such a ban and it is high time that the House be afforded an opportunity to vote on this good government issue. This proposition is identical to the Senate passed lobby reform and gift ban adapted to apply to House rules. The Bryant proposal is not anything new and different, it is merely an opportunity to do for the House what the

Senate has already wisely and prudently imposed upon themselves. For that reason, I will support Mr. BRYANT and his proposed amendment to this rule.

I would ask that the amendment to the rule be printed in the RECORD at this point. The amendment would adopt the text of a concurrent resolution providing lobby and gift reform, and I would ask that the text of House Concurrent Resolution 99 also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The material referred to is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO RULE ON H.R. 1854

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH CONFERENCE REPORT

"Section 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have adopted a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) directing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1854.

"Section 3. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall not send to the Senate a message informing the Senate of the adoption by the House of the conference report on H.R. 1854 until the House receives a message from the Senate informing the House of the adoption of a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) directing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1854."

H. CON. RES. 99

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 1854) entitled, "An Act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes", the Clerk of the House shall make the following correction:

At the end of title III add the following:

TITLE IV—LOBBYING DISCLOSURE

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995".

SEC. 402. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) responsible representative Government requires public awareness of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence the public decisionmaking process in both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government;

(2) existing lobbying disclosure statutes have been ineffective because of unclear statutory language, weak administrative and enforcement provisions, and an absence of clear guidance as to who is required to register and what they are required to disclose; and

(3) the effective public disclosure of the identity and extent of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence Federal officials in the conduct of Government actions will increase public confidence in the integrity of Government.

SEC. 403. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLIENT.—The term "client" means any person or entity that employs or retains another person for financial or other compensation to conduct lobbying activities on behalf of that person or entity. A person or entity whose employees act as lobbyists on its own behalf is both a client and an employer of such employees. In the case of a coalition or association that employs or retains other persons to conduct lobbying activities, the client is the coalition or association and not its individual members.

(3) COVERED EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered executive branch official" means—

(A) the President;
(B) the Vice President;
(C) any officer or employee, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of such an officer or employee, in the Executive Office of the President;

(D) any officer or employee serving in a position in level I, II, III, IV, or V of the Executive Schedule, as designated by statute or Executive order;

(E) any member of the uniformed services whose pay grade is at or above O-7 under section 201 of title 37, United States Code; and

(F) any officer or employee serving in a position of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character described in section 7511(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) COVERED LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered legislative branch official" means—

(A) a Member of Congress;

(B) an elected officer of either House of Congress;

(C) any employee of, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of an employee of—

(i) a Member of Congress;

(ii) a committee of either House of Congress;

(iii) the leadership staff of the House of Representatives or the leadership staff of the Senate;

(iv) a joint committee of Congress; and

(v) a working group or caucus organized to provide legislative services or other assistance to Members of Congress; and

(D) any other legislative branch employee serving in a position described under section 109(13) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" means any individual who is an officer, employee, partner, director, or proprietor of a person or entity, but does not include—

(A) independent contractors; or

(B) volunteers who receive no financial or other compensation from the person or entity for their services.

(6) FOREIGN ENTITY.—The term "foreign entity" means a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b))).

(7) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—The term "lobbying activities" means lobbying contacts and efforts in support of such contacts, including preparation and planning activities, research and other background work that is intended, at the time it is performed, for use in contacts, and coordination with the lobbying activities of others.

(8) LOBBYING CONTACT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—The term "lobbying contact" means any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to—

(i) the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals);

(ii) the formulation, modification, or adoption of a Federal rule, regulation, Executive order, or any other program, policy, or position of the United States Government;

(iii) the administration or execution of a Federal program or policy (including the negotiation, award, or administration of a Federal contract, grant, loan, permit, or license); or

(iv) the nomination or confirmation of a person for a position subject to confirmation by the Senate.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term "lobbying contact" does not include a communication that is—

(i) made by a public official acting in the public official's official capacity;

(ii) made by a representative of a media organization if the purpose of the communication is gathering and disseminating news and information to the public;

(iii) made in a speech, article, publication or other material that is distributed and made available to the public, or through radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication;

(iv) made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party and disclosed under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.);

(v) a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any other similar administrative request, if the request does not include an attempt to influence a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official;

(vi) made in the course of participation in an advisory committee subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act;

(vii) testimony given before a committee, subcommittee, or task force of the Congress, or submitted for inclusion in the public record of a hearing conducted by such committee, subcommittee, or task force;

(viii) information provided in writing in response to an oral or written request by a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official for specific information;

(ix) required by subpoena, civil investigative demand, or otherwise compelled by statute, regulation, or other action of the Congress or an agency;

(x) made in response to a notice in the Federal Register, Commerce Business Daily, or other similar publication soliciting communications from the public and directed to the agency official specifically designated in the notice to receive such communications;

(xi) not possible to report without disclosing information, the unauthorized disclosure of which is prohibited by law;

(xii) made to an official in an agency with regard to—

(I) a judicial proceeding or a criminal or civil law enforcement inquiry, investigation, or proceeding; or

(II) a filing or proceeding that the Government is specifically required by statute or regulation to maintain or conduct on a confidential basis,

if that agency is charged with responsibility for such proceeding, inquiry, investigation, or filing;

(xiii) made in compliance with written agency procedures regarding an adjudication conducted by the agency under section 554 of title 5, United States Code, or substantially similar provisions;

(xiv) a written comment filed in the course of a public proceeding or any other communication that is made on the record in a public proceeding;

(xv) a petition for agency action made in writing and required to be a matter of public record pursuant to established agency procedures;

(xvi) made on behalf of an individual with regard to that individual's benefits, employment, or other personal matters involving only that individual, except that this clause does not apply to any communication with—

(I) a covered executive branch official, or

(II) a covered legislative branch official (other than the individual's elected Members of Congress or employees who work under such Members' direct supervision),

with respect to the formulation, modification, or adoption of private legislation for the relief of that individual;

(xvii) a disclosure by an individual that is protected under the amendments made by the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989,

under the Inspector General Act of 1978, or under another provision of law;

(xviii) made by—

(I) a church, its integrated auxiliary, or a convention or association of churches that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(i) of section 6033(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(II) a religious order that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(iii) of such section 6033(a); and

(xix) between—

(I) officials of a self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act) that is registered with or established by the Securities and Exchange Commission as required by that Act or a similar organization that is designated by or registered with the Commodities Future Trading Commission as provided under the Commodity Exchange Act; and

(II) the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodities Future Trading Commission, respectively;

relating to the regulatory responsibilities of such organization under that Act.

(9) LOBBYING FIRM.—The term "lobbying firm" means a person or entity that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists on behalf of a client other than that person or entity. The term also includes a self-employed individual who is a lobbyist.

(10) LOBBYIST.—The term "lobbyist" means any individual who is employed or retained by a client for financial or other compensation for services that include more than one lobbying contact, other than an individual whose lobbying activities constitute less than 20 percent of the time engaged in the services provided by such individual to that client over a six month period.

(11) MEDIA ORGANIZATION.—The term "media organization" means a person or entity engaged in disseminating information to the general public through a newspaper, magazine, other publication, radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication.

(12) MEMBER OF CONGRESS.—The term "Member of Congress" means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

(13) ORGANIZATION.—The term "organization" means a person or entity other than an individual.

(14) PERSON OR ENTITY.—The term "person or entity" means any individual, corporation, company, foundation, association, labor organization, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, group of organizations, or State or local government.

(15) PUBLIC OFFICIAL.—The term "public official" means any elected official, appointed official, or employee of—

(A) a Federal, State, or local unit of government in the United States other than—

(i) a college or university;

(ii) a government-sponsored enterprise (as defined in section 3(8) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974);

(iii) a public utility that provides gas, electricity, water, or communications;

(iv) a guaranty agency (as defined in section 435(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(j))), including any affiliate of such an agency; or

(v) an agency of any State functioning as a student loan secondary market pursuant to section 435(d)(1)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(d)(1)(F));

(B) a Government corporation (as defined in section 9101 of title 31, United States Code);

(C) an organization of State or local elected or appointed officials other than officials

of an entity described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subparagraph (A);

(D) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e));

(E) a national or State political party or any organizational unit thereof; or

(F) a national, regional, or local unit of any foreign government.

(16) STATE.—The term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

SEC. 404. REGISTRATION OF LOBBYISTS.

(a) REGISTRATION.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—No later than 45 days after a lobbyist first makes a lobbying contact or is employed or retained to make a lobbying contact, whichever is earlier, such lobbyist (or, as provided under paragraph (2), the organization employing such lobbyist), shall register with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(2) EMPLOYER FILING.—Any organization that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists shall file a single registration under this section on behalf of such employees for each client on whose behalf the employees act as lobbyists.

(3) EXEMPTION.—

(A) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), a person or entity whose—

(i) total income for matters related to lobbying activities on behalf of a particular client (in the case of a lobbying firm) does not exceed and is not expected to exceed \$5,000; or

(ii) total expenses in connection with lobbying activities (in the case of an organization whose employees engage in lobbying activities on its own behalf) do not exceed or are not expected to exceed \$20,000,

(as estimated under section 405) in the semi-annual period described in section 405(a) during which the registration would be made is not required to register under subsection (a) with respect to such client.

(B) ADJUSTMENT.—The dollar amounts in subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted—

(i) on January 1, 1997, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) since the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) on January 1 of each fourth year occurring after January 1, 1997, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) during the preceding 4-year period,

rounded to the nearest \$500.

(b) CONTENTS OF REGISTRATION.—Each registration under this section shall contain—

(1) the name, address, business telephone number, and principal place of business of the registrant, and a general description of its business or activities;

(2) the name, address, and principal place of business of the registrant's client, and a general description of its business or activities (if different from paragraph (1));

(3) the name, address, and principal place of business of any organization, other than the client, that—

(A) contributes more than \$10,000 toward the lobbying activities of the registrant in a semiannual period described in section 405(a); and

(B) in whole or in major part plans, supervises, or controls such lobbying activities.

(4) the name, address, principal place of business, amount of any contribution of more than \$10,000 to the lobbying activities of the registrant, and approximate percentage of equitable ownership in the client (if any) of any foreign entity that—

(A) holds at least 20 percent equitable ownership in the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3);

(B) directly or indirectly, in whole or in major part, plans, supervises, controls, directs, finances, or subsidizes the activities of the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3); or

(C) is an affiliate of the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3) and has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity;

(5) a statement of—

(A) the general issue areas in which the registrant expects to engage in lobbying activities on behalf of the client; and

(B) to the extent practicable, specific issues that have (as of the date of the registration) already been addressed or are likely to be addressed in lobbying activities; and

(6) the name of each employee of the registrant who has acted or whom the registrant expects to act as a lobbyist on behalf of the client and, if any such employee has served as a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official in the 2 years before the date on which such employee first acted (after the date of enactment of this Act) as a lobbyist on behalf of the client, the position in which such employee served.

(c) GUIDELINES FOR REGISTRATION.—

(1) MULTIPLE CLIENTS.—In the case of a registrant making lobbying contacts on behalf of more than 1 client, a separate registration under this section shall be filed for each such client.

(2) MULTIPLE CONTACTS.—A registrant who makes more than 1 lobbying contact for the same client shall file a single registration covering all such lobbying contacts.

(d) TERMINATION OF REGISTRATION.—A registrant who after registration—

(1) is no longer employed or retained by a client to conduct lobbying activities, and

(2) does not anticipate any additional lobbying activities for such client,

may so notify the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and terminate its registration.

SEC. 405. REPORTS BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS.

(a) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—No later than 45 days after the end of the semiannual period beginning on the first day of each January and the first day of July of each year in which a registrant is registered under section 404, each registrant shall file a report with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives on its lobbying activities during such semiannual period. A separate report shall be filed for each client of the registrant.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Each semiannual report filed under subsection (a) shall contain—

(1) the name of the registrant, the name of the client, and any changes or updates to the information provided in the initial registration;

(2) for each general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying activities on behalf of the client during the semiannual filing period—

(A) a list of the specific issues upon which a lobbyist employed by the registrant engaged in lobbying activities, including, to the maximum extent practicable, a list of bill numbers and references to specific executive branch actions;

(B) a statement of the Houses of Congress and the Federal agencies contacted by lobbyists employed by the registrant on behalf of the client;

(C) a list of the employees of the registrant who acted as lobbyists on behalf of the client; and

(D) a description of the interest, if any, of any foreign entity identified under section

404(b)(4) in the specific issues listed under subparagraph (A).

(3) in the case of a lobbying firm, a good faith estimate of the total amount of all income from the client (including any payments to the registrant by any other person for lobbying activities on behalf of the client) during the semiannual period, other than income for matters that are unrelated to lobbying activities; and

(4) in the case of a registrant engaged in lobbying activities on its own behalf, a good faith estimate of the total expenses that the registrant and its employees incurred in connection with lobbying activities during the semiannual filing period.

(c) ESTIMATES OF INCOME OR EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section, estimates of income or expenses shall be made as follows:

(1) Estimates of amounts in excess of \$10,000 shall be rounded to the nearest \$20,000.

(2) In the event income or expenses do not exceed \$10,000, the registrant shall include a statement that income or expenses totaled less than \$10,000 for the reporting period.

(3) A registrant that reports lobbying expenditures pursuant to section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may satisfy the requirement to report income or expenses by filing with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives a copy of the form filed in accordance with section 6033(b)(8).

SEC. 406. DISCLOSURE AND ENFORCEMENT.

The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall—

(1) provide guidance and assistance on the registration and reporting requirements of this title and develop common standards, rules, and procedures for compliance with this title;

(2) review, and, where necessary, verify and inquire to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of registration and reports;

(3) develop filing, coding, and cross-indexing systems to carry out the purpose of this title, including—

(A) a publicly available list of all registered lobbyists, lobbying firms, and their clients; and

(B) computerized systems designed to minimize the burden of filing and maximize public access to materials filed under this title;

(4) make available for public inspection and copying at reasonable times the registrations and reports filed under this title;

(5) retain registrations for a period of at least 6 years after they are terminated and reports for a period of at least 6 years after they are filed;

(6) compile and summarize, with respect to each semiannual period, the information contained in registrations and reports filed with respect to such period in a clear and complete manner;

(7) notify any lobbyist or lobbying firm in writing that may be in noncompliance with this title; and

(8) notify the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia that a lobbyist or lobbying firm may be in noncompliance with this title, if the registrant has been notified in writing and has failed to provide an appropriate response within 60 days after notice was given under paragraph (6).

SEC. 407. PENALTIES.

Whoever knowingly fails to—

(1) remedy a defective filing within 60 days after notice of such a defect by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives; or

(2) comply with any other provision of this title;

shall, upon proof of such knowing violation by a preponderance of the evidence, be sub-

ject to a civil fine of not more than \$50,000, depending on the extent and gravity of the violation.

SEC. 408. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit or interfere with—

(1) the right to petition the government for the redress of grievances;

(2) the right to express a personal opinion; or

(3) the right of association,

protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

(b) PROHIBITION OF ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit, or to authorize any court to prohibit, lobbying activities or lobbying contacts by any person or entity, regardless of whether such person or entity is in compliance with the requirements of this title.

(c) AUDIT AND INVESTIGATIONS.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to grant general audit or investigative authority to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 409. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1—

(A) by striking subsection (j);

(B) in subsection (o) by striking “the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence” and inserting “any activity that the person engaging in believes will, or that the person intends to, in any way influence”;

(C) in subsection (p) by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking subsection (q);

(2) in section 3(g) (22 U.S.C. 613(g)), by striking “established agency proceedings, whether formal or informal.” and inserting “judicial proceedings, criminal or civil law enforcement inquiries, investigations, or proceedings, or agency proceedings required by statute or regulation to be conducted on the record.”;

(3) in section 3 (22 U.S.C. 613) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) Any agent of a person described in section 1(b)(2) or an entity described in section 1(b)(3) if the agent is required to register and does register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the agent’s representation of such person or entity.”;

(4) in section 4(a) (22 U.S.C. 614(a))—

(A) by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”; and

(B) by striking “and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such an agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such transmittal”;

(5) in section 4(b) (22 U.S.C. 614(b))—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”; and

(B) by striking “(i) in the form of prints, or” and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting “without placing in such informational materials a conspicuous statement that the materials are distributed by the agent on behalf of the foreign principal, and that additional information is on file with the Department of Justice, Washington, District of Columbia. The Attorney General may by rule define what constitutes a conspicuous statement for the purposes of this subsection.”;

(6) in section 4(c) (22 U.S.C. 614(c)), by striking “political propaganda” and inserting “informational materials”;

(7) in section 6 (22 U.S.C. 616)—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking "and all statements concerning the distribution of political propaganda";

(B) in subsection (b) by striking "and one copy of every item of political propaganda"; and

(C) in subsection (c) by striking "copies of political propaganda,";

(8) in section 8 (22 U.S.C. 618)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2) by striking "or in any statement under section 4(a) hereof concerning the distribution of political propaganda"; and

(B) by striking subsection (d); and

(9) in section 11 (22 U.S.C. 621) by striking "including the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated or distributed".

SEC. 410. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYRD AMENDMENT.

(a) REVISED CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1352(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting the following:

"(A) the name of any registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who has made lobbying contacts on behalf of the person with respect to that Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement; and

"(B) a certification that the person making the declaration has not made, and will not make, any payment prohibited by subsection (a).";

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking all that follows "loan shall contain" and inserting "the name of any registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who has made lobbying contacts on behalf of the person in connection with that loan insurance or guarantee."; and

(3) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(b) REMOVAL OF OBSOLETE REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 1352 of title 31, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

SEC. 411. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LOBBYING PROVISIONS.

(a) REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT.—The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 261 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO HOUSING LOBBYIST ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Section 13 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3537b) is repealed.

(2) Section 536(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490p(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 412. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER STATUTES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO COMPETITIVENESS POLICY COUNCIL ACT.—Section 5206(e) of the Competitiveness Policy Council Act (15 U.S.C. 4804(e)) is amended by inserting "or a lobbyist for a foreign entity (as the terms 'lobbyist' and 'foreign entity' are defined under section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995)" after "an agent for a foreign principal".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 219(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "or a lobbyist required to register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the representation of a foreign entity, as defined in section 3(7) of that Act" after "an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938"; and

(2) by striking out "as amended".

(c) AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1980.—Section 602(c) of the Foreign Service

Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4002(c)) is amended by inserting "or a lobbyist for a foreign entity (as defined in section 3(7) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995)" after "an agent of a foreign principal (as defined by section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938)".

SEC. 413. IDENTIFICATION OF CLIENTS AND COVERED OFFICIALS.

(a) ORAL LOBBYING CONTACTS.—Any person or entity that makes an oral lobbying contact with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall, on the request of the official at the time of the lobbying contact—

(1) state whether the person or entity is registered under this Act and identify the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact is made; and

(2) state whether such client is a foreign entity and identify any foreign entity required to be disclosed under section 404(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.

(b) WRITTEN LOBBYING CONTACTS.—Any person or entity registered under this Act that makes a written lobbying contact (including an electronic communication) with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall—

(1) if the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact was made is a foreign entity, identify such client, state that the client is considered a foreign entity under this Act, and state whether the person making the lobbying contact is registered on behalf of that client under section 4; and

(2) identify any other foreign entity identified pursuant to section 404(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.

(c) IDENTIFICATION AS COVERED OFFICIAL.—Upon request by a person or entity making a lobbying contact, the individual who is contacted or the office employing that individual shall indicate whether or not the individual is a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official.

SEC. 414. ESTIMATES BASED ON TAX REPORTING SYSTEM.

(a) ENTITIES COVERED BY SECTION 6033(b) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—A registrant that is required to report and does report lobbying expenditures pursuant to section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may—

(1) make a good faith estimate (by category of dollar value) of applicable amounts that would be required to be disclosed under such section for the appropriate semiannual period to meet the requirements of sections 404(a)(3), 405(a)(2), and 405(b)(4); and

(2) in lieu of using the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 3(8) of this Act, consider as lobbying activities only those activities that are influencing legislation as defined in section 4911(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) ENTITIES COVERED BY SECTION 162(e) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—A registrant that is subject to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may—

(1) make a good faith estimate (by category of dollar value) of applicable amounts that would not be deductible pursuant to such section for the appropriate semiannual period to meet the requirements of sections 404(a)(3), 405(a)(2), and 405(b)(4); and

(2) in lieu of using the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 403(7) of this Act, consider as lobbying activities only those activities, the costs of which are not deductible pursuant to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF ESTIMATE.—Any registrant that elects to make estimates required by this Act under the procedures au-

thorized by subsection (a) or (b) for reporting or threshold purposes shall—

(1) inform the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives that the registrant has elected to make its estimates under such procedures; and

(2) make all such estimates, in a given calendar year, under such procedures.

(d) STUDY.—Not later than March 31, 1997, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review reporting by registrants under subsections (a) and (b) and report to the Congress—

(1) the differences between the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 403(7) and the definitions of "lobbying expenditures", "influencing legislation", and related terms in sections 162(e) and 4911 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as each are implemented by regulations;

(2) the impact that any such differences may have on filing and reporting under this Act pursuant to this subsection; and

(3) any changes to this Act or to the appropriate sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that the Comptroller General may recommend to harmonize the definitions.

SEC. 415. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, or the application thereof, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this title and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 416. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect, and shall be effective with respect to calendar years beginning on, January 1, 1996.

(b) The repeals and amendments made under sections 409, 410, and 411 shall take effect as provided under subsection (a), except that such repeals and amendments—

(1) shall not affect any proceeding or suit commenced before the effective date under subsection (a), and in all such proceedings or suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted; and

(2) shall not affect the requirements of Federal agencies to compile, publish, and retain information filed or received before the effective date of such repeals and amendments.

TITLE V—CONGRESSIONAL GIFT RULES

SEC. 501. AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RULES.

Clause 4 of rule XLIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"4. (a)(1) No Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives shall knowingly accept a gift except as provided in this rule.

"(2) A Member, officer, or employee may accept a gift (other than cash or cash equivalent) which the Member, officer, or employee reasonably and in good faith believes to have a value of less than \$50, and a cumulative value from one source during a calendar year of less than \$100. No gift with a value below \$10 shall count toward the \$100 annual limit. No formal recordkeeping is required by this paragraph, but a Member, officer, or employee shall make a good faith effort to comply with this paragraph.

"(b)(1) For the purpose of this rule, the term 'gift' means any gratuity, favor, discount, entertainment, hospitality, loan, forbearance, or other item having monetary value. The term includes gifts of services, training, transportation, lodging, and meals, whether provided in kind, by purchase of a ticket, payment in advance, or reimbursement after the expense has been incurred.

"(2)(A) A gift to a family member of a Member, officer, or employee, or a gift to

any other individual based on that individual's relationship with the Member, officer, or employee, shall be considered a gift to the Member, officer, or employee if it is given with the knowledge and acquiescence of the Member, officer, or employee and the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe the gift was given because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(B) If food or refreshment is provided at the same time and place to both a Member, officer, or employee and the spouse or dependent thereof, only the food or refreshment provided to the Member, officer, or employee shall be treated as a gift for purposes of this rule.

"(c) The restrictions in subparagraph (a) shall not apply to the following:

"(1) Anything for which the Member, officer, or employee pays the market value, or does not use and promptly returns to the donor.

"(2) A contribution, as defined in the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) that is lawfully made under that Act, or attendance at a fundraising event sponsored by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(3) A gift from a relative as described in section 107(2) of title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-521).

"(4)(A) Anything provided by an individual on the basis of a personal friendship unless the Member, officer, or employee has reason to believe that, under the circumstances, the gift was provided because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and not because of the personal friendship.

"(B) In determining whether a gift is provided on the basis of personal friendship, the Member, officer, or employee shall consider the circumstances under which the gift was offered, such as:

"(i) The history of the relationship between the individual giving the gift and the recipient of the gift, including any previous exchange of gifts between such individuals.

"(ii) Whether to the actual knowledge of the Member, officer, or employee the individual who gave the gift personally paid for the gift or sought a tax deduction or business reimbursement for the gift.

"(iii) Whether to the actual knowledge of the Member, officer, or employee the individual who gave the gift also at the same time gave the same or similar gifts to other Members, officers, or employees.

"(5) Except as provided in paragraph 3(c), a contribution or other payment to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee, that is otherwise lawfully made, if the person making the contribution or payment is identified for the Committee of Standards of Official Conduct and complies with other disclosure requirements established by such Committee.

"(6) Any gift from another Member, officer, or employee of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

"(7) Food, refreshments, lodging, and other benefits—

"(A) resulting from the outside business or employment activities (or other outside activities that are not connected to the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder) of the Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse of the Member, officer, or employee, if such benefits have not been offered or enhanced because of the official position of the Member, officer, or employee and are customarily provided to others in similar circumstances;

"(B) customarily provided by a prospective employer in connection with bona fide employment discussions; or

"(C) provided by a political organization described in section 527(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in connection with a fundraising or campaign event sponsored by such an organization.

"(8) Pension and other benefits resulting from continued participation in an employee welfare and benefits plan maintained by a former employer.

"(9) Informational materials that are sent to the office of the Member, officer, or employee in the form of books, articles, periodicals, other written materials, audiotapes, videotapes, or other forms of communication.

"(10) Awards or prizes which are given to competitors in contests or events open to the public, including random drawings.

"(11) Honorary degrees (and associated travel, food, refreshments, and entertainment) and other bona fide, nonmonetary awards presented in recognition of public service (and associated food, refreshments, and entertainment provided in the presentation of such degrees and awards).

"(12) Donations of products from the State that the Member represents that are intended primarily for promotional purposes, such as display or free distribution, and are of minimal value to any individual recipient.

"(13) Training (including food and refreshments furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the training) provided to a Member, officer, or employee, if such training is in the interest of the House of Representatives.

"(14) Bequests, inheritances, and other transfers at death.

"(15) Any item, the receipt of which is authorized by the Foreign Gifts and Decorations Act, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, or any other statute.

"(16) Anything which is paid for by the Federal Government, by a State or local government, or secured by the Government under a Government contract.

"(17) A gift of personal hospitality (as defined in section 109(14) of the Ethics in Government Act) of an individual other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal.

"(18) Free attendance at a widely attended event permitted pursuant to subparagraph (d).

"(19) Opportunities and benefits which are—

"(A) available to the public or to a class consisting of all Federal employees, whether or not restricted on the basis of geographic consideration;

"(B) offered to members of a group or class in which membership is unrelated to congressional employment;

"(C) offered to members of an organization, such as an employees' association or congressional credit union, in which membership is related to congressional employment and similar opportunities are available to large segments of the public through organizations of similar size;

"(D) offered to any group or class that is not defined in a manner that specifically discriminates among Government employees on the basis of branch of Government or type of responsibility, or on a basis that favors those of higher rank or rate of pay;

"(E) in the form of loans from banks and other financial institutions on terms generally available to the public; or

"(F) in the form of reduced membership or other fees for participation in organization activities offered to all Government employees by professional organizations if the only restrictions on membership relate to professional qualifications.

"(20) A plaque, trophy, or other item that is substantially commemorative in nature

and which is intended solely for presentation.

"(21) Anything for which, in an unusual case, a waiver is granted by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

"(22) Food or refreshments of a nominal value offered other than as a part of a meal.

"(23) An item of little intrinsic value such as a greeting card, baseball cap, or a T-shirt.

"(d)(1) A Member, officer, or employee may accept an offer of free attendance at a widely attended convention, conference, symposium, forum, panel discussion, dinner, viewing, reception, or similar event, provided by the sponsor of the event, if—

"(A) the Member, officer, or employee participates in the event as a speaker or a panel participant, by presenting information related to Congress or matters before Congress, or by performing a ceremonial function appropriate to the Member's, officer's, or employee's official position; or

"(B) attendance at the event is appropriate to the performance of the official duties or representative function of the Member, officer, or employee.

"(2) A Member, officer, or employee who attends an event described in clause (1) may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at the event for an accompanying individual if others in attendance will generally be similarly accompanied or if such attendance is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

"(3) A Member, officer, or employee, or the spouse or dependent thereof, may accept a sponsor's unsolicited offer of free attendance at a charity event, except that reimbursement for transportation and lodging may not be accepted in connection with an event that does not meet the standards provided in paragraph 2.

"(4) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'free attendance' may include waiver of all or part of a conference or other fee, the provision of local transportation, or the provision of food, refreshments, entertainment, and instructional materials furnished to all attendees as an integral part of the event. The term does not include entertainment collateral to the event, nor does it include food or refreshments taken other than in a group setting with all or substantially all other attendees.

"(e) No Member, officer, or employee may accept a gift the value of which exceeds \$250 on the basis of the personal friendship exception in subparagraph (c)(4) unless the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct issues a written determination that such exception applies. No determination under this subparagraph is required for gifts given on the basis of the family relationship exception.

"(f) When it is not practicable to return a tangible item because it is perishable, the item may, at the discretion of the recipient, be given to an appropriate charity or destroyed.

"2. (a)(1) A reimbursement (including payment in kind) to a Member, officer, or employee from an individual other than a registered lobbyist or agent of a foreign principal for necessary transportation, lodging and related expenses for travel to a meeting, speaking engagement, factfinding trip or similar event in connection with the duties of the Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder shall be deemed to be a reimbursement to the House of Representatives and not a gift prohibited by this rule, if the Member, officer, or employee—

"(A) in the case of an employee, receives advance authorization, from the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works, to accept reimbursement, and

“(B) discloses the expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed and the authorization to the Clerk of the House of Representatives within 30 days after the travel is completed.

“(2) For purposes of clause (1), events, the activities of which are substantially recreational in nature, shall not be considered to be in connection with the duties of a Member, officer, or employee as an officeholder.

“(b) Each advance authorization to accept reimbursement shall be signed by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works and shall include—

- “(1) the name of the employee;
- “(2) the name of the person who will make the reimbursement;
- “(3) the time, place, and purpose of the travel; and

“(4) a determination that the travel is in connection with the duties of the employee as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the employee is using public office for private gain.

“(c) Each disclosure made under subparagraph (a)(1) of expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed shall be signed by the Member or officer (in the case of travel by that Member or officer) or by the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works (in the case of travel by an employee) and shall include—

- “(1) a good faith estimate of total transportation expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
- “(2) a good faith estimate of total lodging expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
- “(3) a good faith estimate of total meal expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
- “(4) a good faith estimate of the total of other expenses reimbursed or to be reimbursed;
- “(5) a determination that all such expenses are necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses as defined in this paragraph; and

“(6) in the case of a reimbursement to a Member or officer, a determination that the travel was in connection with the duties of the Member or officer as an officeholder and would not create the appearance that the Member or officer is using public office for private gain.

“(d) For the purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘necessary transportation, lodging, and related expenses’—

“(1) includes reasonable expenses that are necessary for travel for a period not exceeding 3 days exclusive of travel time within the United States or 7 days exclusive of travel time outside of the United States unless ap-

proved in advance by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct;

“(2) is limited to reasonable expenditures for transportation, lodging, conference fees and materials, and food and refreshments, including reimbursement for necessary transportation, whether or not such transportation occurs within the periods described in clause (1);

“(3) does not include expenditures for recreational activities, nor does it include entertainment other than that provided to all attendees as an integral part of the event, except for activities or entertainment otherwise permissible under this rule; and

“(4) may include travel expenses incurred on behalf of either the spouse or a child of the Member, officer, or employee, subject to a determination signed by the Member or officer (or in the case of an employee, the Member or officer under whose direct supervision the employee works) that the attendance of the spouse or child is appropriate to assist in the representation of the House of Representatives.

“(e) The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make available to the public all advance authorizations and disclosures of reimbursement filed pursuant to subparagraph (a) as soon as possible after they are received.

“3. A gift prohibited by paragraph 1(a) includes the following:

“(a) Anything provided by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal to an entity that is maintained or controlled by a Member, officer, or employee.

“(b) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal on the basis of a designation, recommendation, or other specification of a Member, officer, or employee (not including a mass mailing or other solicitation directed to a broad category of persons or entities), other than a charitable contribution permitted by paragraph 4.

“(c) A contribution or other payment by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal to a legal expense fund established for the benefit of a Member, officer, or employee.

“(d) A financial contribution or expenditure made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal relating to a conference, retreat, or similar event, sponsored by or affiliated with an official congressional organization, for or on behalf of Members, officers, or employees.

“4. (a) A charitable contribution (as defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) made by a registered lobbyist or an agent of a foreign principal in lieu of an honorarium to a Member, officer, or employee shall not be considered a gift under this rule if it is reported as provided in subparagraph (b).

“(b) A Member, officer, or employee who designates or recommends a contribution to a charitable organization in lieu of honoraria described in subparagraph (a) shall report within 30 days after such designation or recommendation to the Clerk of the House of Representatives—

- “(1) the name and address of the registered lobbyist who is making the contribution in lieu of honoraria;
- “(2) the date and amount of the contribution; and
- “(3) the name and address of the charitable organization designated or recommended by the Member.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make public information received pursuant to this subparagraph as soon as possible after it is received.

“5. For purposes of this rule—
“(a) the term ‘registered lobbyist’ means a lobbyist registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act or any successor statute; and

“(b) the term ‘agent of a foreign principal’ means an agent of a foreign principal registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

“6. All the provisions of this rule shall be interpreted and enforced solely by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized to issue guidance on any matter contained in this rule.”

SEC. 502. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect, and shall be effective with respect to calendar years beginning on, January 1, 1996.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both the chairman and ranking member of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee for their very hard work on this bill. I know their task has been very difficult; I only hope that the cuts made to the operations of the Congress will not, in the long-run, inhibit our ability to do the people's business.

I include the following additional material for the RECORD.

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

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed: contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive: Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4: Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive: only certain substitutes	2R; 4D
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive: considered in House no amendments	N/A
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open: Pre-printing gets preference: Contains self-executing provision	N/A
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive: brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed: Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed	H. Res. 88	Restrictive: makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive: makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive: 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive: 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive: 8 hr. time cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive: 7 hr. time cap on amendments: Pre-printing gets preference	N/A

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

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive: makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive: Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive: Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive: Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive: Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive: waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive: Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive: Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive: Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive: Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Menendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive: Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive: Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A.
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A.
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive: 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 2(1)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A.
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive: waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Bliely amendment (30 min) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H.Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Skeen amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive: provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A.
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) And H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A.
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title: Pre-printing gets priority..	N/A.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation, 58% restrictive; 42% open. *** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103rd Congress. **** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Miami, FL for yielding me this time. Ordinarily I would not take the time of this House to speak on a rather routine rule that simply allows us to consider a conference report.

However, I feel compelled to do so because the minority is trying to convert this rule debate into something that it is not, should not be, and cannot be under the rules of this House.

What the minority is proposing is that we defeat the previous question so that we can consider a nongermane substitute rule.

It is just that simple, it is just that ridiculous, it is just that outrageous, and it is just that futile.

The rule before us simply waives points of order against the conference report on the legislative branch appropriations bill.

The rule the minority Democrats would like to offer if they defeat the previous question would do much more than that. It would deem the conference report to be rejected and would then make it in order to take the House-passed bill from the Speaker's table with Senate amendments thereto, and substitute the conference language with further amendments—one of which is completely nongermane to that conference language.

But even if the additional language were germane to the conference report, the substitute rule itself is nongermane to the reported rule because it goes beyond waiving points of order on the conference report—it attempts to provide for the consideration of another matter by another procedure.

In other words, even if the minority were to succeed in defeating the previous question, there substitute rule would be ruled out of order on a germaneness point or order.

It is not germane to a rule waiving points of order to provide for the consideration of another matter using another procedure.

And here I cite Cannon's Precedents, volume 8, section 2956; Hinds' Precedents, volume 5, sections 5834-36; and Deschler-Brown's Precedents, volume

10, chapter 28, section 17.3, 17.4, and 17.5.

The precedents are clear on this. The minority knows this is the case. They tried this same ploy back on March 30th of this year on H.R. 831, the bill providing a health insurance tax deduction for the self-employed.

We got an advisory reading from the Parliamentarians at that time, just as we have on this occasion. That reading is that this is a nongermane substitute rule—plain and simple.

And yet the minority Democrats still insist on going through these meaningless procedural hoops that will get them absolutely nowhere. This is not just an exercise in futility. It is a political sham, a partisan charade, and a hollow gesture—all signifying nothing.

Moreover, by pursuing a procedural strategy that is clearly in violation of House rules and therefore cannot succeed under any circumstances, the minority Democrats are engaging in a cynical ploy by pretending to do something they know they cannot do.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we blew that whistle on such tactics as knowingly and willfully attempting to mislead the American people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the proposed substitute rule the minority would like to offer is nongermane on two counts. First, it attempts to make in order a nongermane procedure; and second, it attempts to make in order a nongermane amendment under that nongermane procedure.

Being knowingly guilty on one count is shameful; being knowingly guilty on two counts is downright sham-ful and deserves to be punished by the overwhelming adoption of the previous question on this rule.

I just want to commend the chairman and the subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for bringing this bill to the floor because it does set the example for this Congress with all the other agencies, bureaus, departments of the Federal Government that are going to have to tighten their belt. We are doing it. With our help we expect the rest of the agencies to live up to the same thing so we can deal with the most important problem facing this Nation, and that is the terrible deficit that is literally turning this Nation into a bankrupt debtor nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the previous question and the rule.

□ 1615

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

Mr. Speaker, some people viewing this proceeding, Members listening in the Chamber, certainly are aware that the United We Stand organization had a meeting during the break in my hometown of Dallas, TX. I went to that meeting and I had to regretfully tell the members of that organization that the majority leadership in the House of Representatives was stonewalling on the lobby reform issue, would not let us bring it up for a vote. I regretted that I had to communicate that to them.

We tried to offer this on the first day of the session, and we were prevented from offering this in January. I tried to offer this in the Committee on Rules, waiving points of order, so that it clearly would have been in order, and I was voted down on a strict partisan vote in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, my only point is that the majority leadership in the House does not want this issue to come up, will not permit the lobbying gift ban to come up, and it is very unfortunate and I regretted that I had to inform the United We Stand organization of that.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will take time during the debate on the conference report itself to explain the bill, so I do not intend to do that at this time. I simply want to respond to the effort that is being made to put the gift ban issue onto this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the gift ban issue is a very serious issue. It certainly demands and deserves a great deal of debate. To put anything of this consequence, which consists of 51 pages of legislation into the confines of a very limited debate during this conference report would be an absolute mistake. It ought to stand on its own; it ought to be debated on its own. It certainly should not be put on as a rider to a conference report that has 1 hour of debate on the rule and 1 hour of debate on the report itself. It is an issue of such great consequence that it ought to

have much more than that. So I would strongly urge the Members to not vote to allow this to go onto this conference report without the opportunity to have extensive debate and extensive review.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the ranking member of this subcommittee.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Texas for yielding me this time and indicate my congratulations to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], who brings this conference report to the floor, for the fine job that he has done in general during his first year as chairman of this subcommittee. But I regret that I have to stand in opposition to the previous question, in hopes that this body will take the opportunity when it deals with the budget of the legislative branch to deal with something that we have far too long neglected, certainly in this Congress, and frankly, in prior Congresses, to deal with, and that is the need to adopt strong lobby reform and gift ban legislation.

The House twice approved strong lobby reform and gift reform in the 103d Congress by 3-to-1 bipartisan majorities. The Republicans sadly filibustered it in the Senate at the end of the last session of Congress in order to deprive the President and the Democratic majority of having a political victory on something that had been worked out in great detail.

Regrettably, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has already indicated, despite the effort to speak to the Perot movement in this country, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the Speaker have stonewalled lobbying and gift reform for the 7 months we have been here. There was no willingness to deal with it during the reforms that were engaged in, far less significant reforms, on the first day of this session. And now, despite our efforts to speak to this group of people in our society, we continue to avoid dealing with the responsibility of having to reform the way we go about dealing with lobbyists, the way we go about dealing in our interrelationships with those who would lobby us or give us gifts.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed lobby reform and a gift ban unanimously, something I never thought could possibly occur. The House should now join the executive branch and the Senate and do the same.

Mr. Speaker, the issues are well known. This conference report provides an excellent opportunity to deal legislatively with both of these issues in an expeditious fashion.

Lobby provisions that are included in this motion are identical to what the Senate has done, and that is appropriate. We need a commonly understood statute that would affect the enormous loopholes that have existed in the 1946 Lobbying Act that have permitted a situation in which fewer than

4,000 of the estimated 13,500 known Washington lobbyists are registered with this Congress. We need to close that loophole. We need to make sure, on the other hand, that the unpaid grassroots activities are completely exempt from this new requirement, and so those who opposed this bill last year because of opposition from the so-called Christian coalition should be comfortable to understand that advocacy by churches and religious groups are exempted in this bill that the Senate has adopted.

The gift restrictions are identical to the Senate-passed provisions and mirror restrictions that now apply to Members of the executive branch. Any gift over \$10 counts toward a \$100 annual limit per Member, or per staff, per lobbyists. We ought to have the same provisions apply to us that now apply to the Senate. It is appropriate we deal with it now so it can be effective in the next year.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words that the chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, RON PACKARD, spoke at Rules Committee—that the reductions in this conference report build on the progress started under my chairmanship.

The conference report improves the House bill in several ways.

But the thoughtful treatment of many issues in this conference report, and the successful defense of the House position at conference on several important items, unfortunately emphasizes the two major issues where the conference has fallen far short:

General Accounting Office—the conference chose the lower Senate number, \$374 million, nearly \$20 million less than the House—more than a 15-percent cut below last year.

Office of Technology Assessment—despite two strong votes in the House and a near-majority in the Senate, the conference gave in to the Senate in mandating a close-down of OTA.

Accordingly, I reluctantly oppose the conference report.

The shut-down of OTA is particularly thoughtless. Restoring OTA did not need to come at the expense of GAO or the Library of Congress, who are struggling with flat budgets or budget cuts.

There are different ways to accomplish it:

An across-the-board cut—the Congressional Budget Office says less than a .03 percent—three one-hundredths of a percent—would be required to provide another \$6.5 million for OTA.

Use existing budget authority. The bill is \$114 million below the House 602b allocation and \$20 million below in outlays—there is plenty of room to provide these funds.

In fact, there was plenty of room to provide funds and stay close to the \$200 million in cuts that seem to be the goal of the Republicans.

But it is clear that the Republican fight to close OTA has been a symbolic fight.

It is clear this has nothing to do with budget cuts. The public is unlikely to be more impressed that we cut \$205 million instead of \$200 million.

At conference, Chairman PACKARD and Chairman LIVINGSTON opposed \$6.5 million to keep OTA alive—yet pleaded vigorously for \$7 million to renovate the Botanic Garden.

So this is a symbolic victory for the Republicans—but it is a victory that will be very expensive in the long run.

Policy issues across the spectrum are increasingly complex and technical.

OTA helps us sort out the facts from the fiction.

The need won't go away in the future—but we will be ill-equipped to deal with it.

The issues in the last few days before we adjourned for the August recess—environmental risk assessment and telecommunications—are just two examples of complicated policy issues that confront Congress each year.

I have examples of OTA reports issued in just the past few days:

Information Security and Privacy in Network Environments—this was produced as a followon report for the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs on the heels of a 1994 report, and it was used to prepare for hearings and legislation in this Congress.

This report points out the necessity of a standing agency. Some opponents have said we can contract for such reports, but where do we get the followup assistance if we paid a private contractor to do the first report?

Electronic Surveillance in a Digital Age—this is a background paper requested by our colleague, MIKE OXLEY, last September when he was still a member of the minority.

But the Technology Board thought Mr. OXLEY had a great idea—to consider the technical aspects of implementing the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act—so the background paper was authorized.

This report is perhaps the best indicator of the bipartisan nature of OTA and the fair-handed manner that the Technology Board operates.

International Partnerships in Large Science Projects—the budget implications of international collaboration in research and science projects are huge.

When does international collaboration make sense? When is it not in our national interest?

Research into such sweeping questions is what OTA does best—neither CRS or GAO is prepared to pick up analyses of such scope.

In short, I find it particularly ironic that the Speaker has termed this the cyber-Congress—yet has instructed his whips to destroy OTA.

AMO HOUGHTON has made a convincing case. He speaks with the best outside-the-beltway experience of any Member.

The House agreed with AMO, and spoke strongly in two votes, but the conferees did not insist on House position.

There were 46 votes in the Senate to sustain OTA including eight Republicans.

We believe there were other OTA supporters who were concerned about offsets from Library and GAO.

Since this ill-considered action by the conference, the outpouring of editorial comment has been astounding:

The Washington Post—"Congress should think this one over again. Thrift in Government operations holds a high priority in today's politics. But the information and insights provided by OTA's studies are important ingredients of wise legislating, and worth far more than the few millions needed to keep OTA alive."

The Economist—"What do you do with an institution that offers you impartial technical advice? If you are America's Congress, you close it down."

The Christian Science Monitor—"It would be a costly mistake."

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette—"Through a comedy of errors, oversight and political machismo, Congress has chosen ignorance, and ended the 23-year history of its best and smallest agency."

The Minneapolis Star-Tribune—"The majority acts as though it wants to be a 20th century Know Nothing Party."

The International Association for Technology Assessment and Forecasting Institutions—"It would be a serious loss to the world community if OTA should be terminated. We see OTA as a flagship for all countries interested in adapting wisely to the ever increasing rate of technological change."

To summarize: OTA is a bipartisan organization—overseen by bipartisan House-Senate Technology Board.

OTA goes outside-the-beltway—5000 specialists from business, industry, and academia have contributed to its reports and policy recommendations.

OTA is a lean organization—since 1993, OTA voluntarily has reduced its middle and senior management by almost 40 percent. The funds we are seeking would represent a 40 percent cut below last year.

But the bottom line—OTA saves taxpayer dollars.

In looking at the Defense appropriations bill we'll take up soon, I'm struck by what CURT WELDON and JOHN SPRATT said in a "Dear Colleague" about OTA—"The type of work they perform is just not available from other congressional agencies."

It is imperative that Congress retain an independent analytical function, but that function is missing from this conference report.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first of the appropriations bills to make it through the conference process, and I wish to commend the bill's managers, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], as well as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the full committee who is here, for making sure that the legislative branch leads the way in the belt tightening that we know is going to be done.

This conference report, which obviously funds the conference, comes in at \$200 million below the actual amount spent for the current fiscal year. That is a real cut. That is real savings and one we can all be proud of, I think, in these tight budgetary times.

Mr. Speaker, the issue has been raised today that somehow the conferees of this spending bill failed because they did not include provisions reforming the gift rule for Members of this House. Well, the first point here is that reform of the gift rule, although it is a matter of great importance and very significant interest to many people, is not within the scope of the legis-

lative branch funding bill. It is an apples and oranges problem. No matter how big an apple gift reform is, it just cannot become an orange because somebody wants to declare it so. It would be a little bit like Cal Ripken showing up at Fenway Park tonight. Wrong place. So from a procedural point of view, raising this issue as part of today's debate I think is way off the mark.

Mr. Speaker, after the substance of reforming the gift rules, I do share the interests of many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle of reviewing our gift rules and for the action recently taken in the other body reforming our House rules. I would point out I believe tomorrow there are going to be hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary; our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, CHARLES CANADY, I believe is chairing a subcommittee hearing on the bill of the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, which actually was the forerunner of all of these, which is what got it started, and I believe that we are proceeding apace. I understand the Speaker has made a public statement today committing that we will take this up in due course. In my office we have a strict policy.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in due course?

Mr. GOSS. I think due course is coming a lot sooner than you think.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Something like deliberate speed?

Mr. GOSS. Deliberate speed means different things of course on different sides of the aisle, but I think at this point we have a promise to go by early next year on this, and we are going to start the hearings tomorrow.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Would this be effective in the next calendar year?

Mr. GOSS. I do not know what the effective date is. I think it remains to be seen, but I think it is very clear that we can start the hearings tomorrow.

Along those lines, I have to point out that others have offered all kinds of bills. I have a lobbyist-paid travel bill that is in. It has a handful of Members' bipartisan support. Unfortunately, some of the colleagues I hear discussing this issue today are not on that bill. I hope they will take a good long look at it. I think efforts are underway to tighten the disclosure requirements to bring sunshine and accountability into our process.

Certainly as Members know, these principles sound easy, but they are not as easy when you start applying them, because you have to define what a gift is. If somebody gives you a memento, it is hard to make that distinction occasionally. I think most Members agree that we have to be wise and judicious in what we do, and I think it is very clear that both the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Committee on Rules, both of which I am on, are interested in this along with the Committee on the Judiciary.

It has a terrific amount of interest, it is underway, it is going forward. To

somehow say that we are off on the wrong track here because the appropriations process, which we all know is on a very tight timetable which needs to go forward, to suddenly now throw a monkey wrench on that process because it does not have what is clearly a nongermane, inappropriate, out of scope issue in it, does not do us a service here at all. We need to get on with this rule, we need to get on with the conference, let things happen, and we need to take up the gift reform and the lobby reform and campaign reform as we have promised we would do in the right season when their time comes, and that season apparently starts tomorrow.

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

Mr. Speaker, last night in Fort Worth, TX, the local United We Stand organization had another meeting, and once again I informed them that I was going to attempt to bring this up today and once again the Republican leadership would steamroll this issue and not permit it to be brought up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

(Mr. BRYANT of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be simpler in the legislative business of this House than what we are doing today. It is a simple question for Members. Do you think that we should be able to continue to play golf for free, play tennis for free, go skiing for free, fly around the country on these recreational outings that are thinly disguised vacations, or do you think we ought to impose the same limits on this House that the U.S. Senate imposed on itself 4 weeks ago?

It is that simple. We ask you to vote against the previous question so that the amended rule of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] may come forward so that we can simply offer the same provisions which the Senate has applied to itself as applicable to the House. That is all there is to it. All of this gobbledygook about procedures and all the tough talk about Deschler's Rules and so forth, all of it is meaningless. It is a very simple question.

There are those who believe Members of the House of Representatives ought to be able to play golf for free, who do not want to pay for their own golf or their own ski trips or their own tennis. They think the lobbyists ought to pay for it, and there are those who think it ought not to be allowed, that it ought to stop, that it is an embarrassment to the institution. There are those of us who have worked for 2½ years to pass legislation to stop this outrage, and there are those who spent 2½ years trying to prevent that legislation from passing. We have heard from some of those this afternoon just a few moments ago. They jump up and holler regular order. They are ready to fight for their right to have free golf and free tennis.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I wish we could get the same interest for some other issues as we seem to get for protecting free golf for Members of the House of Representatives. All of this would have the same rules that the Senate passed which, by the way, are quite moderate; they do not go as far as I would like to go. We want those rules applied to the House of Representatives. We do not have to wait for January, or more hearings; we can do it in the next 1½ hours. That is all we are asking for. We ask you to vote down the previous question so that we can offer this amendment to the legislative appropriation bill.

What are we doing? We are simply saying that there is a limit of \$50 on all gifts, meals and entertainment to Members of the House of Representatives. Fifty bucks is probably too much. I do not think most folks watching this debate think we even ought to get 50 bucks. But that limit is on there, and for those Members who want to keep on accepting it, they can keep on accepting it. But for goodness sakes, the same rules ought to apply to the House of Representatives.

We are saying that there is a \$100 limit from a single source. Pay for your own meals and golf and ski trips, but let the rest of us impose this rule upon the House so that we can regain the confidence of the American people and this institution.

I would point out to you that the bitterest attacks on this institution have come from some of the same people who stand up here every time we have this debate and defend the status quo. And where does the status quo get us? It just gets us greater and greater in debt to the American people with regard to credibility.

Why do we not go ahead and do this? Two-and-a-half years ago we embarked on an effort to do it. This House passed it two times by overwhelming margins. It would be law today except for a filibuster in the Senate that killed it. Why not get it done right now, impose reasonable restraints on the behavior of Members of the House with regard to gifts from lobbyists and be done with it. Why not?

Nobody wants to rise and answer that question. The defense over here today will be all over the board. Now we hear there is going to be more hearings. We had hearings on this 3 months ago. We were told there would be a markup in due course, very soon, do not worry about it. Here we are, September, 3 months before the end of the year, no markup. All we have had is an announcement that as a result of what we are trying to do here today, my goodness, there will be another hearing tomorrow.

□ 1630

Well, let us stop beating around the bush and putting the American people off and stop playing games. Lobbyists should not be able to buy meals and so forth for Members of the House of Rep-

resentatives. It is as simple as that. There is not a single person in this House who has served here or who has served in State and local government who has not behaved in the same fashion we are trying to prohibit today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not hold myself out as a paragon of virtue either, but it is clear some years ago it was necessary to make this change. We began trying to make the change, and I would encourage the Members of the House to vote down the previous question and given us an opportunity to amend this law to pass the same rules to apply to the House as apply to the Senate and be done with this issue once and for all, and say if you are going to play golf, gentlemen, pay for it yourself. If you are going to go on a ski trip, pay for it yourself. If you are going to go out and have a big fancy meal, pay for it yourself. That is all we are saying today. Vote down the question.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress who has never played golf nor has any intention to, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that my colleagues appear to be so sanctimonious and self-righteous about somebody going out and having a hamburger or dinner with somebody saying that is buying influence when the same Members that are making these statements and trying to make the American people feel like we are doing something wrong by playing golf with somebody or tennis with somebody or having dinner with somebody are accepting thousands of dollars in campaign contributions.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], according to the information on his FEC report, got 52, count them, 52 \$5,000 contributions from PAC's. I would not accuse him of wrongdoing, but if there is any influence peddling, if the appearance of influence peddling is something we are talking about, I would think 52 \$5,000 contributions would have more of an impact on the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. BRYANT], than somebody buying me a sandwich, or somebody playing tennis with someone, or someone playing golf with someone; 52 \$5,000 contributions.

In 1994, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] got \$273,689.51, and over half of those were from special interest PAC's, but he does not want to talk about that.

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] got \$196,400, and 69 percent, over two-thirds, came from PAC's. He got contributions from the American Federation of State, county and municipal people. He got the cable industry, human rights campaign, Democrat, Republican, Independent Voters Educational Political Action Fund, and a lot of labor unions. But those do not have influence, folks, those \$5,000 contributions to him does not have any influence. I believe that. But if I have a hamburger with somebody I am break-

ing the law? That is buying influence? I think my colleagues have their priorities kind of skewed.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that many of these functions that we are talking about raises money for charitable contributions, like leukemia research and cancer research. I say to my colleagues, I think that is very important. I would rather have these private individuals do this and private groups do this than the taxpayers.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] if he would like to respond to the gentleman who just spoke.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he would engage in a colloquy with me.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, since we are talking about political action committee contributions, did the gentleman vote for the campaign finance bill that passed the House last year?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not know which the gentleman is talking about. We had several.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Did the gentleman vote for any of them?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would have to check.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I do not have to check.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question? I will limit the campaign contributions to \$1,000. Will he vote for that?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Regular order, Mr. Speaker. I have the time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, then let me respond.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. The gentleman had political action committee contributions when most of us voted to limit those and the gentleman did not.

Let me ask a second question. Has the gentleman played golf at any time in the last year at the expense of a lobbyist?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I have played golf at the expense of people raising money for leukemia research and for cancer research so the taxpayers do not have to.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Did those people happen to be lobbyists?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Is the gentleman going to tell Members of the House that you have not played golf this year at the expense of a lobbyist?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. How about last year?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No. The people who put on fundraisers for cancer research are organizations, not lobbyists.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am not even talking about these sham vacations that come in the guise of—

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, will you let me answer? Do not ask me a question if—

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. The gentleman's answer was no, I think. And what I am saying is, I am not even talking about these sham vacations that come in the guise of some fundraising scheme for some charity. I am talking about just taking you out on the golf course and letting you play golf for free? The gentleman is going to say you have not done that?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No. I said no. Did the gentleman hear me?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Very well. I am just so surprised, Mr. BURTON.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Will the gentleman vote for an amendment to your bill to limit campaign contributions from PACs to \$1,000? Because I am going to introduce it, and I want to see if the gentleman will vote for it because you are getting all these \$5,000 contributions.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I would ask the gentleman if he will vote for a bill that says Members do not get to play golf for free and they have to pay for their own green fees? That is what we have before the House today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Of course.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. The gentleman will vote for a bill that says a lobbyist cannot pay for a Member's golf green fees?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Of course.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. It is before us. Vote with us.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The fact of the matter is, will the gentleman vote to limit your campaign contributions to \$1,000?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I have already voted for political action committee reform.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The gentleman is going to get that chance, because we are going to propose that amendment to your bill.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time. I will say one more time. Mr. BURTON protests against circumstances against which he had a chance to change and he refused to vote to change it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Did you get 52 \$5,000 contributions?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this rule. This is a fair rule which provides for the consideration of the legislative branch appropriations bill. This appropriations bill is the first shot across the bow for those last defenders of the status quo. It cuts spending first, it cuts spending fast, and it cuts spending fairly.

In fact, this bill spends \$205 million less than we spent last year on the leg-

islative branch. These are real cuts, not the mythical decreases in the rate of spending made popular by the former majority.

Mr. Speaker, we have kept our promises with this legislation and we will continue to keep these promises all during the fall. Let us not be confused by the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle. They keep trying to confuse the issue. The issue here is spending. They do not have a plan to cut spending so they go into gift bans and all this other stuff.

A vote to defeat the previous question will kill this conference report. It will not reform campaign finance, it will not reform our lobby laws. Any claims to the contrary are simply not accurate. The minority seeks to defeat the previous question so they can stop this first spending reduction bill in its tracks. That is not why the American people sent us here. They sent us here to change the way the government operates.

I want to commend the gentleman from California, RON PACKARD, my good friend, for his excellent work on this conference report. It is truly the first step to a balanced budget. So I urge my colleagues to think before you vote to vote for real reform and to vote to cut spending first by voting for the previous question for the rule and for this conference report.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked earlier of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] if he could indicate when we would deal with gift reform and lobby reform if it were not possible to do it on this bill at this time, which, by the way, does nothing to disturb any of the other work that Mr. PACKARD and his committee have done, as I have indicated. But when will that be brought to the floor if we do not bring it up tonight and try to resolve it before we go to Baltimore?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the best I can tell the gentleman is before we adjourn sine die.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, does that mean it will be effective in the next Congress?

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

This is an incredible debate to have on our first day back. It is absolutely no wonder the American people are very tired of listening to the wrangling in this body. It is like we have not been away.

Now, let me talk about some of the things that I think do not pass the straight-face test. Yes, this is the first of the 13 bills we have to pass to keep the Government going before September 30. September 30 has been the dead-

line forever and ever. It is not a secret date. We know it. And we have never been so late in getting these bills done. So there is a possibility that many people are going to be furloughed, all sorts of awful things are going to happen, the Government may close down, or whatever, but we are going to step up to the plate today, if this passes, and we are going to pass ours first. That means if we get to the 30th and you have not passed the others, we will not be hurt.

It is interesting because we are putting it in the name of "we are belt tightening," which is true, we are belt tightening, so we are setting an example and we just hope that we will be able to get the other people's bills through. If they are not, they will be furloughed, have a nice day, or their programs will be cut or whatever, but we will not be hurt. We will not be tied to the track as this train wreck is coming. That is No. 1.

Listen to this and say wait a minute.

Wait a minute. This bill ought to be last, not first. If the Congress has not gotten its business done, they certainly should not make sure that they are held harmless by the fact they have not done their business. That is what the President is talking about when he says he will not sign this. I salute him. He is right.

Now, No. 2, we have been trying to get a gift bill cleaned up since President Truman was here. President Truman was the first President to come down and say that there were lobbying loopholes, and we have worked away at trying to tinker and figure it out. Last year this body passed it, the other body filibustered it. This year the other body passed it and we are trying to say let us put exactly the same thing on and be done with it.

Mr. Speaker, I love the golf conversation. Now, the way I understand these things, and maybe the gentleman from Texas can explain it to me, people come to play golf to raise money for these wonderful causes, and they are wonderful causes, but they come because they think they are going to get to play with a Congressman and they may have some words with them as they ride around in the cart.

Now, first of all, if we cared so much about the cause, I would think we would be willing to donate our time, would we not, and pay for our own green fees and have a little more money for whatever we are doing? And, second, to pretend like these are just citizens who walked in and were willing to donate so some Congressman could play free, that does not make sense. We know what this is all about and it is not passing the straight-face test.

We should pass this gift ban. It would make people feel much better about what is going on here. We also should not be rushing out here to pass our bill first so ourselves and our staff and the Senate, boy, no matter how bad we mess up, we will not be hurt. We will

get our paycheck through all of this and we just hope some of those GS-7's or some people relying on Government checks or whatever, that they do not get hurt too bad, and we hope we get their bills through before the 30th or whatever.

Now, that just looks like the same old same old. In fact, worse than that, because I think that the people on this side of the aisle, who have been on the appropriations and in a leadership position can tell you we had these bills in this body passed every single time in July, at the latest. Never have we come back and had more than one or two bills hanging out there with some kind of disagreement. But now to have all 13, and run forth and say we will take care of ourselves first, as this great example that we belt tightened, yeah, we belt tightened, and we should have, but we are not hurt, and we are not going to do the gift bill because we are hiding behind the legalism of nonegermane, baloney. People are tired of it. Vote it down.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Rules for recommending a good rule. This is an excellent conference agreement, and I urge the adoption of this conference agreement and the ordering as well of the previous question.

Frankly, I am astounded at hearing all of this revisionist history, about how in 40 years of Democratic control of the House of Representatives you could not pass a gift ban bill, so now all of a sudden it is imperative we defeat the previous question on a rule so we can add a gift ban bill to a conference report that has nothing whatsoever to do with a gift ban bill.

Now, you had 40 years to do it and yet you want to do it today? How about next year? That is when we are going to take it up. The Speaker has indicated we are going to take it up next year. Let us take it up then.

□ 1645

This is a good conference agreement. The gentlewoman says, "We are helping ourselves first." First of all, this conference agreement cuts \$206 million below 1995, when the Democrats were in control of the House. It cuts \$114.7 million below the budget authority allocation for this bill. It cuts \$20.4 million below the outlay allocation, and it cuts, this is what they do not like to hear, 2,614 full-time Federal employees, a 9.5 percent reduction. They do not like to hear that, so they want to tack on all this extraneous stuff to overlook the fact that we are actually accomplishing a great deal.

The gentlewoman says, "We have never approached this bill first." Let

me suggest to the gentlewoman she is entirely wrong. In fact, for fiscal year 1995, in which the Democrats were the majority party, this was the first bill to be signed by the President of the United States on July 22, 1994. For fiscal 1994 it was the first bill to be signed on August 11, 1993. For fiscal 1992 it was the first bill to be signed, on August 14, 1991, and for the point that the gentlewoman made about it never being so late, never been passed late, this bill was signed with all 13 bills on November 5, 1990. It was signed with all 13 bills on December 22, 1987, and it was signed with all 13 bills in an omnibus C.R. on October 18, 1986.

The point is that these arguments are fallacious. They are red herrings. They are trying to get around the fact that this is a good conference agreement. We cut our budget, we bring it to the President and say, "It cuts money out of the legislative budget, the budget that governs the conduct of this House and the other body." It is a decent conference report, and it is foolish, foolish to say, after they could not pass a gift ban in 40 years, therefore we ought to disrupt this good bill and pass a gift ban with it today. I say to the Members, reject what they are trying to do, order the previous question, pass the rule, pass the bill, and let us get on with the business, because we are running out of time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who is a very fine Member, before he leaves the Chamber I am afraid had a little case of selective amnesia a moment ago. He said that we had never passed this. I know he did not intend that. We did pass this bill last year. It was passed when the Democrats controlled the Congress last year, it passed the House of Representatives, went over to the Senate, was filibustered by Republicans in the Senate.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the time to simply inform Members what I plan to do on the motion to recommit, and also to urge opposition to the previous question on the rule. As the gentlewoman from Colorado has indicated, I think it is extremely unseemly, when it appears that we are headed into a train wreck with the Government shutting down because of the nonpassage of various appropriations bills, I think it is unseemly that the one bill which would be released from the track so it will not participate in that train wreck is the bill that funds the legislative branch of Government. I do not think the public will understand that, I do not think we would want to have to go home and explain that.

If other groups in this society are going to be held hostage, so should we. That is why I will offer a motion to recommit, which would require that the bill be recommitted to the committee on conference with instructions that

the conferees not meet until they are subsequently instructed to do so by the House, so we can in fact pass our other business before we take care of our own.

Second, with respect to the previous question, I simply want to say that I find it amazing that the majority party cannot object at all when 17 separate legislative riders were attached to the EPA appropriation bill, virtually all of which were special interest deals. Yet, they somehow are morally offended when we try to attach an amendment to the legislative appropriations bill which cleans up the relationship between Members of Congress and lobbyists.

I for one am tired of seeing network news programs run stories about Members of Congress schmoozing with lobbyists on beaches or on golf courses. We all understand the special advantage that gives them. We think it is a special advantage that ought to be taken away. That is why the Bryant amendment ought to pass.

With respect to the equation of PAC contributions, let me simply say this. I myself make no apologies whatsoever for any PAC contributions I have ever received. They are fully aboveboard, they are reported, and I have no objection to having a bunch of workers in the back of the shop being able to unite to contribute collectively as much as four chief executives in the front office can contribute to the other side in any corporation.

I would also say that I frankly find it a joke to have Members of the majority party concerned about a \$5,000 PAC contribution and the damage that may do to the legislative process, but they have no objection whatsoever to one family in Wisconsin contributing \$1 million to the empire of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], GOPAC, and the other pieces. If we want to get worried about buying special privileges, I would say that is what we ought to start looking at.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], a distinguished and effective freshman Member of this Congress.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a conference in Dallas that I heard referred to earlier. It was United We Stand America. I have spoken in 2 weeks to over 20,000 people at conventions. There is now a national group called the Clean Congress Foundation that is now bigger than all of the individual groups.

I will tell the Members, America is disgusted as much by the partisan bickering, posturing, with no intent to go anywhere, as they are with anything. Dallas was about a lot of people tired of partisan politics, disgusted by people that have held power for 42 years that could have cleaned up the system, who are now standing pure as the driven snow, disgusted; disgusted by the Republicans that used to do the

same thing, all of us, them and us, on both sides of the aisle.

I want to tell the Members that what is most disturbing today to Middle America is what they are seeing on the floor today. I checked out to see if this amendment could actually do anything. No. Members know it cannot do anything. The Parliamentarian stands and says it is not germane. It is not even debatable. They knew when they took up this time on the floor that there was not a chance of a cold day in hell of getting it through, and they were playing with the American people again, and they are mad. They are mad.

I tell the Members today, we have a bill, the Clean Congress Act, 2072, and it stops playing around like this bill that still allows trips, trips that fly you all over the world as gifts, still allows things that people do not want. They do not want a \$50 gift, they do not want a \$100 gift, they do not want any gift. They want no money flowing here in Washington, DC. 2072 is the bill that we want to pass, and we ask Members to stop quibbling and support it. Please approve the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentlewoman, who is a new Member, that I offered a motion in the Committee on Rules to waive germaneness so this could be brought up on the floor today, and that motion was voted down on a straight party line vote. The Republican members of the Committee on Rules refused to waive germaneness in the Committee on Rules so we could address this issue today. The Democratic members asked that it be waived in the Committee on Rules.

If the Republican Members had been willing to do that in the Committee on Rules, there would be no argument on the floor today about whether it is germane or not germane. This is all a game. This is all a sham on the other side of the aisle. This could be brought up. This could have been on the floor today if the Republican Members of the Committee on Rules would have permitted it to be on the floor today.

It is 9 months now. We passed this last year. I want to make that point again, because the gentlewoman made the same point that the gentleman from Louisiana made: Why did the Democrats not pass this? The Democratically controlled House of Representatives did pass this last year, and it was blocked by the Republican Members of the U.S. Senate in a filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the previous question, and I urge my colleague to vote against the previous question so that the gift and lobbying reform language can be added to this legislation. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are very fond these days of talking about how responsive they are

to the American public. I will tell the Members, go to any town hall, go to any group of Americans these days, working middle-class families. The American public strongly favors banning gifts from lobbyists to Members of Congress, and they are right, because it is the perks and the privileges that demean this institution, and every single person who serves here.

That is not what we were elected to do, or why we were elected to this body. We are here to do the people's business, and we are well compensated for that. We do not need free vacations, free frequent flier miles, free gifts, or free meals to sweeten the deal.

Let me say that working middle-class families are getting nothing for free. They are paying every single day for everything, and they are working darned hard for it. Let us understand what their lives are about. They are getting a glimpse of what some Members of this body's lives are about in accepting free gifts from lobbyists and their influence every single day.

We do need to enforce disclosure by the lobbyists. The American people have a right to know how much these groups are spending in order to influence legislation in this body. It is high time that we tackled these issues and join our colleagues in the other body in implementing serious gift and lobby reform.

The Republican leadership has repeatedly told us that the schedule for this session is full, so that the vote today, Mr. Speaker, is probably our last chance to pass lobby and gift reform this year. Let us seize the opportunity to limit the influence of special interests. Let us defeat the previous question. Let us once and for all tell the American people that we are serious about reform. Let this body reflect the interests of the people and not the special interests.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

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

Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of debates where you wonder whether you should weigh in, because a lot of people are angry and there is a lot of partisan debate. Then you say, "Is this something you want to be a part of, this debate?" I do not know if I want to be a part of this debate, but I do want to say that I believe with all my heart and soul that I have waited 40 years for the opportunity to have a leading role as a majority Member. I have only been in office 8 months in the majority. I would like to give my Republicans an opportunity to do in 2 years this issue, which my colleagues on that side had an opportunity to do for 40 years.

When I listen to the gentlewoman from Colorado, PAT SCHROEDER, saying that "I am voting for the legislative appropriation because I want to increase or make sure that I am paid," in this code, by statute, Members of Con-

gress and the President of the United States are under permanent appropriation. The Democrats voted in 1980, and Republicans as well, to make sure that we were paid under permanent appropriation, so I just do not think it carries any weight to say a Member of Congress wants to vote for the legislative appropriation to be paid. We are, for whatever reason, in this book, permanent.

In terms of the issue of gift ban or lobby disclosure, I will say something I would never say if I did not mean it. I would not run again if gift ban and lobby disclosure are not passed. I would say to my colleagues, this issue is going to be taken up by Republicans. If it is not taken up, I will not run again. That is how strongly I believe in my leadership and in my fellow Republicans taking up gift ban and lobby disclosure.

I happen to agree with what the Senate has done. I do not think it is monumental, but I think it gets us a long way. I do not criticize that side for bringing this issue up. If it puts it on the antenna of some of our leadership, then so be it. However, there are very important Members of this Congress who have gotten elected on this issue.

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

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I have to say this. I think there are some Members on the other side who feel if they repeat something often enough that is not true, people will believe it, so I feel an obligation to repeat what is true. The previous speaker just said the Democrats did not pass this legislation. We passed this legislation last year. The gift ban was passed by the Democratically controlled House of Representatives. It is not true to say that the Democratic Party would not and could not pass this piece of legislation.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

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

Mr. Speaker, the Senate of the United States has acted on this issue and they achieved a good result because they had some bipartisan support. It is unfortunate today that there appears to be no bipartisanship on this question of how we can cut the ties that have bound legislators and lobbyists, because it definitely needs to be attended to.

I think that all that this will accomplish is to take an imperfect compromise from the Senate and put it in place here in the House. If anyone needs a reason as to why this ought to occur, let me reflect on my own experience in this regard, because when this measure was up before, I spoke on it here on the floor of the House. I addressed the issue on the floor of the House in the motion to recommit, and

I did so without making any reference to either Democrats or Republicans, but suggested there was a need to end these freebies.

What I got from that in response was a member of the Republican Committee on Appropriations, one of the great cardinals who is here on the floor today, to tell me that he had told his staff to go out and look for a project to cut in my district. They found one to the tune of \$90 million, a project in my district to whittle out because I had the audacity as a new Member to stand up and say we need to do something about a gift ban.

Well, I am here today to say I am not going to be intimidated on that issue because I think it goes to the core of what this Congress is about and the demand of people to see this place cleaned up. My objection to the Republicans is not that they have done too much to change the way this Congress operates, but they have done too little, and they know it.

In Texas when you shake hands on something like Speaker GINGRICH did up in New Hampshire, it means something. It is an agreement. You lend your word. But all we got was a promise and a lot of talk and whistling in the background. Someday over the rainbow we will get around to dealing with this.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I will yield on your time as long as you want to talk about this act of intimidation right here on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take time to clarify two issues that have been mentioned several times.

Last year we did pass a gift ban bill. It was not this gift ban that is being proposed. Totally different. This one is 51 pages long. I have not read a single page of that 51 pages. I do not think any Member of Congress except those that have proposed it have read the 51 pages. This is not the time to pass a 51-page amendment to this conference report. That is the point I wanted to make.

The second point: We have worked very carefully for several years and certainly this year to make this a bipartisan bill. I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] who is the ranking member of the subcommittee. We have worked in a bipartisan way.

Unfortunately, this is turning into a very partisan vote on the rule. Frankly, that is probably the way it is going to go, along a straight partisan vote. That is unfortunate when we have worked together on a nonpartisan bill that has done a lot of good work for restructuring Congress.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Then I will be yielding to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. Speaker, last night at the United We Stand meeting in Fort Worth, I informed the United We Stand members that the Republicans would unanimously vote against the gift ban today. That appears to be the case, based on what I have just heard. I think that is unfortunate. We have a chance to lay this issue to rest once and for all, but the Republicans will not permit us to bring it up.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], the author of the gift ban.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

(Mr. BRYANT of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] yielding me the time.

Let me simply say that we have heard a number of statements on the floor today that once again, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] said, need to be corrected very clearly. First, the repeated refrain from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and a few others, why did the Democrats not pass this legislation in the past when they had control of the House?

The answer, of course, is we did pass it. We did not just pass it once, we passed it twice. It was filibustered to death by the then Republican minority in the Senate.

Second, we heard the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] say a moment ago that somehow or another what we are trying to do will have no effect, it cannot happen, it is against the rules.

The fact of the matter is that notwithstanding what the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] was told, I am sure by some Members on her side, we can pass this gift ban in the next hour and a half simply by voting down the previous question. That is all we are asking that this House do.

This is about the third time we have asked that this be done this year. We did it last year. We are simply asking that we go ahead and make the same rules that apply to the Senate as of 5 weeks ago also apply to the House. It is not complicated. It is a simple question of whether or not you want to do it. It is just that simple.

Does it make sense, particularly in light of all of the legislatures around the country who have already applied these kind of rules or more strict rules to themselves, does it make any sense that the House of Representatives would be the last bastion of free golf and free tennis and free ski trips for legislators? I think it does not make any sense. We have moved into a new era. Nobody is perfect.

We began this process, by the way, in a very bipartisan fashion 2½ years ago.

We actually got it out of the subcommittee which I was the chairman of at the time with a unanimous vote of both parties. But at some point along the way, one side of the House decided it was not in their interest to see it passed and it was filibustered to death in the Senate.

Look, let us just take it up and pass it today and not hear of it any more. If you want to go further than the Senate has gone, and I would sure like to because I do not think they went far enough, but if you want to go further than the Senate has gone, you can do so. This does not raise any obstacles to that. Certainly you can do so. But today let us pass the Senate rule that says Members of the Senate cannot get free gifts from lobbyists, and make it apply to the House of Representatives, and be done with this issue and do the American people a favor.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to that distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Miami, the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House, for yielding me this time.

I would like to bring us back to the issue that we are debating here. It happens to be the legislative branch appropriations bill.

If we are going to simply comply with the standing rules of the House which is what we try desperately to do on a regular basis, we will not waive germaneness. With the exception of the conference report itself, there are not waivers on this bill, and so it seems to me that the responsible thing for us to do is to recognize that a measure which is going to cut \$205 million, a real cut of \$205 million, should have the chance to be voted on here on the House floor.

We have been debating during this legislative branch appropriations debate the issue of lobbying reform. The fact of the matter is that is going to come up. As my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, has pointed out, an opportunity has existed for four long, uninterrupted decades on the other side of the aisle to deal with this issue. The 104th Congress has met for 8 months. We have had 8 months to deal with a wide range of things.

I would hasten to say to my friends from Texas, Mr. DOGGETT especially whom I asked to yield earlier, when he said that we have not brought about reforms, I have to take that as a personal insult, because on January 4, we passed the largest, most sweeping reforms that the U.S. Congress has seen in over half a century. Not since the 1946 Legislative Reorganization Act have we done very important things that gained bipartisan support, like eliminating proxy voting; dramatically reducing the number of committees and subcommittees, by 25 percent; reducing by

a third committee staff; and something that my friend from Connecticut also worked long and hard on, having Congress comply with the laws imposed on other Americans.

The fact of the matter is we brought about major sweeping reforms and it has not come to an end. But this bill is not where we should be debating this. We are simply trying to cut the level of appropriations for this institution, and I hope very much that we will be able to pass the previous question, and pass this rule.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question in order to add the gift and lobbying reform provisions passed by the other body to the conference report now before the House. Unless we act now, the House will have no opportunity this year to vote on lobbying and gift reform.

Throughout the 104th Congress, the House Republican leadership has refused to schedule consideration of lobbying and gift reform legislation. In fact, they have made it clear that such measures will not be considered by the House this year. From the first day of the 104th Congress, the Republican leadership has allowed corporate lobbyists unprecedented access to the legislative drafting process. This access has resulted in weakened environmental and health protections, crippled worker safety standards, and special tax benefits for the wealthiest Americans. Nowhere in the much-heralded Contract With America did the Republican leadership address gift and lobbying reform. Nowhere in the Rules of the House reform package did these provisions appear. My colleagues, the silence of the House Republican leadership on this issue has been deafening.

Mr. Speaker, twice during the 103d Congress, the House approved similar lobbying reform and gift legislation by solid bipartisan majorities only to see these measures stalled by filibusters in the other body. Now that they have finally passed these reforms, we in the House must also act.

The lobbying reform provisions would correct the enormous loopholes in current law that allow more than 70 percent of Washington's lobbyists to lobby congressional offices without registering. Under these provisions, unpaid grass-roots lobbying activities would be completely exempt from the new requirements, as would advocacy by churches and religious groups.

My colleagues, the issue of lobbying and gift reform has been thoroughly debated by Congress. The time to act is now. I urge defeat of the previous question so that we may add these important provisions to H.R. 1854, the conference report on legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question on the rule for the legislative branch appropriations conference report.

First, let me commend my colleagues, VIC FAZIO, MARTY MEEHAN, and JOHN BRYANT for bringing this important issue to the floor.

My friends, let's not pass the bill which funds our daily business until we reform the political business-as-usual in this city.

It has been 87 days since our Speaker shoot hands with the President in New Hampshire, pledging to act on campaign finance and political reform.

I praised the Speaker for that handshake. In fact, I asked the Speaker to consider a bill I introduced with MARTY MEEHAN, TIM JOHNSON and others that would establish the kind of independent commission that the Speaker shook hands on.

But since then, the Speaker argued against a rush to judgment.

Eighty-seven days later, it's safe to say the Republican leadership of the House is in no rush to clean up our political system.

And that's a shame. We're the only House in this city that is dragging its feet on reform.

At the White House, the President has twice laid out his detailed plan to the Speaker. He's even named possible commissioners.

The other body—not known for its zest for reform—held 2 days of debate and passed solid lobbying and gift ban reform bills.

During the first 100 days of this Congress, we passed numerous items of the Contract With America which will do great harm to our cities, our families, and our environment.

During the second 100 days, we passed appropriations bills that slash so many of the programs which benefit ordinary Americans, while at the same time leaving policies that help rich and powerful corporations untouched.

So before another 100 days go by since the historic handshake in New Hampshire, let's at least take one small step to try to convince the American people that this institutions is not for sale to the highest bidder.

Defeat the previous question. Adopt these critical gift and lobbying reforms.

Don't wait another day. Pass reform now.

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

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. 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.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 179, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 636]
YEAS—228

Allard
Archer
Armedy
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)

Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bliley
Blute

Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning

Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert

Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley

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

NAYS—179

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chabot
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit

Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost

Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gutiérrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecicka
LaFalce

Lantos	Orton	Spratt
Levin	Owens	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Stenholm
Lipinski	Pastor	Stokes
LoBiondo	Payne (NJ)	Studds
Lofgren	Payne (VA)	Stupak
Lowe	Pelosi	Tanner
Luther	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Manton	Peterson (MN)	Tejeda
Markey	Pickett	Thompson
Martinez	Pomeroy	Thornton
Mascara	Poshard	Thurman
Matsui	Rahall	Torres
McCarthy	Rangel	Torricelli
McDermott	Reed	Towns
McHale	Richardson	Velázquez
McNulty	Rivers	Vento
Meehan	Roemer	Visclosky
Meek	Rose	Volkmer
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Ward
Miller (CA)	Rush	Waters
Mineta	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Minge	Sanders	Waxman
Mink	Sawyer	Williams
Montgomery	Schroeder	Wise
Moran	Schumer	Woolsey
Nadler	Scott	Wyden
Neal	Skaggs	Wyn
Obey	Skelton	Yates
Olver	Slaughter	

NOT VOTING—27

Bishop	Maloney	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	McDade	Riggs
Deal	McKinney	Sanford
Fattah	Mfume	Serrano
Foley	Moakley	Sisisky
Geren	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)
Green	Morella	Tucker
Harman	Oberstar	Waldholtz
Lincoln	Ortiz	Wilson

□ 1731

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MANTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I, reluctantly voted for the previous question in spite of my desire to support the Senate gift ban. I personally have implemented the Senate gift ban in my office. While the golf and tennis trips worth thousands of dollars to Members usually benefit charity as well as the Members, there is no question in my mind that these primarily recreational trips should be eliminated as a Member's perk. The American people are demanding that we reform this system of expensive dinners, gifts, and trips. The question is not whether or not people believe the other party. They don't trust them either. Citizens are fed up with both parties because they believe we work too closely with those who give us financial benefits—personal and political. Our large freshman Republican class was elected largely on Government reform. We are not likely to remain if we don't progress on real reform—of Congress itself, or PACS, of gifts, of term limits. I will continue to sponsor legislation on these issues, as well as voluntarily implement them in my office. While ultimately this is a question of integrity and character, I sincerely hope that our leadership will begin voting on these issues soon because previous Congresses have spent the public's full measure of trust.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

LIMITING DEBATE ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1854 be limited to 10 minutes each, equally divided between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the conference report to H.R. 1854, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 206, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 28, 1995, at page H7964.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] each will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is pleasure to present the conference report on the 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill. This is the first 1996 appropriations bill to come out of conference, but there are a number close behind us.

The conference report presents a bill that will greatly reduce the size of our own branch of Government.

To summarize, the conference agreement provides budget authority of \$2.18 billion. This is \$433 million below the President's budget request, a 16.5 percent reduction. It is \$205.7 million

below fiscal year 1995; that's an 8.6 percent reduction in funding below the current year. This agreement reduces legislative branch jobs [FTE's] by 2,614 under fiscal year 1995, Senate staffing excluded; that's a 9.5 percent reduction in jobs. Finally, the conference agreement is \$114.7 million below our 602(b) budget resolution target.

The House and Senate concluded a successful conference.

There were 55 amendments to the House bill, all were resolved by the conferees.

I will include a table showing details and a list of the highlights of the conference agreement.

We have compared the conference agreement to the House bill.

The bill we sent to the Senate did not have funds for Senate operations.

Excluding the Senate items, the conference agreement is \$9,518,000 below the House-passed bill. The reductions to the House bill consist of: \$18,458,000 further reduction to GAO; \$4,511,000 further reduction in congressional printing; \$903,000 reduced from the Joint Committee on Taxation; \$1,060,000 further reduction in the power plant; \$14,999,000 reduced from Congressional Research Service in order to restore Library of Congress funding; \$7,000,000 from the Botanic Garden Conservatory renovation which eliminates the funds to begin that project.

There were several additions to the House bill, including: \$2,500,000 for a joint Office of Compliance; \$3,615,000 for an orderly shutdown of the Office of Technology Assessment; \$50,000 for Capitol buildings maintenance; \$17,753,000 was restored to the funding of the Library of Congress; and \$13,995,000 was added back for the depository library program under the Superintendent of Documents.

There were several provisions included, primarily to facilitate the operations of the House and Senate. The conference report (House Report 104-212) has been available for several weeks and explains these provisions.

One of these provisions is contained in amendment No. 10 which provides \$6,115,000 for the orderly shutdown of the Office of Technology Assessment and includes provisions for severance pay and disposal of property.

Amendment No. 55 includes some House housekeeping provisions added by the managers and a provision that establishes an awards and settlement fund required by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

In addition to the overall reductions I have already enumerated, a few of the highlights include:

House of Representatives—has been cut \$57.2 million—\$57,174,000—below 1995. Included in this reduction, committee staff have been cut 33 percent; committee budgets have been reduced by \$39.8 million—\$39,762,000—House administrative offices have been cut by \$11.9 million below 1995—\$11,934,000—

and administrative staff have been reduced by 313 FTE's.

Senate—has been cut \$33.7 million in 1995.

Joint items—Joint committees—printing, economic, taxation—have been cut by 22.8 percent overall.

Office of Technology Assessment—has been eliminated, a \$22 million savings.

Congressional Budget Office—has been given \$1.1 million and 13 more FTE's to perform unfunded mandates workload.

Architect of the Capitol—has been cut \$16.8 million below 1995. The conference agreement ends the subsidy to the Flag Office. Flag prices will be raised to reimburse the cost of the flag

raising operation. Requests for proposal will be issued to privatize custodial and maintenance work, and a panel of outside experts will propose how the powerplant can be privatized.

Government Printing Office—has been cut \$7.9 million below 1995. Congressional printing has been cut by \$5.6 million, including no more constituent copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The number of daily records printed will be reduced from 17,791 to 11,370, and we have eliminated free copies of documents to judges, to former Members, to press and other media, and to executive agencies.

Library of Congress—funding increased \$1.5 million—only increase in bill. The national digital library pro-

gram of the Library is funded at \$3 million, the amount requested.

General Accounting Office—cut \$75 million below 1995. The report indicates our intent to reduce GAO by 25 percent over a two-year period.

SUMMARY

In summary, the bill is \$205.7 million below fiscal year 1995. It effects a 2,614 reduction in full-time-equivalent jobs; that's a 9.5 percent cut, not including Senate jobs. In total, it is a \$432.8 million reduction below the requests included in the President's budget, a 16.5 percent reduction. Finally, it is \$114.7 million below our 602(b) target allocation.

Every Member can justify an "aye" vote on passage.

FY 1996 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1854)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
SENATE						
Mileage and Expense Allowances						
Mileage of the Vice President and Senators.....	60,000	60,000				-60,000
Expense allowances:						
Vice President.....	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000	
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.....	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000	
Majority Leader of the Senate.....	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000	
Minority Leader of the Senate.....	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000	
Majority Whip of the Senate.....	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Minority Whip of the Senate.....	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Chairman of the Majority Conference Committee.....	3,000	3,000		3,000	3,000	
Chairman of the Minority Conference Committee.....	3,000	3,000		3,000	3,000	
Subtotal, expense allowances.....	56,000	56,000		56,000	56,000	
Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders.....	30,000	30,000		30,000	30,000	
Total, Mileage and expenses allowances.....	146,000	146,000		86,000	86,000	-60,000
Salaries, Officers and Employees						
Office of the Vice President.....	1,513,000	1,549,000		1,513,000	1,513,000	
Office of the President Pro Tempore.....	457,000	469,000		325,000	325,000	-132,000
Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders.....	2,195,000	2,246,000		2,195,000	2,195,000	
Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips.....	658,000	672,000		658,000	658,000	
Conference committees.....	1,992,000	2,040,000		1,992,000	1,992,000	
Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority.....	384,000	394,000		380,000	380,000	-24,000
Policy Committees.....				1,930,000	1,930,000	+1,930,000
Office of the Chaplain.....	182,000	201,000		182,000	182,000	
Office of the Secretary.....	12,961,000	13,260,000		12,128,000	12,128,000	-833,000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.....	32,739,000	35,399,000		31,879,000	31,889,000	-850,000
Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority.....	1,197,000	1,225,000		1,047,000	1,047,000	-150,000
Agency contributions and related expenses.....	17,052,000	18,396,000		15,500,000	15,500,000	-1,552,000
Total, salaries, officers and employees.....	71,338,000	75,841,000		69,717,000	69,727,000	-1,611,000
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate						
Salaries and expenses.....	3,381,000	3,543,500		3,381,000	3,381,000	
Office of Senate Legal Counsel						
Salaries and expenses.....	936,000	985,000		936,000	936,000	
Expense Allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Secretaries for the Majority and Minority of the Senate: Expenses allowances.....						
	12,000	12,000		12,000	12,000	
Contingent Expenses of the Senate						
Senate policy committees.....	2,574,000	2,672,000				-2,574,000
Inquiries and Investigations.....	78,112,000	78,863,000		66,395,000	66,395,000	-11,717,000
Expenses of United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control.....						
	348,000	379,000		305,000	305,000	-43,000
Secretary of the Senate.....	1,968,500	1,968,500		1,266,000	1,266,000	-700,500
(By transfer).....	(7,000,000)					(-7,000,000)
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.....	74,894,000	72,234,000		61,347,000	61,347,000	-13,547,000
Miscellaneous items.....	7,426,000	7,429,000		6,644,000	6,644,000	-785,000
Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account.....	206,542,000	222,663,000		204,029,000	204,029,000	-2,513,000
Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices.....	869,000	890,000		778,000	778,000	-111,000
Settlements and Awards Reserve.....	1,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	
Stationery (revolving fund).....	13,000	13,000		13,000	13,000	
Official Mail Costs						
Expenses.....	11,000,000	36,300,000		11,000,000	11,000,000	
Total, contingent expenses of the Senate.....	384,767,500	424,409,500		352,777,000	352,777,000	-31,990,500
Total, Senate.....	460,580,500	504,937,000		426,908,000	426,919,000	-33,661,500
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 1/						
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
Gratuities, deceased Members.....	267,200					-267,200
Salaries and Expenses						
House Leadership Offices						
Office of the Speaker.....	1,444,000	1,800,000	1,478,000	1,478,000	1,478,000	+34,000
Office of the Majority Floor Leader.....	1,220,764	1,114,000	1,470,000	1,470,000	1,470,000	+249,236
Office of the Minority Floor Leader.....	1,445,413	1,525,000	1,480,000	1,480,000	1,480,000	+34,587

1/ Enacted and request reflect current organization of House funding.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to see Cal Ripkin break that record as much as anybody, but, you know, there are other people's lives at stake here in this bill.

I rise in opposition to the bill. One reason is it eliminates the Office of Technology Assessment. I think it is important that the Members understand fully what this bill does. For one, it eliminates the Office of Technology Assessment, the studies they do, technical studies, studies that give us information we could not get otherwise. They are overseen by a bipartisan board.

It is going to make us much more reliant upon the high-priced lobbyists that represent the billion-dollar telecommunications industry or whatever others may have a vested interest.

It eliminates 25 percent of the General Accounting Office. Think of the millions of dollars that have been saved every year by GAO. Yet we are going to tell them that a quarter of GAO is expendable. I think that is penny wise and pound foolish.

But most importantly, my friends in this Chamber, we need to know what this does to the lives of those people that have devoted their lives to serving this institution.

I would like you to focus for a moment on someone like Nancy Glorius. She started working for this institution when she was 15 years old. She has worked for the House of Representatives for 34 years, helping the House buy anything from paper clips to computer networks, has always done a good job. You know what, she just received a form letter, pink slip, without so much as her name on it, after spending 34 years of her life serving this institution; people like Charles Hoag, who worked here 24 years and was let go just months before his retirement and replaced with higher paid employees. This is not right.

This institution will not serve us, more importantly the American people, if this is the way we conduct ourselves.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], because the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] also serves

as the ranking member on House oversight.

I think the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] made the point this is an absolute reduction. It is a cut. This is a change from previous Congresses.

□ 1745

Notwithstanding the desire not to make reductions or cuts, I still want to compliment everyone involved because I think it was done in the fairest manner and in the most efficient way possible. We took the major cuts ourselves. We eliminated three committees. Fully 30 percent of the money, 29 million, came out of the committees.

So, I think by example we have indicated where we want to go. The 25-percent General Accounting Office cut was recommended by the General Accounting Office. All we did was accept it. We have more changes coming. Look at the new handbook which my colleagues have received. This is just the beginning.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I have never voted for a legislative appropriations bill in the 4 years that I have been in Congress. But for the first time, in a bipartisan way, in order to balance the budget, in order to work together across aisles, and I hope this is a vanguard in the next few weeks and months, I will vote for this bill. It makes tough choices toward balancing the budget. It cuts 33 percent out of our mail accounts. It cuts money from the clerk hire. It cuts money from the General Accounting Office and the Office of Technology Assessment.

Yes, my colleagues, if we are going to more toward balancing the budget, which I fully endorse, Congress has to take the first step and share in the sacrifice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we were successful in working with the gentleman from New Jersey and getting a Roemer-Zimmer amendment attached. If my colleagues save money in their office account, that money will go for the U.S. deficit.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage with the gentleman from California [Mr. Packard] in a colloquy.

Mr. Packard, in reviewing the conference report language, it appears that the intent of the subcommittee is to prohibit all moves by Members of their offices. As my colleague knows, as part of the transition we are attempting to consolidate Member offices, consolidate split suites where there are two rooms and one room that is located elsewhere. We want to make sure that the bipartisan building commission, as part of the transition, still has the ability to consolidate suites, and I want to make sure that even

though there is a prohibition, that that prohibition is more if a Member's term is limited for one reason or another by death or resignation and not for the incidental consolidation Members' suites.

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. The subcommittee recognizes that the bipartisan Building Commission may need some flexibility in fulfilling its goal of consolidating office space, including eliminating split suites. It is not the intent of the subcommittee to prohibit such moves authorized by the bipartisan Building Commission.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do support the cuts in this bill, but I do not believe that Congress ought to be exempted from the negotiating squeeze if, in fact, the entire national budget is headed for a train wreck. The President has indicated that, if we send this bill to him before other issues are resolved, he will veto it. That is not going to be in anybody's interest, so it seems to me what we ought to do is to delay the sending of this bill to the President.

That is why the motion to recommit, which I will offer in just a moment, will do just that. It will simply recommit the conference report to the committee with instructions that the conference not meet until subsequently instructed to do so by the House pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XXVIII. That would simply facilitate the delaying of this bill until other budget issues are worked out in other appropriation bills so that we are not in the unseemly position of appearing to be trying to speed passage through of the bill that funds our agencies while other agencies are going to get caught in the squeeze.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in response to the motion to recommit.

Let us look at the motion to recommit. It delays. If my colleagues want gridlock, if my colleagues want a so-called train wreck, then vote for this motion to recommit. The best way to avoid a train wreck is to do what we are supposed to do, and that is pass appropriations bills.

What is wrong with the conference report the way it is? I do not think there is anything wrong with it. It cuts below last year's bill. Could it be that those who want to hold this bill are opposed to deficit reduction? We are supposed to be bringing about deficit reduction. That's what this conference report does. It also makes significant reforms in the legislative branch.

Vote against delay. Vote against the motion to recommit.

Since the first of the year Republicans have set an aggressive legislative agenda. Now we are bringing the

fruits of our labors to our colleagues. Let us move forward. Vote for deficit reduction, vote against delay, vote against the motion to recommit.

This motion to recommit the bill to conference is an unprecedented action since I have been here. It is designed to remove control of the legislative agenda from the majority. It is designed to delay the appropriations process. It is designed to give the President control over the legislative branch of Government. I would ask the Members to oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is through, I will yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from California going to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER]?

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I do not see that on the table right now.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be important simply to reference the concern the gentleman had, however.

Mr. PACKARD. There has been some concern, particularly by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, that our bill would change the reduction in force of GAO as it affects, as it might affect, veterans' preference. We have discussed this with Mr. BUYER, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs subcommittee. I have a letter from the GAO, and I would submit it for the RECORD. It is to Mr. Detweiler, the National Commander of the American Legion, who has posed the problem in a letter of August 22, 1995. The Comptroller General's, Mr. Charles Bowsher letter assures the veterans that there is no intention of undermining veterans' preference, and certainly I think this issue is cleared up as far as my understanding of the bill is concerned. There apparently has been a misunderstanding of section 212 of the conference report. Mr. Bowsher's letter clears that up. And both Mr. BUYER and I wanted to make sure this is clarified.

The letters referred to are as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, September 1, 1995.

Mr. WILLIAM DETWEILER,
*National Commander, The American Legion,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. DETWEILER: I am very troubled by the August 22 letter, which you sent to members of Congress. Your assertion that section 211 of H.R. 1854 (the legislative branch appropriations bill) would result in an erosion of veterans' preference is erroneous.

Section 211 provides no exemption from the statutory requirement for veterans' preference in a reduction-in-force. On the contrary, section 211 specifically requires that GAO recognize veterans' preference in developing its reduction-in-force rules. GAO will do so.

Beyond this bill, GAO's enabling legislation requires that the agency accord employees the same preferences, including veterans' preference, that are provided to employees in the executive branch.

I assure you that we have no intention of undermining veterans' preference. Indeed, GAO is committed to preserving veterans' preference and will accord veterans the same rights as they would receive during reductions-in-force in executive branch agencies.

I would be happy to meet with you to discuss this matter further. I hope you will join us in correcting any misunderstanding your letter has created about the effect of section 211 on veterans' preference.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BOWSHER,
Comptroller General of the United States.

—
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, August 22, 1995.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Legion is requesting that you oppose the conference report on H.R. 1854, the FY 1996 appropriations bill for the Legislative Branch.

The American Legion is strongly opposed to section 211 of H.R. 1854, a provision that will allow the General Accounting Office to place less emphasis on veterans' preference in reduction-in-force situations. The American Legion believes this is a major step in the erosion of veterans' preference for employment purposes.

"The Veterans' Preference Act of 1944" was enacted by Congress to assist veterans seeking employment because their military service prevented them from earning promotions and benefits in the civilian work force like their civilian counterparts. Unlike affirmative action programs, veterans' preference requires that veterans must be fully qualified and competitive for the preference to apply. The law simply provides preference to a veteran in obtaining and retaining federal employment provided the candidates or employees have equal qualifications.

The American Legion requests that you preserve America's contract with veterans and oppose the conference report for H.R. 1854. Thank you for the continued leadership on important veterans issues.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. DETWEILER,
National Commander.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all I do want to reference the last point made by my friend from California. I have been on the phone with the Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Ed Scott. It is the administration's position that unless the language is changed, the Comptroller General would retain the authority to pay less attention to veterans' preference. I appreciate the concern that I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] had, and I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has just indicated he shares, but I do think it is important that we point out for the record that this concern remains extant in the executive branch, and I also want to join with the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] in saying it is not the intent of either the majority or the minority to have that effect, but I would, for further clarification, include the letter from Jesse Brown, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in the RECORD at this time:

THE SECRETARY OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, September 6, 1995.

Hon. VIC FAZIO,

Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Legislative, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FAZIO: I am deeply concerned about a provision in the conference report on H.R. 1854, the proposed Legislative Appropriations Act for FY 1996, that could erode veterans' preference under a downsizing of the General Accounting Office.

Section 212 of the conference report, which originated in the Senate, would authorize the Comptroller General to give less weight to veterans' preference in any reduction-in-force that GAO carries out under this legislation.

This provision overlooks the vitally important role of veterans' preference in America's sacred contract with her defenders. The week after we commemorated our great victory in World War II and a month after the dedication of the Korean War Memorial is no time for the Congress to permit any dilution of our obligations to our warriors. The suggestion that something less than strict adherence to veterans' preference would be acceptable is a slap in the face to all those who have served and sacrificed in defense of freedom and democracy.

I hope you agree with me that legislation, such as H.R. 1854, allowing the weakening of veterans preference must not be enacted.

Sincerely,

JESSE BROWN.

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] to recommit, I want to say very clearly that I would never advocate a veto of this bill by any President of either party. I have never in the time I have managed this bill as chairman of this subcommittee seen that likelihood carried out by President Reagan or President Bush. But I think we all understand that none of us want to be treated differently in this branch of Government than anyone else in Government.

We want to make that clear to all the people who are observing our proceedings. If we are going to be asking loyal and hard-working Federal employees to take furloughs and to have their lives disrupted, certainly the American public would think it important that we share in that same struggle, that same burden. It would only be fitting that we, therefore, indicate our interests in being treated alike.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the motion to recommit would instruct the conferees to wait until further progress has been made on the other appropriations bills, would not tempt the White House to issue a veto, and is a middle ground that perhaps some of us would seek short of having a confrontation on an issue that ought to be treated with comity by both the executive and legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, just in completing my remarks, I want to pay tribute once again to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] who has done an outstanding job in his first voyage as chairman of this subcommittee under very difficult circumstances. I voted for this bill when it passed the House, and, as a courtesy to him, I signed the

conference report. The conference does make some significant improvements. It provides additional funds to CBO to handle the needs of unfunded mandate analysis, which we recently gave them. It restores additional FTE's to the Government Printing Office, it restores funds for our depository libraries around the country, it reestablishes the Joint Committee on Printing, it restores the Folk Life Center at the Library, and restores funding to the Library of Congress. For many Members an important provision: It keeps the Flag Office alive, although the cost of flags will rise to cover the full cost of the dissemination.

But sadly it goes too deep in its cuts in the GAO, more than a 15-percent cut below last year, and most regrettably, and I share this with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], our colleague who chairs the board that guides the Office of Technology Assessment, rather than support the House position that kept OTA alive under the Library of Congress, it actually does away with the entity. So for those two reasons, Mr. Speaker, regrettably I must oppose this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, my most popular remark of the evening: I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, if Congress sent as the first appropriations bill the Labor-HHS or some other appropriations bill with an 8- or 9-percent cut to the President, do my colleagues know what we would hear from the President? Why do you not cut yourselves first before cutting these other agencies?

We are cutting ourselves first. We think that is appropriate. This is a model for the rest of the appropriations bills. We are proud to send it to the President first, but we think it will be accompanied by several other bills. I urge the Members to vote for it and to vote against the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, we in Congress, under the leadership of the Republican majority, have the opportunity to end business as usual in Government. We have the opportunity to prove to the American people that the change they voted for last November has not fallen on deaf ears.

Through the hard work and diligence of both the House and the Senate, we have crafted a legislative branch appropriations bill that cuts spending and returns sanity to congressional expenditure. This bill indicates just how serious we are about reshaping Government. By cutting our own budget, we have set the standard for every other Federal agency and taken the first crucial step toward a brighter, more prosperous future for our children.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1854.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 1854 (H. Rept. 104-212) to the Committee on Conference with instruction that the conferees not meet until subsequently instructed to do so by the House pursuant to clause 1(C) of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 243, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 637]

AYES—164

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Obey
Ackerman	Gibbons	Olver
Baesler	Gonzalez	Orton
Baldacci	Gordon	Owens
Barcia	Green	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Pastor
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Harman	Pelosi
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (FL)
Bevill	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Boniior	Hilliard	Pickett
Borski	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Browder	Holden	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Reed
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Richardson
Clay	Johnson, E.B.	Rivers
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Clement	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rush
Coleman	Kaptur	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Schroeder
Condit	Kennelly	Schumer
Conyers	Kildee	Scott
Costello	Kleczka	Skaggs
Coyne	Klink	Slaughter
Cramer	LaFalce	Spratt
Danner	Lantos	Stark
DeFazio	Levin	Stockman
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Dellums	Lipinski	Studds
Deutsch	Lofgren	Stupak
Dicks	Lowe	Tanner
Dingell	Luther	Thompson
Dixon	Manton	Thornton
Doggett	Markey	Thurman
Dooley	Martinez	Torres
Doyle	Mascara	Torricelli
Durbin	Matsui	Towns
Edwards	McCarthy	Velázquez
Engel	McDermott	Vento
Eshoo	McHale	Visclosky
Evans	McNulty	Volkmmer
Farr	Meehan	Ward
Fazio	Meek	Waters
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Filner	Miller (CA)	Williams
Flake	Mineta	Wise
Foglietta	Minge	Woolsey
Ford	Mink	Wyden
Frank (MA)	Moran	Wynn
Frost	Nadler	Yates
Gejdenson	Neal	

NOES—243

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

NOT VOTING—27

Bishop	McDade	Sabo
Brown (FL)	McKinney	Serrano
Cardin	Mfume	Sisisky
Fattah	Moakley	Smith (NJ)
Foley	Mollohan	Tucker
Geren	Morella	Waldholtz
Hoyer	Oberstar	Waxman
Lincoln	Reynolds	Wilson
Maloney	Riggs	Young (FL)

□ 1816

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Maloney for, with Mr. Foley against.

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

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 101, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 638]

YEAS—305

Ackerman	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E.B.
Allard	Dickey	Johnson, Sam
Andrews	Dixon	Johnson (SD)
Archer	Dooley	Jones
Army	Doolittle	Kaptur
Bachus	Dornan	Kasich
Baesler	Doyle	Kelly
Baker (CA)	Dreier	Kennedy (RI)
Baker (LA)	Duncan	Kim
Baldacci	Dunn	King
Ballenger	Edwards	Kingston
Barcia	Ehlers	Klecza
Barr	Ehrlich	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Knollenberg
Barrett (WI)	English	Kolbe
Bartlett	Ensign	LaHood
Barton	Eshoo	Largent
Bass	Everett	Latham
Bateman	Ewing	LaTourette
Bentsen	Farr	Laughlin
Bereuter	Fawell	Lazio
Bevill	Fields (TX)	Leach
Bilbray	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Bilirakis	Flanagan	Lewis (KY)
Bliley	Forbes	Lightfoot
Blute	Ford (TN)	Linder
Boehkert	Fowler	Lipinski
Boehner	Fox	Livingston
Bonilla	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo
Bono	Franks (CT)	Lofgren
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Longley
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Brewster	Frisa	Luther
Brown (OH)	Funderburk	Manton
Brownback	Furse	Manzullo
Bryant (TN)	Gallely	Martini
Bunn	Ganske	Mascara
Bunning	Gekas	McCarthy
Burr	Gilchrest	McCollum
Burton	Gillmor	McCreery
Buyer	Gilman	McHale
Callahan	Goodlatte	McHugh
Calvert	Goodling	McInnis
Camp	Goss	McIntosh
Canady	Graham	McKeon
Castle	Greenwood	McNulty
Chabot	Gunderson	Meehan
Chambliss	Gutknecht	Menendez
Chapman	Hall (OH)	Metcalf
Chenoweth	Hamilton	Meyers
Christensen	Hancock	Mica
Chrysler	Hansen	Miller (FL)
Clayton	Hastert	Mineta
Clement	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Clinger	Hayes	Mink
Coble	Hayworth	Molinari
Coburn	Hefley	Montgomery
Collins (GA)	Heineman	Moorhead
Combest	Herger	Murtha
Cooley	Hilleary	Myers
Costello	Hobson	Myrick
Cox	Hoekstra	Neal
Crane	Hoke	Nethercutt
Crapo	Holden	Neumann
Creameans	Horn	Ney
Cubin	Hostettler	Norwood
Cunningham	Houghton	Nussle
Danner	Hunter	Ortiz
Davis	Hutchinson	Orton
de la Garza	Hyde	Oxley
Deal	Inglis	Packard
DeFazio	Istook	Pallone
DeLay	Jackson-Lee	Parker
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Paxon

Payne (VA)	Schiff	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Schumer	Tiahrt
Petri	Seastrand	Torkildsen
Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Torricelli
Porter	Shadegg	Towns
Portman	Shaw	Trafficant
Poshard	Shays	Upton
Pryce	Shuster	Visclosky
Quillen	Skeen	Vucanovich
Quinn	Skelton	Walker
Radanovich	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Waters
Reed	Solomon	Watts (OK)
Regula	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Rivers	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Roberts	Spratt	Weller
Roemer	Stearns	White
Rogers	Stockman	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wicker
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Wise
Roth	Talent	Wolf
Roukema	Tate	Woolsey
Royce	Tauzin	Wyden
Salmon	Taylor (MS)	Young (AK)
Saxton	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Scarborough	Tejeda	Zeliff
Schaefer	Thomas	Zimmer

NAYS—101

Abercrombie	Green	Pelosi
Becerra	Gutierrez	Peterson (FL)
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Berman	Harman	Pomeroy
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Rahall
Browder	Hefner	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Hinchey	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Jacobs	Rush
Clyburn	Jefferson	Sanders
Coleman	Johnston	Sanford
Collins (IL)	Kanjorski	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Schroeder
Condit	Kennelly	Scott
Conyers	Kildee	Skaggs
Coyne	Klink	Slaughter
Cramer	LaFalce	Stark
DeLauro	Lantos	Stenholm
Dellums	Levin	Stokes
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Studds
Doggett	Lowe	Tanner
Durbin	Markey	Thompson
Engel	Martinez	Thornton
Evans	Matsui	Thurman
Fazio	McDermott	Torres
Fields (LA)	Meek	Velázquez
Filner	Miller (CA)	Vento
Foglietta	Moran	Volkmer
Frost	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Gephard	Obey	Ward
Gibbons	Olver	Watt (NC)
Gonzalez	Owens	Williams
Gordon	Pastor	Wynn
	Payne (NJ)	Yates

NOT VOTING—28

Bishop	McDade	Serrano
Brown (FL)	McKinney	Sisisky
Cardin	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Moakley	Tucker
Fattah	Mollohan	Waldholtz
Foley	Morella	Waxman
Geren	Oberstar	Wilson
Hoyer	Reynolds	Young (FL)
Lincoln	Riggs	
Maloney	Sabo	

□ 1825

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Waldholtz for, with Ms. McKinney against.

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT ON FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS) 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 Government Reform and Oversight:

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (Public Law 92-463; 5 U.S.C. App. 2, 6(c)), I am submitting my second Annual Report on Federal Advisory Committees covering fiscal year 1994.

This report highlights continuing efforts by my Administration to reduce and manage Federal advisory committees. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12838, as one of my first acts as President, we have reduced the overall number of discretionary advisory committees by 335 to achieve a net total of 466 chartered groups by the end of fiscal year 1994. This reflects a net reduction of 42 percent over the 801 discretionary committees in existence at the beginning of my Administration—substantially exceeding the one-third target required by the Executive order.

In addition, agencies have taken steps to enhance their management and oversight of advisory committees to ensure these committees get down to the public's business, complete it, and then go out of business. I am also pleased to report that the total aggregate cost of supporting advisory committees, including the 429 specifically mandated by the Congress, has been reduced by \$10.5 million or by over 7 percent.

On October 5, 1994, my Administration instituted a permanent process for conducting an annual comprehensive review of all advisory committees through Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-135, "Management of Federal Advisory Committees." Under this planning process, agencies are required to review all advisory committees, terminate those no longer necessary, and plan for any future committee needs.

On July 21, 1994, my Administration forwarded for your consideration a proposal to eliminate 31 statutory advisory committees that were no longer necessary. The proposal, introduced by then Chairman GLENN of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs as S. 2463, outlined an additional \$2.4 million in annual savings possible through the termination of these statutory committees. I urge the Congress to pursue this legislation—adding to it if possible—and to also follow our example by instituting a review process for statutory advisory committees to ensure they are performing a necessary mission and have not outlived their usefulness.

My Administration also supports changes to the Federal Advisory Committee Act to facilitate communications between Federal, State, local, and tribal governments. These changes are needed to support this Administration's efforts to expand the role of these stakeholders in governmental policy deliberations. We believe these actions will help promote better communications and consensus building in a less adversarial environment.

I am also directing the Administrator of General Services to undertake a review of possible actions to more thoroughly involve the Nation's citizens in the development of Federal decisions affecting their lives. This review should focus on the value of citizen involvement as an essential element of our efforts to reinvent Government, as a strategic resource that must be maximized, and as an integral part of our democratic heritage. This effort may result in a legislative proposal to promote citizen participation at all levels of government consistent with the great challenges confronting us.

We continue to stand ready to work with the Congress to assure the appropriate use of advisory committees and to achieve the purposes for which this law was enacted.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 6, 1995.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN UNITED NATIONS, 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United States Government in the United Nations and its affiliated agencies during the calendar year 1994. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 264, 79th Congress; 22 U.S.C. 278b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 6, 1995.

□ 1830

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). 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.

JUDGE HENRY WOODS AND THE WHITEWATER CASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, about 4 or 5 weeks ago I took a special order talking about a judge in Arkansas, in Little Rock, a Federal judge who has close political ties to the current Governor, Jim Guy Tucker, and President Clinton, and particularly the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton. Judge Henry Woods has been a long-time political adviser to the President and to Mrs. Clinton. He has appointed her to a number of boards. He recently was given a case involving the current Governor, Jim Guy Tucker, which was brought to his attention and put before his court by Mr. Starr, who is investigating the Whitewater matter and other related matters.

At that time, when I had my special order, I suggested that in order to eliminate any appearance of impropriety, Judge Henry Woods should recuse himself and not be the judge to hear this case, because no matter what he did, if he rendered a decision in favor of Mr. Tucker, Governor Tucker, it would have the appearance of impropriety.

One of the other judges down there in a related case dealing with Webb Hubbell, who was indicated and convicted, you remember Webb Hubbell, he was the Assistant Attorney General appointed by President Clinton, did recuse himself. He did it because he felt like the appearance of impropriety was something that should not even be considered by a Federal judge.

I urged during my special order that Judge Henry Woods recuse himself, as the other Federal judge did in a related case, but Judge Henry Woods did not do that. This week it was announced that he dismissed one of the indictable offenses against Governor Jim Guy Tucker, and it certainly does give the appearance of impropriety because of this connection with Jim Guy Tucker and the people who are currently residing in the White House, as well as other Democrat leaders throughout Arkansas.

Tonight I would like to submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, all of the information I have regarding Judge Henry Woods, my previous special order, an article that was written by a person from Little Rock who served in the Arkansas State Senate with Judge Henry Woods when he was in the Senate, and I would like for all of these articles to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so at some future date, if Judge Henry Woods renders decisions that are of concern to Members of the House, there will be a record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say to all who are on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight that we ought to have a complete and thorough hearing on the Whitewater case and all the related cases, including the one currently pending before the courts involving Jim Guy Tucker, the Governor of Arkansas, I think there is so much that appears to be col-

lusion down there that it boggles the mind. For Judge Henry Woods to participate and render the decision he did last week regarding Jim Guy Tucker is just beyond comprehension.

As a matter of fact, I would like to just read one thing that was said in the newspaper article which I think was put in the paper today. "It's typical hometown anger at the Feds coming in," says James Madison University political science professor Robert Roberts. "But if it hadn't been for Federal prosecutors, the level of scandal at the local and State level would be 10 times greater than it is today," Roberts predicted. This is the part I want to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In particular, "Roberts predicted Starr would win on appeal," that is the decision by Judge Henry Woods he is going to appeal, that "Roberts predicted Starr would win on appeal because of the long tradition of granting independent counsels widespread discretion. This is nothing for President Clinton to cheer about," says Roberts. "He is best served by letting the investigation run its course quickly, and this just delays things."

I submit to my colleagues here in the House that the reason for this delay is because of the close personal relationship Judge Henry Woods has with First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton and other people in the Jim Guy Tucker administration. It is unfortunate this happened. It should not have happened. He should have recused himself.

The material referred to follows:

[From the USA TODAY]

INDEPENDENT COUNSEL CHALLENGED

(By Tony Mauro)

A Little Rock federal judge's decision Tuesday to dismiss fraud indictment against Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker marks the first time the broad powers of an independent counsel have been trimmed.

U.S. District Judge Henry Woods said Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth Starr overstepped his authority in June by indicting Tucker of fraud charges related to a federal loan to finance a cable TV venture.

Starr contends the judge has no authority to rule on the scope of the investigation, which was launched to look into irregularities relating to the Whitewater real estate venture in which President Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton were partners.

"I cannot accept the proposition that . . . no court has the power to determine where there is jurisdiction to proceed in the matter," wrote Woods, a 1979 Carter appointee.

Starr promptly announced he would seek an expedited review by a federal appeals court in St. Louis.

Tucker still faces an 11-count indictment stemming from dealings with Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan, which was owned by the Clintons' Whitewater partners, James and Susan McDougal. They also have been indicted.

The ruling comes amid debate over the power of independent counsels, a hybrid breed of prosecutors created by a post-Watergate federal law in 1978.

Independent counsels are appointed by a three-judge panel at the request of the attorney general when a high-level official is suspected of violating federal law.

Originally viewed as properly insulated from political influence, critics now say

independent counsels are too insulated—politically unaccountable and prone to lengthy fishing expeditions that go far beyond the original allegations.

"The logic of the law is to sweep in more and more potential cases, things the Justice Department would not have punished," says former Justice Department official Terry Eastland, who wrote a book on independent counsels. "It becomes a very messy business and it's bad for the system."

Starr, a former Republican administration official, came under attack in Arkansas and in the White House for straying beyond Whitewater and reviewing every political transaction in recent Arkansas political history.

"It's typical hometown anger at the feds coming in," says James Madison University political science professor Robert Roberts. "But if it hadn't been for federal prosecutors, the level of scandal at the local and state level would be 10 times greater than it is today."

Roberts predicted Starr would win on appeal because of the long tradition of granting independent counsels wide discretion.

"This is nothing for President Clinton to cheer about," says Roberts. "He is best-served by letting the investigation run its course quickly, and this just delays things."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 6, 1995]

ONE WHITEWATER INDICTMENT OF TUCKER
DISMISSED

FEDERAL JUDGE RULES INDEPENDENT COUNSEL
STARR EXCEEDED HIS AUTHORITY IN TAX CASE

(By Susan Schmidt)

A federal judge yesterday dismissed one of two indictments against Arkansas Gov. Jim Guy Tucker on grounds that the prosecutor, Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth W. Starr, exceeded his authority in bringing the case.

U.S. District Judge Henry Woods threw out a June tax fraud and conspiracy indictment of Tucker and two other men involved with him in a cable television venture, saying the case "bears no relation whatsoever" to the questions Starr was charged with investigating. A second bank fraud indictment of Tucker, handed up last month, still stands.

Tucker has not sought dismissal of that indictment, which relates more directly to the Whitewater investigation. That case is being handled by a different judge.

The 21-page ruling, issued after 1½ hours of oral arguments, touches on the controversial question of how broad a special prosecutor's authority should be in pursuing evidence not directly connected to the central theme of an investigation.

Objections to broad inquires have been raised in other independent counsel investigations, including the probe of former agriculture secretary Mike Espy.

Woods agreed with Tucker's lawyers that the allegations had nothing to do with the independent counsel's mandate to investigate the interrelationships between two defunct Arkansas lending institutions and the two couples who owned the Whitewater Development Corp.—Bill and Hillary Rodham Clinton and James B. and Susan McDougal.

It was not enough, the judge said, that Starr "fortuitously stumbled across the defendants' alleged violation of law." The authority to bring charges against Tucker rested with the Justice Department, he said.

The issues raised in the tax fraud indictment "were not related in any way to the investigation of Whitewater," said Tucker's lawyer, William H. Sutton. "We felt the independent counsel legislation was very special, applicable to a defined set of people, primarily high officials in the federal government."

Starr said his office will seek an expedited appeal of Woods's ruling before the 8th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals and then the Supreme Court, if necessary.

Appearing before Woods in Little Rock yesterday morning, Starr argued that his evidence against Tucker was sufficiently related to the main areas of his investigation to justify his bringing an indictment.

Even if Woods did not agree, Starr said, the judge did not have the authority to limit the powers of an independent counsel's activity.

The scope of such a probe has never been successfully challenged "since Watergate, since the scandals that gave rise to the Ethics in Government Act" under which he was appointed, he said. Attorney General Janet Reno filed a court brief in support of Starr's position.

But Woods disagreed. "I cannot accept the proposition that a citizen can be put on trial in my court for a loss of his liberty, and that no court has the power to determine whether there is jurisdiction to proceed in the matter," he wrote. "Surely the independent counsel and attorney general do not suggest that there can be no judicial review of prosecutorial jurisdiction of an independent counsel. . . . Such a precedent would be both novel and dangerous."

Starr had argued that one of the elements of the June indictment stemmed from a business deal between Tucker and David Hale, owner of Capital Management Services, which Starr is investigating along with McDougal's savings and loan association, Madison Guaranty.

Starr said the second Tucker indictment shows that the crimes alleged in the June indictment were directly tied to Capital Management and to Madison.

Tucker was accused in the dismissed indictment of falsifying a loan application to Capital Management, a company funded by the federal Small Business Administration to make loans to disadvantaged businesses.

He allegedly used the money he borrowed from Capital Management to help purchase a cable television company, then sold the company and allegedly conspired to avoid paying several million dollars in federal taxes.

Tucker has not sought a dismissal of the second 21-count indictment, in which James and Susan McDougal are also named as defendants. The three are accused of engineering financing for millions of dollars in allegedly phony real estate transactions through Madison and Capital Management.

Tucker, a Democrat, has complained that he is being made a scapegoat in a politically motivated investigation, and he has made much of Starr's Republican background.

Even if Woods's ruling is overturned, it will delay by many months Tucker's trial on the first set of charges, pushing it well into next year. If Tucker prevails on appeal, Starr would turn the case over to the attorney general for prosecution.

Woods, appointed to the federal bench by President Jimmy Carter, has had a long-standing professional relationship with Hillary Clinton who practiced law in Arkansas until her husband was elected president.

Woods wrote to late deputy White House counsel Vincent W. Foster Jr. in June 1993 to ask whether he should grant an interview to a reporter from Mother Jones magazine who was preparing an article on Hillary Clinton.

In a written inquiry to Woods, the reporter said she wanted to interview him because he had appointed Hillary Clinton to a trial advocacy panel early in her career and later to the committee on the Little Rock school desegregation case.

"Would you take this up with Hillary or her press secretary and give me instructions as to whether this interview should be granted?" Woods asked Foster.

Woods's letter to Foster was turned over to congressional investigators by the White House.

WHO IS HENRY WOODS?

Last year, the President was reminiscing with Connie Bruck of *The New Yorker* about his 1990 gubernatorial race. At one point, he said, he was undecided about running and an influential Arkansan came up with a substitute: Hillary Clinton. The powerful member of the Arkansas political family "desperately wanted her to run for governor," the President told Ms. Bruck, "and it got out and around the state."

That gentleman was Judge Henry Woods of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas. "Henry," a friend of the judge told Ms. Bruck, "just hangs the moon on Hillary." Judge Woods has contributed 15 years of distinguished service to the judiciary, particularly in the long-running Little Rock school desegregation cases. At a critical point in 1987, Judge Woods named Mrs. Clinton counsel to a citizens' committee working for racial balance in the schools. "I called on Hillary a lot," he told Ms. Bruck. "She was not just functioning as advisor to the committee."

Gov. Tucker has angrily declared his innocence and says he may challenge Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr's jurisdiction. "None of the allegations," Gov. Tucker said, "involve President Clinton, Mrs. Clinton or any other person in the executive branch that the regular U.S. Attorneys would have had a conflict in prosecuting." As we have noted in regard to the Clintons, this is correct in a narrow sense; but it is also true that the indictments and guilty pleas so far obtained by Mr. Starr paint a disturbing picture of the political and business landscape from which the President and First Lady emerged.

Understandably, for example, Gov. Tucker would have preferred that "the regular U.S. Attorney" handle his case. That would be Paula Casey, the long-time Friend of Bill who first received criminal referrals from the Resolution Trust Corp. allegedly naming the Clintons and Mr. Tucker. After making some crucial decisions, Ms. Casey belatedly recused herself from the Madison Guaranty case, in November 1993, in the midst of a six-week period which saw Treasury contacts with the White House, Bruce Lindsey informing the President about the referrals, two Clinton Tucker meetings, and Associate Attorney General Webster Hubbell's own recusal from Whitewater matters.

The problem, of course, is that everyone from the Arkansas political culture comes from the Arkansas political culture. When it come time for Mr. Hubbell to plead guilty to a scheme to defraud the government and his former partners at the Rose Law Firm, he stood before U.S. District Court Judge William Wilson in Little Rock. Two days after the plea, Judge Wilson stepped down from the case, saying his contacts with the Clintons over the years might be misconstrued. "Not only must you do justice," Judge Wilson said, "you must have an appearance of doing justice."

Naturally Judge Woods has the same sort of associations. Now 77, he was for some 40 years a close associate of Arkansas financier and legislator Will Stephens—head of the Stephens Inc. investment giant until his death in 1991. * * * Mr. Woods later fought segregationist Gov. Orval Faubus and was a supporter of current Sen. Dale Bumpers and Rep. Ray Thornton, among others. Messrs. Clinton, Tucker, Hale, and James McDougal of Madison Guaranty fame all got their early political education from one of the towering

figures in Arkansas politics, former Sen. William Fulbright. It's a tight, if sometimes feuding, family.

Mr. Woods actively supported Mr. Bumpers' 1970 gubernatorial run. In 1974, Gov. Bumpers knocked Sen. Fulbright out of the Democratic primary and went on to the Senate; Mr. Fulbright went to work for the Saudis and Stephens Inc. In 1978, Mr. Woods supported Mr. Stephens' nephew, Mr. Thornton, in a three way primary race against then U.S. Rep. Tucker and David Pryor for the Democratic nomination to the Senate. President Carter nominated Mr. Woods to the federal bench in 1979; when he was sworn in, Gov. Clinton saluted him, saying he was a man who would "feel the pain" of the people.

The defendant to the contrary, the Tucker case is not just another case, but one pregnant with implications for the President, the First Lady and the whole circle of the judge's friends and associates. Judge Woods can best honor his distinguished record on the bench by following Judge Wilson's example and stepping aside.

WEBSTER HUBBELL AND GOV. JIM GUY TUCKER

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk today about the conviction of Webster Hubbell, the indictment of Gov. Jim Guy Tucker—both close friends of President Clinton—and the two Arkansas judges overseeing these cases.

The judge in Webster Hubbell's case stepped aside because of his close ties to all of Arkansas' top Democrat politicians. The judge in Governor Tucker's case has made no move to recuse himself, even though many observers believe he has even more conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker, about a month ago former Associate Attorney General Webster Hubbell was sentenced to 21 months in prison. On December 6, 1994, Mr. Hubbell pled guilty to one count of mail fraud and one count of tax evasion to the independent counsel investigating Whitewater, Kenneth Starr. Last week, Mr. Hubbell, who a little more than a year ago was the Nation's third highest ranking law officer, testified before the Senate about the death of Vincent Foster and the obstructions of the investigation at the White House.

I would like to talk for a moment about Webster Hubbell. He is often characterized in the media as the President's frequent golfing partner. But he is much more than that.

Mr. Hubbell was a partner along with Hillary Clinton, William Kennedy III, and the late Vincent Foster at Little Rock's powerful Rose law firm. In fact, Mr. Hubbell served as the firm's managing partner. He also served as mayor of Little Rock, and was appointed by then-Governor Bill Clinton as interim chief justice of the Arkansas State Supreme Court.

He came to Washington with the Clintons after the 1992 election and, in the opinion of many Washington insiders, ran the Justice Department until Janet Reno was confirmed by the Senate. Mr. Hubbell resigned as Associate Attorney General in March 1994, after his former partners at the Rose law firm began to investigate him for overbilling some of his clients, including the Federal Government for work done in a case against the auditors of Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan. Now, like many of the President's friends from Arkansas, Mr. Hubbell has left the Government in disgrace and legal trouble.

On June 23, 1995, Mr. Hubbell asked the judge presiding over his case for leniency, stating that he had made proper restitution to

his former firm. Under the sentencing guidelines, Mr. Hubbell was required to serve a mandatory minimum sentence unless the independent counsel asked the presiding judge for leniency. Mr. Starr replied to Mr. Hubbell's request by stating that he had no intention to ask for leniency.

The fact that Mr. Starr had no intention of asking for the court to be lenient with Mr. Hubbell leads us to believe that Hubbell did little to help Starr's investigation.

After he left the Justice Department, Hubbell landed a new job at G. William Miller and Co., the law firm of Michael Cardozo. Cardozo is the former Clinton Justice Department official who handles the Clintons' legal defense fund. He became notable in the summer of 1993 because he spent the entire weekend with Vincent Foster 3 days before Foster's death. Webster Hubbell and Michael Cardozo spent the weekend at the Eastern Shore secluded with Mr. Foster and his wife. Both have claimed that Foster did not seem unusually depressed, even though investigators have cited Foster's depression as the reason for his suicide 3 days later.

And somehow, Mr. Hubbell's wife was offered a job at the Interior Department after Mr. Hubbell entered his plea. We now know that Mrs. Hubbell's hiring was orchestrated by talks between the White House and the Interior Department. Since Mr. Hubbell and his wife were both being employed by their friends, many people wonder whether he cooperated with the Starr probe as much as he might have.

The judge originally assigned to preside over the Hubbell case was one William Wilson in Little Rock. However, as is so often the case among the political and social elite of Arkansas, Judge Wilson had close associations with Bill and Hillary Clinton, and before becoming a judge was very active in the Arkansas Democrat Party. Judge Wilson realized the possible conflict of interest, and 2 days after Mr. Hubbell's guilty plea he recused himself from the case. In doing so, Judge Wilson stated, "Not only must you do justice, you must have an appearance of doing justice." I take that quote from an editorial in the June 21, 1995 edition of the Wall Street Journal and ask that this editorial be entered into the RECORD.

This editorial raises an interesting question, because we are awaiting the trail of Bill Clinton's successor as Governor of Arkansas, Jim Guy Tucker. On June 7, 1995, Governor Tucker and two associates were indicted by a Federal grand jury in Little Rock. Governor Tucker was indicted for fraudulently obtaining a federally-backed small business loan and evading taxes and is facing up to 12 years in prison if convicted.

On October 6, 1993, Jim Guy Tucker and President Bill Clinton met privately at the White House. About a week before this meeting, White House counsel, Bernard Nussbaum, and White House advisor, Bruce Lindsey, and other top administration officials were informed of the fact that the Resolution Trust Corporation had forwarded criminal referrals regarding Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan to the Justice Department. These criminal referrals named not only Bill and Hillary Clinton but also Jim Guy Tucker.

The White House has stated that President Clinton and Governor Tucker never discussed these criminal referrals, neither at the White House meeting nor at a later meeting in Se-

attle. But we have no way of knowing. That is why so many people are so concerned about the many improper contacts between the White House staff and the Treasury Department.

The judge assigned to preside over the Tucker case is Judge Henry Woods. For some background on Woods I refer my colleagues to the Wall Street Journal editorial I quoted earlier, as well as a column by former elected Arkansas Supreme Court Justice Jim Johnson that ran in the June 23, 1995, edition of the Washington Times. I ask that these articles be entered into the RECORD.

Judge Woods is a longtime member of the Arkansas political elite. He is a major power broker in the Arkansas Democrat Party. He served as chief assistant to Democratic Governor Sid McMath. He freely admits that he is good friends with Bill and Hillary Clinton. Judge Woods named Mrs. Clinton to a State panel to work toward racial balance in schools. Woods and McMath later went on to form a law partnership, McMath, Leatherman and Woods. McMath's son, Sandy McMath, a member of the law firm, was an instrumental leader in the early political campaigns of Jim Guy Tucker. So even if Judge Woods and Governor Tucker are not the best of friends, they are undoubtedly members of the same tightly knit network from which Bill Clinton emerged.

In the Webster Hubbell case, Judge Wilson realized immediately that he had no business trying the case. Even if he could have been completely objective, many people would still question what they saw as the appearance of a conflict. In the Jim Guy Tucker case, Judge Woods has given us no indication that he intends to recuse himself, despite his multiple potential conflicts of interest. With Judge Woods, the conflict of interest is more than just an appearance. it is a very serious matter.

QUESTIONS

If Jim Guy Tucker's attorneys move to throw out the indictments claiming that Kenneth Starr has exceeded his jurisdiction, would Judge Woods' many ties to the State Democrat Party color his decision?

What other connections exist between Judge Woods and Governor Tucker that we do not know about?

With Judge Wilson's recusal due to possible conflicts of interest in the Hubbell case, is it not in Judge Woods' best interest, after a long and illustrious career, to follow his example and recuse himself?

What did Jim Guy Tucker and Bill Clinton talk about at their meeting at the White House in 1993? How can we ever know for sure whether or not they shared confidential information about the RTC criminal referrals that had been revealed to the White House?

What did Jim Guy Tucker and Bill Clinton talk about in their meeting in Seattle?

David Hale.—When Jim Guy was indicted, the media were quick to proclaim that the indictment was not connected in any way to Bill and Hillary Clinton. But this is not the case. The charges brought by the independent counsel against Governor Tucker are the direct result of testimony and documentary evidence provided by Judge David Hale.

Judge Hale is the same man who has accused the President of pressuring him to approve an illegal loan in 1986 to obtain funds to help the failing Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan.

Judge Hale pled guilty to defrauding the Small Business Administration. He has testified to a Federal grand jury that he was pressured by Gov. Bill Clinton and his Whitewater partner, James McDougal, and by Jim Guy Tucker, to provide an illegal \$300,000 loan to McDougal's wife, Susan McDougal. This loan was never repaid, and more than \$100,000 of the loan reportedly ended up in Whitewater Development Company's account.

The day after the Tucker indictment, Mr. Starr secured a guilty plea from Stephen A. Smith, who was one of Bill Clinton's top aides during his first term as Arkansas Governor. Smith pleaded guilty to defrauding the Small Business Administration, lying to obtain \$65,000 from David Hale's lending agency, Capital-Management Services.

The indictment of Jim Guy Tucker and the guilty plea of Stephen Smith show us that the grand jury—made up, incidentally, of normal citizens of Arkansas, not a bunch of right-wing Clinton critics is looking closely at the documents and listening very carefully to the testimony offered by David Hale. The actions taken by Mr. Starr tell us that both the independent counsel's office and the grand jury consider David Hale a credible witness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN MAJORITY REGARDING APPROPRIATIONS MEASURES

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we move forward to the fiscal 1996 legislative branch legislation dealing with the budget, I think it is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report to the legislative branch appropriations bill, H.R. 1854, ends 40 years of bloated congressional bureaucracy. The bill shows that House Republicans are keeping their word to make Congress less costly and more accountable to the American people. We are doing that by cutting our own spending first before cutting any other Federal programs, with the principle in mind, of course, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that vital services are retained, but where there is duplication and waste, that is removed.

By way of recapitulation, Mr. Speaker, let us look to see what has been accomplished. First we have put our own House in order by reducing congressional funding of \$207 million below the fiscal year 1995 levels, which was a 9-percent cut. We also eliminated duplicative bureaucracies. The bill eliminates the Office of Technology Assessment, whose functions have already been duplicated by CRS, Congressional

Research Service, and GAO, and the National Academy of Sciences. This saves at least \$18 million.

We downsized bloated bureaucracies. The bill cuts, again, the duplicative Government Accounting Office funding by 17 percent, which will save \$75 million. It cuts the number of congressional staff. Some \$57 million was cut from House operations, Mr. Speaker, including committee staff, Members' allowances, and the House support offices. It cuts by one-third the House franking privileges for the congressional mail. It further eliminates three committees and 25 subcommittees.

While this is a good start, and there have been millions of dollars saved here in the House, and we know it will also happen in the Senate, we know as we move forward to look to each of the Federal agencies that are in existence we will downsize, privatize, consolidate, and make sure that we are giving for the American taxpayers real services for the tax dollars and eliminating waste, just as we have seen in local businesses all across the country. Where people at their own homes are trying to save money, we can do no less for the American taxpayer here in Congress.

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. Having just returned from a series of meetings, what people have said is they are interested in consolidating, eliminating, reducing programs, but at the same time they want to make sure that Congress has stepped forward.

If I heard the gentleman correctly, the bottom line of the congressional cuts, about \$67 million—is that the number the gentleman mentioned? I was off the floor and I was not sure. I think that is about the figure we are talking about.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is about the figure.

Mr. KINGSTON. We have 163 different Federal job training programs. We have 240 different miscellaneous education programs that the Federal Government funds, 30 different nutrition programs. There is clearly room to consolidate. Yet, if you picked up the headlines and heard that FOX or KINGSTON moved to cut 25 different job training programs, people back home would think you have gone berserk, but yet you still have some 135 other job training programs left.

I think what Congress is doing is trying to set an example that, in eliminating 25 committees, we are taking this real serious. I was a member of two of the committees that were eliminated. Last year I served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. In the coastal area of the district I represent we have a lot of marine issues, shipping issues, dredge issues, Corps of Engineers, and so forth. However, that committee has been eliminated, those

functions rolled into other committees that were duplicating what the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries were doing.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Frankly, the gentleman from Georgia has led the way here in Congress, I would say. What we are trying to do is take a page out of the American industries' book. If you are running a corporation, you want to make sure the bottom line is that, "We are doing our services and we are not wasting, because if we are wasting, then we are not delivering for the taxpayer," or in the case of business, a customer, what is a fair return on their investment.

We want to make sure we are doing exactly what the American public wants, I think whether it is the downsizing of the Federal bureaucracy and agencies duplicating each other's work or whether it is the line item veto, which the House has now passed. We are waiting for the conference committee from the Senate's passage of a slightly different bill, and eventually the President's signature, that line item veto will cut out the wasteful pork barrel which every taxpayer in every jurisdiction knows has caused a great deal of harm, along with unfunded mandates, which we passed.

Mr. KINGSTON. The other thing I think is important to emphasize is that we are not sitting around waiting on the line item veto to be responsible, nor are we set back by the fact that the other body did not pass the balanced budget amendment.

It is clear that the American people want the budget balanced, so every one of our 13 appropriation bills moves us in the direction of balancing the budget by the year 2002.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. This is the first year since 1969 that we have actually had a balanced budget here in Congress, and we did it without having, as you say, even though we passed the balanced budget amendment and it has not been passed in the Senate, we did not wait for that to happen, we made sure we moved along. I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] for his leadership in allowing us to move along in this dialog in the progress of reducing the cost of the Federal Government.

AVOIDING THE TRAIN WRECK OF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, the train wreck about which everyone is speaking these days is to occur if the Congress fails to pass the 13 appropriations bills, or having passed them, if the President of the United States vetoes them. Then we will have reached the point where, with no budget, the Government shuts down. This is an absolute crime against the people of the

United States to allow its Government to shut down.

What can we do about it? The train wreck requires two trains. All we have to do is stop, look, and listen, and take steps to avert the train wreck. We have those in place, if only we would utilize them. What are they, Mr. Speaker? No. 1, for almost every term since I have been here this same train wreck has loomed in the vision and the future of each Congress since 1980, I believe. What happens? When September 30 comes and no budget has been enacted, then the Congress engages in all kinds of legalistic and legislative contortions to keep the Government going until the next impasse should occur, with still a deadline that has not produced a budget.

If the President of the United States should veto the appropriation bills that the House passes, he will be saying in no uncertain terms: "I want these bills to be revisited, and I want more money spent in them," because the budget appropriation bills that the House Republicans have fashioned to present to the President call for lower spending, so the President, I suppose, in sending them back and vetoing them, says "I want more spending."

Should we allow him to veto those bills with no plan for then enacting a full budget to his liking? That is why the train wreck may occur. What I have proposed in term after term since I have been here is the following: Instant replay. If the Congress and the President have failed to enact the budget by September 30 of any given year, then, according to my legislation, the next day, October 1, beginning the new fiscal year, automatically will go into place by way of instant replay the budget of last year.

What does that do? That frees the spending at the levels of the previous year. What else does it do? It prevents for all time, forever, the possibility of and the reality of shutting down the Government. Was it not awful to have in 1990 the spectacle of our youngsters, all of them, gathered in Desert Shield in Saudi Arabia waiting for Desert Storm to occur, and while they are waiting there, preparing for battle, the U.S. Government, their country's Government, shuts down? That actually happened.

If for no other reason than to have that never happen again, we should enact my instant replay legislation, not to mention the thousands of Federal workers who have to meet budgetary outlays, pay bills, feed their families, and do the necessary things to keep house and home and family together. Why should they be used as pawns in an unnecessary game being played by the White House and the Congress? I ask for support for my legislation.

□ 1845

FOUR SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN MEDICINE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there are four significant changes that are happening in our society that have to do with the field of medicine and the reason that medicine right now is going to be a hotly debated subject in the coming months, in the coming years, in our society.

I would say that those changes are philosophical changes, No. 1, in Washington, which I hate to use it but will, is a new paradigm, a new way of looking at things; No. 2, technological changes; No. 3, the possible bankruptcy of Medicare; No. 4, changes in the Medicaid delivery system.

Let me start with No. 1, though, philosophical changes in Washington. We have some 80 new freshmen this year, all of whom I would describe as very regular folks who want to cut the budget and go home. They are not trying to be the next President. They are not trying to run for other offices. They just want to do the right thing. They are very attuned to the problems of middle-class America and businesses and employers, and they are just not as political as I would say classes have been in the past.

I would say also that the reforms, the changes, are not attributable to the Republican Party alone. President Clinton, his election in 1992 did a lot to trigger the moves of reform and the debate for change in health care.

A couple of things that we have seen as evidence of a new philosophy in this House, tangible evidence, the tort reform bill that we for many years debated that never got out of committee, it actually passed the House this year; OSHA reforms, where we are trying to get OSHA to be more technological and employer-friendly and more concentrated on safety rather than concentrating strictly on fines. We are trying to get the FDA to put more money and manpower in faster approval of pills, of medical devices, rather than also being punitive and restrictive in their ways of doing business.

Then of course the biggest thing is, we are taking a serious stab at budget reduction. Interest is the third largest expenditure on our national budget right now. In 2 years it is projected to exceed the defense budget, so we have got to do things about it.

I would say, No. 1, that philosophical changes, we are looking at doing things differently; No. 2, technological changes. We passed this huge telecommunications bill recently. In that will be new avenues for such things as telemedicine. There is going to be the Internet. I believe the Internet will make medicine a lot more consumer-friendly, because a person back home

right now does not know how much a broken arm or broken leg is going to cost.

On an Internet system, they can figure it out, figure out what orthopedists are charging, which ones are the best at this, which hospitals will get them in and out the fastest, and so forth. That would be the case with every operation. You could go in there, plug in whatever your ailment is, and see how much it costs for certain treatments, and so forth, and see who is best at it. I think that is going to make medicine a lot more competitive.

Those are some of the technological things, but I would say that the Federal Government's way of looking at medicine is with a slide rule, but we are in the world of pocket calculators now and we have to move. We have to make that change.

Then, No. 3, Medicare. The April trustees' report said clearly that Medicare will go bankrupt in 6 years if we do not do anything about it. We have to fix it. We have to do it in a non-partisan way. We need to simplify it, to protect and preserve it. We need to slow down the rate of growth.

There are all kinds of options out there that people are looking at and this Congress is going to be addressing, things that will make Medicare more consumer-friendly and again, above all, simplify and protect it.

Then, finally, changes in the Medicaid system, most significantly, welfare reform and block granting this authority back to States so that States have the flexibility. For example, I represent Georgia. Our Medicaid problems, our welfare delivery problems may be different than those in New York City or San Francisco, downtown Cincinnati, and we are going to make those changes but it is going to give the States the flexibility that they need.

Mr. Speaker, this is a lengthy subject. I look forward to the months of debate ahead, but I would say that the four significant changes again in medicine are philosophical changes, new ways of looking at things; changes in Medicare; changes in Medicaid; and, above all, the new technologies.

I thank the Speaker for this time. I will not say it is good to be back completely, but I notice that I am back and it is good to be here and see you, Mr. Speaker.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, there are many very pressing and important issues which we have been discussing. The previous speakers have been talking about some very pressing budget matters. But I have taken this time out this evening to talk about a personal item and that is the fact that

just last week one of our colleagues, Congressman MOOREHEAD, announced his retirement, and I wanted to take a moment. Usually people wait until the very end of the session to talk about Members who have chosen to retire, but I wanted to take just a moment to talk about a person who I believe is a stellar citizen legislator and one who will be sorely missed when he, after 12 terms of service here in the House of Representatives, will retire.

CARLOS MOORHEAD is a citizen legislator. He had a small law practice in his hometown of Glendale, CA where he had grown up. He went to Hoover High School and was one who regularly participated in many civic items, and he is one who chose public service. Now, we know that in this day and age public service itself is much maligned. We regularly see people who have chosen to spend some years of their life in public service criticized. But the fact of the matter is CARLOS MOORHEAD is a very unusual person. We all know from serving here in the House that he is not a show horse. He in fact is a workhorse.

He is the chairman of the Intellectual Property Subcommittee, not one of the most exciting issues discussed here on the House floor, but I am one who believes that it is very important. It is very important, as we look at international trade agreements and other items, that we maintain the intellectual property rights which are so key to the very unique talents which citizens of the United States of America have.

CARLOS served 6 years as a member of the California State Legislature before choosing to run for Congress in 1972. He served on that Judiciary Committee that held the impeachment hearings in the early 1970's, and his loyalty was very great. It has been written up in the media over the past week or so that he stood strongly behind Richard Nixon, and his quote in the papers consisted of the following: He believed it very important to maintain the Presidency at that time.

He also has been heavily involved in the issue of telecommunications, having served as ranking minority member when we were in the minority here on the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, and it was a great achievement to see the legislation which passed this House just before the August recess come about, and Mr. MOORHEAD had spent a long period of time working on that legislation.

I would simply like to say that it is going to be a great personal loss for me when, as he regularly reminds me, in a year and a half he chooses to retire. He will still be serving here for the next 17 some odd months and we know we are going to be spending a great deal of time here, but when he does choose to retire at the end of next year, it will be a personal loss.

I have had the privilege of trying to represent the district which joins his in Los Angeles County, and we all know that he has been a great friend, a very

hard worker, and I happen to believe one of the most underestimated Members of this institution. When he does retire, he will be sorely missed by many of us.

BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House regarding the budget, the debt ceiling that we are now approaching, and why that is important to the American people in an expanded economy for the United States and an expanded job market.

First let us look at the overspending of the Federal Government. Back in 1947 the Federal budget represented 12 percent of this country's gross domestic product. Today it represents almost 22 percent of the gross domestic product. The Federal Government is expanding at an alarming rate.

The Government has not relied on the political negatives of increasing taxes to afford this increased spending, but rather has decided that it is more politically wise to continue borrowing. Our Federal debt today is \$4.8 trillion. Our Federal debt after two world wars was only \$340 billion. We are increasing spending at an alarming rate and you know most people in America say we do not care how Government keeps its books; what we want is better jobs and a better economy.

Here is why it is important. Here is why how we keep our books affects those jobs and affects the economy of this country. Government this year is borrowing 42 percent of all of the money lent out in the United States. Think what that extra demand does for the pressure to increase interest rates.

Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, suggests that if we are able to balance our budget, we will see interest rates drop between 1½ and 2 percentage points. He says if that happens, the stimulation to the economy and the jobs in this country will be greater than we have ever seen before in our history. He says the flip side is that if we do not do it, we will give our children a lower standard of living and less expectations to have a good life than we have had. That will be the first time in history.

How do we achieve a balanced budget with a group of politicians that sit in this Chamber and the one on the other side of the Capitol that are used to expanding programs, that are used to going back home with pork barrel projects, cutting the ribbons and getting their pictures in the paper and being on television, bringing more good programs to the people back home, and they have discovered that it enhances their chances of being reelected. The challenge is great today for these Representatives to say if we want a good future for our kids and not leave the

kids the mortgage of our overindulgence and overspending, we are going to have to cut back on some of those programs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask everybody in the United States to look at this predicament, to encourage their Members in Congress that it is important that we all tighten our belts. A group of us, 156 of us, have signed a letter to the President saying that we are not going to vote to increase the debt ceiling unless we are on an absolute glide path to a balanced budget. Now, that means passing legislation that limits spending, that changes some of the entitlement programs, that has appropriation bills that get us on that glide path to a balanced budget. It is important.

We met with Secretary Rubin. We have now introduced legislation to give the President authority and flexibility to prioritize in the event that debt ceiling is reached. It is important, Mr. Speaker. I hope we are able to stick together to hang tough, to do what is good for America, to disregard the pollsters, to disregard the special interest lobbyists that are pushing for more and more spending, and do what is necessary to give this country and our children and our grandchildren a good future.

EASTERN LONG ISLAND FIRE UNDER CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that the strongest and finest steel is forged from the hottest fire. So too, the wonderful people of Eastern Long Island emerge stronger and more resilient from the worst brush fire in modern memory, bolstered by the bravery of its volunteer firefighters, police, and other emergency personnel and by the tens of thousands of acts of kindness displayed throughout this nationally declared disaster that was televised around the world.

It is with deep sense of relief and gratitude that I report to you today that all is now quiet on Eastern Long Island. The raging fire is no more; thanks to the determination and hard work of 3,000 firefighters—volunteer firefighters, I might add—who came from all over Nassau and Suffolk counties, New York and even Connecticut; along with county, State and Federal fire experts; various military units, State, county, town, and village police officers and other emergency personnel, and the wonderful Red Cross all make possible a satisfying end to what otherwise could have been a most unfortunate disaster. Starting on Monday, August 21, 1995, in the Rocky Point area, then on Thursday erupting in Eastport-Westhampton, for over 13 days our raging brush fires devastated more than 7,000 acres of the precious

Pine Barrens. It earned the distinction of becoming the largest brush fire in New York State since the Adirondack fire of 1908 and unquestionably the biggest fire this century in Suffolk County. We are forever indebted to the thousands of volunteers who risked their lives battling the blazes, as well as our neighbors from across Long Island who cared for the weary firefighters, running food out to them, providing them with clothing to replace their own which became soot encrusted and water soaked; and to those who offered reassurance and comfort to hundreds of people, many senior citizens, who were forced to leave their homes because of the fire. Additionally, let us salute the dozens of people who cared for family pets and those animals relocated from shelters adjacent to the disaster.

Fueled by whipping winds and dry brush, more than 1,800 acres in Rocky Point were the first to explode into flames. Firefighters from Rocky Point, Middle Island, and Ridge stood shoulder to shoulder along Whiskey Road and stopped the flames from engulfing local neighborhoods, including Leisure Village, Coventry Manor, and the Ridge Rest Home. Employing the assistance of 900 volunteers from 90 volunteer fire departments from across Long Island the Rocky Point blaze was brought under control with minimum property damage, no serious personal injury and thankfully, no loss of life.

Before the embers from Rocky Point even cooled, our firefighters were called to respond to a second brushfire, made even more threatening by a ferocious, twisting wind, headed right for Eastport, Speonk, Westhampton, and Westhampton Beach. Moving at over 600 feet per hour, our volunteers beat back a wall of fire that at its worst leaped some 100 feet into the sky with a trail of billowing smoke seen for 250 miles out to sea. Tired and exhausted, our volunteer firefighters dug deep within their own being to find the strength to carry on the face of such overwhelming odds. They put the health and welfare of an entire Eastern Long Island community ahead of their own safety to stop the raging inferno. The perseverance, determination, bravery, and courage of some 5,000 firefighters, police, emergency medical and other personnel can be summed up simply with the words of Bruce Stark, a 24-year-old firefighter from East Islip: "Civilians are depending on us, and if we bail out they have no hope."

As we held our breaths and said our prayers, it was this world class, greatest bunch of firefighters ever, that put us at ease and made possible an end to the disaster with a minimum of injuries and no loss of life.

Our heartfelt thanks go out to each and every firefighter, police officer, and rescue worker who selflessly worked for days to extinguish the mammoth fire. Our emergency medical services, like everyone else, performed above and beyond the call of duty, and

I would particularly like to thank everyone at Central Suffolk Hospital, Southampton Hospital and University Medical Center at Stony Brook for their onsite care, which undoubtedly helped to minimize the extent of injuries.

Thanks are due to those who gave of their time, money, and talents to help neighbors, friends, and mostly, strangers in a time of need. To cite just a few examples: Robert and Marylou Gottschalk of Wading River, took it upon themselves to make and distribute 260 sandwiches during the Rocky Point fire. Pete Pisello, owner of Rainbow Realty, organized a group of businesses in Mastic to supply food and drink to the firefighters. Some 50 volunteers at Mattituck High School, including large numbers of children, made sandwiches and bagged melons, apples, and pretzels—as did local delis—for the firefighters. Dozens of other community members coordinated food donations at area businesses like 7-11 and Aid Auto Stores, or simply dropped off cases of soda or a clean tee shirt. The individuals and donations are without number, but none is forgotten.

It is impossible to try and adequately recognize all of the people and organizations who offered support but you know who you are. I think, as well, the hundreds of businesses both large and small who, gave their employees paid leave to help with the fire efforts, or donated supplies to the hardworking and tireless firefighters including: K-Mart, Caldor, McDonald's, King Cullen Supermarkets, A&P Supermarkets, Waldbaums, AT&T, the Cutchogue Village market, the Handy Pantry, Ammirati's Cupboard, the Long Island Culinary Institute, South Shore Beverage. Good Humor and Mr. Softee Ice Cream, whose ice cream trucks not only helped to keep our firefighters cool but helped to boost morale on the front lines. North Fork Bank and Suffolk County National Bank made cash donations to the fire companies to offset the costs of fighting the fire. Cablevision of Long Island not only established the "Long Island Volunteer Firefighters' Fund" for the education and training of volunteer firefighters, but matched every contribution dollar for dollar. And Suffolk County Community College has created the "Sunrise Scholarship," a financial aid fund for the children of those who helped fight the fire. The list is endless, and all deserve our thanks and admiration for their compassion, charity, and willingness to lend a helping hand.

Nothing exemplifies the American spirit more than the kind of selfless volunteerism exhibited during these trying times. Unselfishly treating one's neighbors like family, coming to their aid in times of danger, and putting community interest above self interest, it's this kind of action that more truly embodies all that is good about our Nation. The thousands upon thousands of hours volunteer firefighters devote to training and learning the latest tech-

niques are demonstrated in their quick responses to calls and their expertise in putting out fires. After recent events, for so many of us who call Eastern Long Island home, we shall honor those who were called upon to save our community from the ravages of the worst fire in Long Island history. In those few days we witnessed first hand the acts of Long Island's solid-gold, true blue American heroes and on behalf of all of us in the community, I express my utmost gratitude to all who worked so successfully to save our homes, our businesses, our schools, and our churches and synagogues.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask the indulgence of the House and join me in a salute to Chief Richard Gianmugnai of Ridge, Chief Jeffrey Noss of Middle Island, Chief John Buckner of Rocky Point, Chief Dean Culver of Westhampton, Chief Richard Schermeyer of Quogue, Chief James Baker of Eastport, Chief Allan Geyer of Hampton Bays, all the chiefs and every member of the 176 fire companies and the 49 men and women injured during the disaster who everyday risk their lives for their neighbors. May God bless each and everyone of them and their families for a job well done. Thank you.

Attached is a list of injured fire fighters who risked their lives in the Rocky Point and Westhampton Beach fires. These people give their time and effort to volunteer for the fire department. I applaud them in their dedication to protecting the residents and the local communities from dangerous fires such as the recent ones that occurred on Eastern Long Island.

This is a list of injured fire fighters available as of September 6, 1995:

C. Bianco/Bethpage;
C. Manzellan/Flanders;
E. Johnston/Shirley;
R. Carey/Bayport;
F. Maute/Shirley;
T. Lynn/Manorville;
R. Carmagnola/Bellmore;
R. Pierson/Southampton;
B. Fleischman/Riverhead;
P. Thomason/Center Moriches;
A. Kyroski/East Quogue;
P. Damato/Nesconset;
C. McKenneth/Quogue;
J. Feinberg/Bayport;
K. McAteer/Central Islip;
F. Lutz/East Quogue;
H. Adler/Middle Island;
J. Washbaugh/Southampton;
P. Berun/Deer Park;
G. Reeder/Dix Hills;
R. Mina/North Babylon;
D. Ryan;
J. Kenneth;
D. Durinick;
A. McEntee;
M. Benefante;
W. Pyse;
P. Hicks;
P. McCormick;
J. Fortner;
J. Cole;
J. O'Shea/Eastport;
William Erario, North Babylon; Gregory Brown/East Hampton Village F.D.; and Lynn Halsey/Gabreski airport employee.
Selden Fire Department injuries: Rachel Rodgers; Christopher Bedus; George Bopp; Wayne Preston; James Pitterese.

Flanders Fire Department: Charlie Manzella; Frank Belson; and Robert A. Train.

Westhampton Beach Fire Department: Paul Hoyle.

Mastic Beach Fire Department: Gary Fuzie; David Bilodeau; William Biondi; Glen Olsen; Christopher Nunemaker; Ed Maute; and Edward Johnston.

□ 1900

THE COMING TRAIN WRECK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I will use no more than half of the 60 minutes allotted.

I realize that we are in a transition period and moving from a district work period to a capital work period is a bit of a strain, and we want to take it slow. So I will not go on at great length today.

But I do think we should note the fact that serious business lies ahead of us. There has been a great deal of talk about a train wreck coming where the mean and extreme balanced budget philosophy of the Republican majority will clash with the more moderate reform approach of the President, and we are going to have some very difficult days.

I think it is quite clear that appropriations bills of the kind that we passed before we left here cannot be left standing. We cannot have a \$9 billion cut in education, job training and social services. We cannot have tremendous cuts in housing. There are a number of things that just cannot be left standing. We cannot tolerate more than \$280 billion in cuts over the next 7 years to Medicare. We cannot tolerate more than \$180 billion in cuts for Medicaid.

There has to be a train wreck.

Unfortunately, in the Congress, in the Senate and the House, the Republican majority has the votes, and they have passed this mean and extreme program. All we have left is a Democratic President who says that he will veto these programs, and then we have a situation where the government may be brought to a halt if the appropriations bills are not signed and the Republican majority of the Congress is not willing to pass a continuing resolution to keep the government going.

It is going to be exciting times. But we should all realize that the basic direction for the Nation is being shaped not only in the next few months but it is already in the process; the direction that this Nation will take is already being shaped faster than we think, and what happens this year we will have to live with, this year and next year, for a long time to come.

It is very important that everybody understands that radical changes are under way. They are being proposed,

ever more mean and radical changes. But radical changes are under way right now.

The great majority of Americans feel that something is very different, that there is something happening. The great majority feels some aspect of this change. But they do not understand it.

So the majority of the people are angry, and they do not know why they are angry. I am here to tell you you have good reason to be angry. The problem in America is that we have to learn who to be angry with and how to focus our anger. Where is the problem?

I hope that everyone will take time to read an article that appeared in the New York Times on last Sunday, September 3. It is an article that appeared on the op ed page. It was entitled "Companies Merge, Families Break Up." "Companies Merge, Families Break Up."

The article is by Lester Thurow. Lester Thurow is an outstanding economist, recognized all over the world. He is a professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. On the Hill here in this capital we have seen and heard Lester Thurow many times over the last two decades.

□ 1930

It is our business to rein in the resources of the country, wherever they may appear, and apply them to the problems that we face.

To get back to Mr. Thurow:

American companies are moving production overseas, using technology to replace workers, engaging in mega mergers, such as this week's Chase-Chemical deal, and otherwise downsizing. Each year more than half a million good jobs are eliminated by the Nation's most prestigious companies. More new jobs are being generated in the service sector, but they come with lower wages and fewer fringe benefits.

With the death of communism and later market socialism and economic alternatives, capitalists have been able to employ more ruthless approaches to getting more for less, to getting maximum profits but with less effort. They do not have to worry about political pressure. Survival of the fittest capitalism is on the march.

What other kind of capitalism can we have except survival of the fittest capitalism. And that is appropriate for capitalism to be a survival of the fittest operation. It is up to government to deal with what the implications of that is.

Falling real wages have put the traditional American family into play. As the one-earner middle class family becomes extinct, with children needing ever more costly educations for ever longer periods of time, the cost of supporting a family is rising sharply just as earnings plunge.

Children exist, but no one takes care of them. Parents are spending 40 percent less time with their children than they did 30 years ago. More than 2 million children under the age of 13 have no adult supervision either before or after school. Paying for day care would use up all or most of a mother's wages.

The traditional family is being destroyed. This is an economist named Lester Thurow, who has written 10 or 20 books, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is talking about the economy and the impact of the economy on the family. We hear a lot of talk about family but we do not acknowledge the fact that the economy and what happens in the economy, what happens with wages, what happens with jobs has a very serious impact, the most serious impact on families. In fact, Mr. Thurow is about to say that.

Returning to the article:

The traditional family is being destroyed not by misguided social welfare programs coming from Washington, although there are some government initiatives that have undermined family structure, but by a modern economic system that is not congruent with family values.

The traditional family is being destroyed not by misguided social welfare programs coming from Washington, but by a modern economic system that is not congruent with family values. When we look at falling wages as a factor:

Beside falling wages, America's other economic problems pale into insignificance. The remedies lie in major public and private investments, in research and development, and in creating skilled workers to ensure that tomorrow's high-wage brainpower industries generate much of their employment in the United States. Yet if one looks at the weak policy proposals of both Democrats and Republicans, it is a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

That is in quotes. As we all know, it is from Shakespeare that Mr. Thurow is quoting. It is that the Democratic and Republican policies at this present point, which focus on this problem, that constitute a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

We just passed legislation which refused to continue the Office of Technology Assessment. The Office of Technology Assessment is a basic tool very much needed by the Members of Congress, Members of the House and Members of the Senate. We just threw it out. The one thing that was most significant got axed. We will be passing an appropriations bill for defense in the next few days and we are going to have a B-2 bomber vote again. If past history is any guide, we know that the B-2 bomber, which the Pentagon does not want, and the President does not want, and the Air Force does not want, it will probably pass again. The most unneeded piece of technology around will pass with votes from the House.

That is the kind of thing we are in. When they say what we do and what we say is a tale told by idiots, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing, that is what they mean.

The American people should be angry about all this. Revenue policies are needed to deal with the present problem. We need taxing policies to take the resources from where they are, the revenues in Wall Street, the revenues

that are in the high prices of corporations, we need to take some of those revenues and put them into research and development and into training workers.

Mr. Speaker, we have a transition period here, a period which will go on for some time still to come where these great downsizings will make more people unemployed. Something needs to be done during this transitional period. Nobody knows where capitalism will go. It is not planned. No one wants to stop progress, but you need to take some steps to deal with it, and one of the steps that should be taken is to balance the tax burden by taking more revenue from corporations.

Corporations now pay only 11 percent of the total tax burden. Individuals are paying 44 percent. That is ridiculous. We need to bring down taxes for individuals and raise taxes on corporations to get enough revenue to sustain the programs that need to be sustained for education and for job training.

Mr. Speaker, I am rushing, because I do not want to take too much time today. We will expand on this in the future. We need a creative revenue commission, a commission similar to the base closings commission, which will look at the revenue situation, look at the fact that over the years corporations have gone down from paying almost 40 percent of the tax burden to paying now only 11 percent of the tax burden. At one point, under Ronald Reagan, it went down to 8 percent of the total tax burden.

The Committee on Ways and Means has swindled the country. The Committee on Ways and Means, part of this body, and other taxing authorities, have allowed a situation to be created where the burden is very lopsided. One of the things that a tax commission could do is find ways to raise the taxes on corporations, pull out more revenue from corporations while you are lowering families and individuals, and use the money that you get to pour it into education, research and development, and job training.

I am going to end at this point, Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of proposals on the board: Flat tax proposals, consumption tax proposals, various proposals that are on the drawing board for such a commission to examine. I would want to add to that an anti-monopoly tax, where any industry which gets more than 25 percent of the market would have to pay a surcharge because it has an advantage that does not need as great an expenditure.

I would also add that something should be done about the banking and financial industry, to recapture the almost \$300 billion that the American taxpayers have put out through the Federal deposit insurance to bail out the savings and loan associations. All of the industries in the banking field and related financial institutions ought to have a surcharge put on them to collect back some of that money. There are a number of creative propo-

sitions by which we could get more revenue instead of focusing only on cuts.

Yes, we should downsize government; yes, there is waste, but there is a great problem. We need to balance the tax burden at the same time that we are trying to balance the budget. In doing that, we will produce a situation where the workers of America, the children of America, the families of America would have more to look forward to in terms of facing these tremendous radical changes that are presently taking place in our economy and our society.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 3, 1995]

COMPANIES MERGE, FAMILIES BREAK UP

(By Lester C. Thurow)

No country without a revolution or a military defeat and subsequent occupation has ever experienced such a sharp shift in the distribution of earnings as America has in the last generation. At no other time have median wages of American men fallen for more than two decades. Never before have a majority of American workers suffered real wage reductions while the per capita domestic product was advancing.

So on Labor Day this year, as with a lot of Labor Days, most laborers don't have a lot to celebrate. The median real wage for full-time male workers has fallen from \$34,048 in 1973 to \$30,407 in 1993.

Wages of white men are falling slightly faster than those of black men, and the young have been clobbered; wages are down 25 percent for men 25 to 34 years of age. Median wages for women didn't start to fall until 1989, but are now falling for every group except college-educated women. The pace of decline seems to have doubled in 1994 and early 1995.

The tide rose (the real per capita gross domestic product went up 29 percent between 1973 and 1993), but 80 percent of the boats sank. Among men, the top 20 percent of the labor force has been winning all of the country's wage increases for more than two decades.

Adding to the frustrations, the old remedy for lower wages—more education—no longer works. True, wages of males with only a high school education are falling faster than the pay of those with college degrees. But investing in a college education doesn't get one off the down escalator and onto an up escalator—it merely slows one's descent.

No one knows exactly how much of the decline can be traced to any particular cause, but we do know the set of causes that has been responsible.

New production and distribution technologies require a much better educated work force. If decisions are to be pushed down the corporate hierarchy, those at lower levels have to have skills and competency beyond what was required in the past.

With our global economy, where anything can be made anywhere and sold everywhere, the supply of cheap, often well-educated labor in the third world is having a big effect on first-world wages. One month's wages for a Seattle software engineer get the same company an equally good engineer in Banaglor, India, for a year. Ten million immigrants entered the United States during the last decade, competing for jobs and lowering wages.

American companies are moving production overseas, using new technology to replace workers, engaging in mega-mergers such as this week's Chase-Chemical deal, and otherwise downsizing. Each year more than a half-million good jobs are eliminated by the

nation's most prestigious companies. More new jobs are being generated in the service sector, but they come with lower wages and fewer fringe benefits.

With the death of Communism and, later, market socialism as economic alternatives, capitalists have been able to employ more ruthless approaches to getting maximum profits without worrying about political pressure. "Survival of the fittest" capitalism is on the march.

What economists call "efficiency wages" (a company paying higher salaries than the minimum it needs to pay, so that it gets a skilled, cooperative, loyal work force) are disappearing to be replaced by a different form of motivation—the fear of losing one's job.

Falling real wages have put the traditional American family into play, as the one-earner middle-class family becomes extinct. With children needing ever-more-costly educations for ever-longer periods of time, the cost of supporting a family is rising sharply just as earnings plunge.

Thirty-two percent of all men between 25 and 34 years of age earn less than the amount necessary to keep a family of four above the poverty line. Mothers have to work longer hours if the family is to have its old standard of living.

Children exist but no one takes care of them. Parents are spending 40 percent less time with their children than they did 30 years ago. More than two million children under the age of 13 have no adult supervision either before or after school. Paying for day care would use up all or most of a mother's wages.

In the agricultural era, children had real economic value at a very early age. Students who use college loans owe their parents less. Living thousands of miles apart, families lose track of one another. The family is no longer the social welfare system when one is disabled, old or sick, and it will not resume these duties even if the state were to withdraw.

The traditional family is being destroyed not by misguided social welfare programs coming from Washington (although there are some Government initiatives that have undermined family structure) but by a modern economic system that is not congruent with "family values."

Beside falling real wages, America's other economic problems pale into insignificance. The remedies lie in major public and private investments in research and development and in creating skilled workers to insure that tomorrow's high-wage, brain-power industries generate much of their employment in the United States.

Yet if one looks at the weak policy proposals of both Democrats and Republicans, "it is a tale, told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

CUTS IN MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the minority leader's designee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again, I would emphasize that I do not intend to use the majority of that time, but I would like to take the time that I plan to use to talk about medicare and what reaction I received during the last 4 weeks when we were having our August district work period.

I found through visiting my constituents and having forums and trying to

address them, in particular on the medicare issue, that many of them were not aware of the challenges that face medicare when we come back in September at this time. But when they were told about the level of cuts, the \$270 billion in cuts that have been proposed by the Republican leadership, and are included in the Republican budget that was adopted last spring, they were very concerned about the impact that that record level of cuts in the medicare program would have.

Mr. Speaker, I think they have every reason to be concerned because I feel very strongly that that level of cuts, the \$270 billion that has been proposed, cannot be implemented without major changes, negative changes, in the medicare program, and probably also without significant out-of-pocket, additional out-of-pocket expenses for senior citizens and those who take advantage of the medicare program.

I wanted to make a few points about these drastic cuts in medicare, if I could, tonight. The first point I would like to make is that the Republican sponsored medicare reductions really should come as no surprise, because 30 years ago, when medicare was first adopted, there was tremendous opposition to the medicare program by the majority of the Republicans in Congress, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives. In fact, the leading Republican presidential candidate now, Senator BOB DOLE, voted against the creation of the medicare program 30 years ago when he was a Member of this body, the House of Representatives.

If you look back at the record of key votes in the history of medicare, going back to 1960, when it was first being proposed, 97 percent of the Republicans in the Senate voted against the creation of the medicare program; and then, 2 years later, on July 17, 1962, 86 percent of the Republicans in the Senate voted against the creation of medicare. Later that year, on September 2, 1962, 85 percent of the Republicans in the Senate voted against the creation of medicare.

The same was essentially true in the House of Representatives, in this body. In 1965, when some of the key votes took place on April 8 of 1965, 93 percent of the Republicans in the House of Representatives voted for a Republican substitute which would have replaced the medicare program with a voluntary health insurance program for the elderly with no guaranteed financing and no guaranteed benefits. Then, on July 27, 1965, 49 percent of the Republicans in the House voted against the creation of medicare on the vote on the adoption of the conference report on the medicare bill.

Thus, many House Republicans who had voted for the Republican voluntary plan I mentioned before, turned around and also voted for the final Democrat sponsored medicare bill, perhaps out of fear of the wrath of their constituents once the medicare program finally got

started. Now that the Republicans are in power here again in both the House and the Senate, and we are talking 30 years later, they want to finance their tax cuts for those better off with Medicare cuts.

If you look at this budget that I talked about before, the one that was adopted back in April by the Republican majority here in the House and in the Senate, \$270 billion in Medicare cuts roughly translate into a tax cut to the tune of \$245 billion. So if you took a chart and you looked at the level of the Medicare cuts, it is pretty much the same as the level of the tax cuts that have been proposed.

I would maintain that although Medicare may need some minor reform, it is not as disaster prone as the Republicans are trying to portray it, and that, in effect, what they are doing with these Medicare reductions is basically budget driven and is not any effort to reform the Medicare Program.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard some of my colleagues in the House mention that the trustees' report on Medicare, that comes out every year, this year indicated that Medicare would be insolvent within 7 years. I would point out, however, that that is one of the longest periods of times projected for money to be available for the Medicare Program. If you look back at some of the trustee reports in prior years, they were for 2 years or 3 years before the program became insolvent.

The bottom line is that, historically, in Congress, we have tried to keep a short rein on the amount of money that is available in the future for Medicare so that it is not raided, so that the hospitals and other health care providers do not say, well, gee, there is this huge pot of money out there that will last us a long time, so why do we not raise our rates and why do we not, in effect, take some of that money to pay us as providers because of the need that we have.

So we cannot here in the House of Representatives or in Congress in general say that Medicare should have a huge pot of money that is available for the next 10 or 20 years, because the end result of that is that that money would probably be raided. We must keep it on a short rein.

□ 1915

Lester Thurow is not an isolationist. He believes in free markets, he believes in the global economy. Lester Thurow cannot be easily pinpointed or pigeonholed as a conservative or a liberal. What we do know is that he is an outstanding thinker, an outstanding economist. I think that some of the things that Lester Thurow had to say in this article last Sunday are absolute must reading for every American. Every adult American should begin to try to understand what is happening to them, what is the matter with our economy, what is affecting our culture, what is destroying our families. Here is an economist who started out from the

point of view of an economist and makes a very strong statement about American families.

Let me just share with you some of the paragraphs and some portions of Lester Thurow's article. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Lester Thurow which appeared in the Sunday, September 3d New York Times be entered into the RECORD.

The first paragraph is the most shocking statement. The first paragraph should be emblazoned on the walls of this hall to remind all of us as to where we are right now. Mr. Thurow opens with this statement. Listen carefully: "No country without a revolution or a military defeat and subsequent occupation has ever experienced such a sharp shift in the distribution of earnings as America has in the last generation. At no other time have median wages of American men fallen for more than two decades. Never before have a majority of American workers suffered real wage reductions while the per capita domestic product was advancing." Mr. Speaker, that is the end of first paragraph of Mr. Thurow's article.

Mr. Speaker, it is so outstanding, and it does such a great job of summing up exactly where we are in this ongoing, radical change. It is under way already; it has been under way for two decades now, Mr. Thurow says. Let me just repeat: "No country, without a revolution or a military defeat and subsequent occupation, has ever experienced such sharp shift in the distribution of earnings as America has in the last generation. At no other time have median wages of American men fallen for more than two decades. Never before have a majority of American workers suffered real wage reductions while the per capita domestic product was advancing." Mr. Speaker, that is the end of the quote from Mr. Thurow's first paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is very significant that Mr. Thurow's article appears on Sunday, September 3, the day before Labor Day where we do pay some homage to the working people of America. On Labor Day we stop and consider the plight of the workers or the conditions of workers, and it is quite appropriate that this article should appear on that day.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities that used to be called the Education and Labor Committee. There was a time when the official Government of America paid more recognition and homage to organized labor. Just a year ago we had a committee with labor in the name of it.

But now the Education and Labor Committee is no more, it is called the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and none of the subcommittees have the name labor in them. The change in name is reflective of the change in attitude, because a

massive war has been declared on organized labor and on workers in America. Let me just get that straight. Because workers in America all need a wage increase. A raise in the minimum wage is not just for people who are unionized, a raise in the minimum wage benefits all workers, and most of the workers who are working at minimum wage now and who would benefit from an increase in the minimum wage are not unionized. Most unionized workers are making more than the minimum wage.

It has been proposed by President Clinton and by Democrats in Congress that we raise the minimum wage two steps, a mere 90 cents, and that has met all-out war. The leadership of the majority Republicans have declared, never. Never will we permit minimum wages to move forward at all. So minimum wages benefit all workers. There is no consideration in the program of the majority for relieving workers of the wages that have led to the condition that Mr. Thurow is describing here in the first paragraph.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to not tolerating any discussion of forward movement on minimum wage, the majority Republicans here have declared war on workers on a massive basis. Speaker GINGRICH uses the phrase that politics is war without blood. Well, they have declared war on workers and war on organized labor.

We have a whole series of bills that have been introduced which seek to undercut the gains of the last 50 years for working Americans. We have bills that have been introduced which will radically change OSHA. OSHA is the safety agency, the Agency which is responsible for workplace safety. We have a bill which is designed to curb the activities of the National Labor Relations Board. We have a bill which is designed to cut the budget drastically and curb the activities of MSHA, the mine safety agency. We have a bill which is designed to undercut the organization of workers called the Team Act, which is allowing employers to select the people who are going to be the collective bargaining agents.

We have a number of bills of that kind which are stymied in the sense that they have to move through a two-stage process. They have to go through the House where there are definitely enough votes. The Republican majority has enough votes to make certain that they pass. They also have to go through the Senate. That is a slow process.

So what has the Republican majority of the House decided to do? They have taken the appropriations bills and they have used the appropriations bills to legislate these changes. They do not have authorizing legislation to deal with the gutting of OSHA and the destruction of safety measures for American workers, so they have cut OSHA by more than 30 percent, about 33 percent in the appropriations process.

In the appropriations process they have put in language which says, no

funds may be used for certain activities. They cannot even study ergonomics. Ergonomics, which is a serious problem where workers who are involved in repetitive motion have well-identified ailments and problems and we cannot even study that anymore. So there is an onslaught on working people and an onslaught on organized labor which is very significant in light of the fact that Mr. Thurow says, these people that you are waging war against have already suffered greatly in the last two decades.

Mr. Speaker, let me just continue reading from Mr. Thurow's article. Another paragraph reads as follows: "The tide rose, the real per capita gross domestic product went up 29 percent between 1973 and 1993, but 80 percent of the boats sank. Among men, the top 20 percent of the labor force has been winning all of the country's wage increases for more than two decades."

Twenty years. For more than 20 years, the men at the very top already are the only ones who have been winning the wage increases. Listen closely again. "The tide rose, but 80 percent of the boats sank." Remember Ronald Reagan invented the slogan, all tides will rise if you cut taxes and you take care of corporations and you deal with providing maximum benefits for the rich, they will invest and all tides will rise, everybody will benefit.

Well, here is an economist who says that, it worked in terms of the tide rising from 1973 to 1993, a 20-year period. But 80 percent of the boats sank; 80 percent of the American population does not benefit from this great prosperity that we have experienced in the last 20 years and are still experiencing.

Mr. Speaker, let me just pause for a moment, because I think it is very important that we consider that Mr. Thurow later on offers no solutions, but consider the fact that for a small percentage, for 20 percent, we have great prosperity. Wall Street is booming, profits are higher than ever before. These are the benefits of technology, computerization, automation, all kinds of various technological changes, most of which are the result of Government research, most of which are driven by the fact that in our defense race, in our military arms race with the Soviet Union we did tremendous amounts of research.

Since World War II tremendous amounts of research have laid the basis for much of the booming economy that we have today. One of the biggest beneficiaries has been the telecommunications industry. Telecommunications benefits all the way from computerization and miniaturization of parts which were perfected first in Government research trying to get things together for our missiles and our space program, all the way to satellites that are up there in the atmosphere now, satellites that were perfected and developed by the Government.

The biggest industry in terms of the hardest industry in terms of dollars, in

terms of transaction is the communications industry, telecommunications and media. All of those have benefited. They have benefited from the public expenditure, the public participation. But now, only 5 percent of the population benefits from the profits. Part of the solution to the long-term problem lies in the recognition of the fact that there should be some sharing of those benefits, that the small percentage of Americans are reaping as a result of the effort made by the larger mass of society. Sharing that is part of where the answer to the problem lies.

Mr. Speaker, let me just continue to read from Mr. Thurow again:

New production and distribution technologies require a much better educated force, a much better educated force. If decisions are to be pushed down the corporate hierarchy, those at lower levels have to have skills and competency beyond what was required in the past. With our global economy where anything can be made anywhere and sold everywhere, the supply of cheap, often well-educated labor in the third world is having a big effect on first world wages. One month's wages for a Seattle software engineer gets the same company an equally good engineer in Bangalor, India for a whole year. One month's wages for an engineer, a software engineer gets the same company an equally good engineer in Bangalor, India for a whole year.

Consider the implications of that. You have heard a lot about unskilled jobs and manufacturing jobs leaving the country. Well, here are jobs for which a college degree is required. Here are jobs which require extensive training and experience, and you can go overseas and get the same quality of workers for one-twelfth the cost of the worker. I think engineers probably do not like to be called workers. They are professionals. That is a great myth in this country.

Professionals think they are different, they are safe. Large numbers of people who did not join unions are now talking about forming associations, in order to deal with a situation where the country is being hijacked. The multinational corporations are ignoring the plight of the workers.

Corporations are not in business to take care of workers. Corporations are not in business to make America great. Corporations are not in business to promote national security. There are a lot of things we have been led to believe, but which are just ridiculous. Corporations are in the business to make money and that is what they are supposed to do. Nobody should worry about that. They are there for profit and that is their business. All power to corporations to make profits.

Government and the people who run the Government, Congressmen, Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate, the President, Government has the responsibility of taking care of the country, of seeing that our society is not destroyed, of seeing that families are not destroyed. Whatever is necessary to be

done now is up to us, not to corporations. Let them go. They will do whatever they can to increase their profits. That is their business.

□ 1945

The Republican plan to reduce Medicare funding by this \$270 billion I believe is going to force seniors to pay out of their pocket as much as \$1,000 per year over the next few years. The biggest problem, though, is that right now we really do not know what the Republican leadership is going to suggest as a means of implementing this major reduction in Medicare. If we look at some of the proposals that are out there, we can see that they are devastating, but so far, there is not a specific proposal that we can examine in detail.

I am concerned that what we are going to see is that sometime toward the end of this month, in September, we are going to see a plan put forward at the last minute, without an opportunity for a great deal of debate, and it is going to be brought to the House floor in some manner through a procedural vote so that there are only a few hours or a few days or perhaps a little longer than that for this great national debate on how to change the Medicare Program.

I would say that that is essentially a stealth plan; to bring this up at the last minute, bring it up when there is not a lot of time for the public to review it, and then pass it. I think we have to guard against this stealth attack, and hopefully, certainly myself and others will bring it to the attention of the American public when this finally comes out, that there has not been enough time, and there should be enough time to review it in detail.

Mr. Speaker, this past month, in August, when we did have our district work period for about 4 weeks, I had the opportunity in my home State of New Jersey to join with the other Democratic Congressmen from my State to essentially try to put forward to the public through various means our concern about these Medicare reductions. We had a very successful bus trip around the State which started at the State House in Trenton and traveled from Trenton to Edison, in my district, and then to Elizabeth, and finally to North Bergen in Hudson County.

We expressed the concern, both myself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. PAYNE, that the Republican plans of gutting Medicare would essentially end the Federal Government's 3-decade-old commitment to provide health coverage for older Americans.

We gave four top reasons, pursuant to our bus trip, we called it the Medicare Express, why the public should oppose the Republican Medicare cuts. I would like to highlight those four reasons now, if I could. One I already sort of hinted at, and that is that we are going to see dramatically increased health costs for seniors. We have to un-

derstand that this \$270 billion in cuts outlined in the Republican budget resolution is the largest cut in the history of Medicare. No matter how we figure it out, it is going to result in major out-of-pocket expenditures to our senior citizens, and increased costs essentially.

Second to that and just as important when we were out on the road and talking to seniors was the concern that we found on the part of senior citizens in New Jersey, and I am sure it is shared with the rest of the country, that the Republican plan will restrict choice and also reduce the quality of care; because essentially what I think we are going to see, and we have already heard some talk about that, is that on the House side, the Republicans have put forward this idea of a voucher plan, that somehow they will give senior citizens a check or a voucher, as it is called, and that the seniors then take that voucher or check to go out and buy their own health insurance in the private market.

I think a lot of people do not realize that Medicare now is a government-run program. If we simply give people a voucher and make them go out and buy their own health insurance, a lot of them are not going to be able to afford the existing what we call fee-for-service system, which allows them to choose their own doctor or their own hospital and then have the Government reimburse the doctor or the hospital for the care.

What will happen, I believe, is that if we do a voucher system, which again is budget-driven or cost-driven, a lot of seniors will find that they cannot buy a fee-for-service system that allows them to choose their own doctor or their own hospital with the amount of money they get in the voucher. Therefore, they will be forced into what we call HMO's or managed care systems, which basically prevent or limit seniors' choices with regard to doctors and with regard to hospitals.

That is why we, as Democrats, have been very suspicious of the Medicare cuts, not only because of the increased health costs for seniors, but also because if we move to a voucher system, where somehow we force senior citizens into a HMO, we are restricting their choice of hospitals and we are restricting their choice of physicians. In many cases many of the seniors have used the particular hospital or physician for 30, 40 years, and all of a sudden they will find they do not have a choice anymore.

However, the Medicare cuts not only harm seniors, they also harm all Americans, because if we look at what has happened in the past and what existed before the Medicare system was established 30 years ago, young families were often faced with the prospect of caring for a seriously ill elderly relative, and faced bankruptcy in order to care for that relative. Medicare has basically made it possible for young families to spend their hard-earned re-

sources on other things, other than seniors or their parents or grandparents' health care; for example, for their children's education. If we go back to a system where seniors do not have quality care or do not have sufficient care, then a lot of those costs are going to be borne by younger people and make it more difficult for them to do other things; for example, care for their children or their children's education.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would stress that it really is not fair, because 30 years ago this Congress made a compact or a contract, if you will, with senior citizens that said that they would be provided with health care when they reached the age of 65. That contract is essentially broken if Medicare is gutted or if seniors do not have access to the doctors or hospital of their choice, or have quality care.

The Republicans on the Committee on the Budget have put forward a number of suggestions for implementing this \$270 billion cut in the Medicare program. They put together what they call a budget task force that came up with about over 30 recommendations about how to implement these cuts. I just wanted to highlight a few of them. I mentioned the voucher plan, which I think is the worst of all. However, some of the other ideas that were mentioned were increased premiums for new beneficiaries who use Medicare fee-for-service. In other words, if instead of going to a voucher system, you say to seniors,

Look, if you want to stay in a fee-for-service system where you choose your own doctor, as opposed to an HMO, we will simply make you pay more for that, for that type of a system, the one you have now.

The other option, of course, is to just increase deductibles or to increase copayments. Many seniors, most seniors know now, that there are deductibles and there are copayments for various services, so you could simply increase those and there would be more out-of-pocket expenditures.

However, the one thing that has not been highlighted very much, and I wanted to spend just a little bit of time on it today, because when I was back in my district in New Jersey and I went around, a lot of the people who showed up at either the forums or who called me were from hospitals who were concerned about the quality of care, and what it would mean to the hospitals if this program of Medicare cuts were to take place.

I was amazed when I got information from the State Hospital Association and from some of the hospitals in my 6th Congressional District about how these cuts, what these cuts would mean in terms of dollars, because so many of the hospitals in my part of the country, and I am sure in others, are so dependent upon Medicare, as well as Medicaid funding. Medicaid is the program, the health care program, for poor people. Medicare is, or course, the health care program for senior citizens.

If I could take as an example Monmouth Medical Center, which is in my hometown of Long Branch, which we did visit, and where I talked with the president of the hospital and some of the hospital executives about the problems that they would face with these levels of Medicare cuts, they estimated that at Monmouth Medical Center, which is the largest area hospital in my district, that the Monmouth Medical Center would lose an estimated \$77 million in Medicare payments over the next 7 years under this Republican proposal.

Interestingly enough, Monmouth Medical Center receives 55.17 percent, or a majority of its revenues, from Medicare and Medicaid. That figure is pretty much repeated for a lot of the other hospitals in my district. Jersey Shore Medical Center, which some people know recently had to lay off a lot of personnel, 56.29 percent of its revenues are from those two programs; Riverview in Red Bank, 51 percent; John F. Kennedy Medical Center in Edison, 59 percent; South Amboy Medical Center, also in my district, 57 percent.

Although the Republican congressional leadership has been vague about the specifics of their Medical proposal, it is inevitable that reductions in hospital spending will have to be a big part of this Medicare reduction package. The effects of these cuts will be felt throughout the community and force many hospitals to make some really tough choices. I think that we are going to see increasingly hospitals laying off staff, that is already happening to a lot of them, and many of the community benefits that hospitals now offer, such as multiple health screening centers, transportation services, and some of the clinics that are so important to a lot of people in my district and around the country would probably end up closing.

The reductions in Medicare spending that are being proposed by the Republican majority did not cover the additional costs of program enrollment growth plus inflation, so in other words, what we are doing here is we are not anticipating that a lot more seniors will be entering into the Medicare program and taking advantage of it when we estimate what these costs are going to mean.

I have a lot of other information, and I do not want to repeat it all. The bottom line is that increased Medicare admissions are a substantial part of the revenue that a lot of New Jersey hospitals receive, and we estimate through the hospital association, again, the New Jersey Hospital Association, that there are about 76 hospitals that would be on the critical list, in other words, either face closures or face significant downsizing if this Republican Medicare reduction takes effect.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just mention a couple more things in a larger sense before I conclude today. Then I am going to yield some time to my friend, the gentleman from American

Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] who I think would like to use some of the time that I have remaining.

I cannot help, in discussing Medicare and the proposals that the Republican majority have put forward, not only with Medicare but also with Medicaid, the health care program for the poor, but think about what the situation was like in this House a year ago when the President had put forward a proposal for universal health coverage, and whether or not we liked President Clinton's proposals, and I frankly did, but whether or not you did or you did not, the focus of the debate in this House was on universal coverage, or at least trying to achieve an increase in the number of Americans that were covered by health insurance, rather than a reduction.

We talked then, a year ago, about the fact that there were something like 30 million to 40 million Americans that had no health insurance coverage. The bottom line is if we look at the statistics, that figure has only gotten worse since that time a year ago. A year ago we had fewer people that were uninsured, and we had the hope that we were going to try through some mechanism to cover if not all of them, then a significant portion of them.

Now one year later we face a situation where significantly more Americans, we estimate something like 43 to 44 million Americans, have no health insurance, yet, the focus in this House is on cutting back on the Medicare program for the elderly and the Medicaid program for the poor, which I would suggest ultimately is going to result in even more people entering the rolls of the uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I could, just quote some excerpts from a recent editorial that was in the *Star Ledger* on September 3, which is the major, the largest daily circulation newspaper in the State of New Jersey. It says: "Last year at this time it was not just the major policy issue," talking about health care reform under discussion, "but almost the only one. This year, for all practical purposes, it", the health care reform agenda:

Does not exist. Despite the intensity of today's political debate, it plays no part in the dialogue.

One would think the problem of bringing health care coverage to the uninsured had disappeared, or miraculously been solved, except it has not. Things are worse. Last summer when President Clinton unsuccessfully pressed Congress to enact a system to provide universal health care coverage, estimates of the number of people without insurance ranged from 37 million to 39 million. This summer, with the fight for health care reform only a memory, the number of uninsured has increased. Estimates now range as high as 43.4 million. This means that one of six Americans is without coverage, and that does not take into account those who are underinsured and those who are paying scandalously high individual rates for their insurance. The number of uninsured will continue to grow rapidly.

The Clinton administration claims that Republican plans to cut projected spending

on Medicaid, the Federal-state program of health insurance for the poor, over 7 years could deprive nine million more people of coverage. The big mistake that both parties are making now is to ignore the larger need for a universal health care plan. The debate may have gone away but the problem is as acute as ever. Polls still show universal coverage to be a concept that has wide support.

I think it is very sad that we are going to spend the next month here talking about how to cut back on the Medicare and the Medicaid program at a time when the number of uninsured continues to grow. What I hoped, and I hope that some day we will see it, is that the debate on Medicare reform would focus on what we could do to expand Medicare in a way that made the quality of health care better, and emphasized preventative care, and also saved money.

Those of us who have been concerned about Medicare for a number of years in this House, many of us on both sides of the aisles have talked about, in the past have talked about expanding Medicare to include prevention measures such as prescription drugs or home health care. We know and studies have shown if you emphasize those prevention measures and you include prescription drugs or home health care and long-term care in the Medicare program, that prevents senior citizens from having to go to a hospital, being institutionalized in a nursing home, or whatever, and ultimately saves the Federal Government billions of dollars in costs for that institutionalized care.

But instead of moving in that direction, looking for a Medicare reform proposal that would actually expand Medicare, emphasize prevention, and ultimately save money without negatively impacting seniors' health care, we are just talking about this budget-driven proposal by the Republican leadership that would slash Medicare by \$270 billion and I believe ultimately gut the Medicare program and significantly decrease the quality of health care for America's seniors.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from American Samoa.

PROTESTING FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE PACIFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding me this time and I really appreciate his consideration for allowing me to share with my colleagues and the American people what is happening in French Polynesia, the eve of the French nuclear testing catastrophe that I feel that what is happening now.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday France detonated a nuclear bomb in French Polynesia, defying worldwide opinion which

has uniformly condemned their resumption of nuclear testing. Mr. Speaker, about 2 hours ago, I personally received word from Tahiti's most prominent leader against nuclear testing, the mayor of the village of Take Ah Ah, Mr. Temaru.

My colleagues, as I speak, Tahiti is burning right now. Tahiti is at a standstill. The only airport in Tahiti is burning. As a result of France's explosion of the nuclear bomb in Mururoa Atoll right now, Tahitians attempted to hold a peaceful demonstration and occupy the only airport on the island. As a result, a French military hurled grenades and starting shooting at these unarmed Tahitians.

Mr. Speaker, what arrogance. Several Tahitians are wounded and Mr. Temaru is making an appeal to the world community of what is happening because the French Government right now is making every attempt to suppress what is happening right now on this island in French Polynesia.

Mr. Speaker, there are several good reasons why France should not, does not need to explode eight more nuclear bombs under the atoll, Mururoa Atoll. First, France has already exploded 163 nuclear bombs in the atmosphere on and under the Mururoa Atoll. The nuclear contamination under this atoll is equivalent to several times the contamination of the city of Chernobyl in Russia. And let me share with my colleagues and the American people what the atoll looks like, Mr. Speaker, if I can get a focus on this. And this is what the atoll looks like. This is a French document showing the areas of the atoll that is contaminated. And despite all this publicity that some of the people have seen, the President of French Polynesia swimming on the beach, it is a total misinformation given to the world community, and the fact is this atoll is contaminated, Mr. Speaker. And it could be 10 years from now, 50 years from now, if this atoll starts leaking nuclear contamination, the people of the Pacific are going to be the victims while Mr. Chirac continues to drink his wine in Paris.

Mr. Speaker, France currently has the third largest supply of nuclear bombs in the world. Nuclear bombs are weapons of genocide, Mr. Speaker. Nuclear bombs destroy everything and anything on sight, including human beings. Mr. Speaker, who are the French going to explode these bombs against?

The fact that Europe is united, we have a NATO organization. And the fact that Chirac says that this is in the national interest of France's nuclear deterrent force system, what about our friends in Germany? Should they then also be concerned that this is the kind of thing that France is opening up a complete can of worms. What is there for us then to tell Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan, that they have no right to conduct nuclear testing for their national interest? What hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, what hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, after exploding over 1,000 nuclear bombs, the United States, who happens to be an ally of France, has already offered the technology for which France seeks to achieve by exploding 8 more nuclear bombs. Each nuclear bomb with a force of up to 10 times, 10 times more powerful than the nuclear bomb that we dropped on Hiroshima 50 years ago. And that bomb, Mr. Speaker, incidentally, killed 120,000 men, women, and children in that city with an additional 80,000 people who died as a result of radioactive contamination and illnesses.

Mr. Speaker, three major newspapers and several others in the United States, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Los Angeles Times, all called for President Chirac to stop the nuclear tests in the South Pacific. The U.S. Senate has also passed a resolution under the leadership of U.S. Senator DANIEL AKAKA of Hawaii that calls upon the Government of France not to conduct these tests. In the House of Representatives, the Committee on International Relations unanimously adopted a resolution again calling upon the Government of France not to conduct these nuclear testings. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has also issued a strong statement last month to call upon all nations, especially France and China, for a complete ban on termination or termination of nuclear bomb testings.

Mr. Speaker, the United States alone has enough nuclear bombs to blow this whole planet 10 times over. The notion that the nation with more nuclear bombs will win the next nuclear war is sheer nonsense and total madness of what this world is doing now. Mr. Speaker, if France does not set a good example by canceling nuclear bomb tests, what is there to stop countries like Iran and Iraq and Pakistan and India to also conduct nuclear bomb tests and also either purchase or develop their own nuclear arsenals? What madness, Mr. Speaker. When is this madness going to end?

I personally visited Mururoa Atoll 3 years ago, Mr. Speaker, and I must say in all candor, the military officials of France personally told me that that atoll is contaminated. The atoll is contaminated. Mr. Speaker, in appealing to the people of French Polynesia and to the leaders of French Polynesia, who are in constant contact with Mr. Chirac, one day the children of the Pacific and their children's children are either going to live as a free people or as victims of nuclear contamination from the Pacific Ocean which has served our Polynesian people for centuries as a highway system and also the source of all forms of life where man, the animals, and plants have co-existed.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly a sad commentary to make in a democratic country like France to totally disregard the sincere concerns of some 27 million men, women, and children who live in the Pacific who have no hatred

or animosity toward the people of France. The people of the Pacific only want to live without fear of nuclear contamination in their vast ocean of the marine environment. Is this asking too much of President Chirac who, maybe 10 or 50 years from now, when we are going to be all gone but our children's children will then ask how can the Government of France allow such nuclear contamination to happen?

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of what a great western leader once said. He may have even been a French philosopher, for all I know. But he said the only real reason why evil continues to exist in this world is because good men do nothing. And I call upon President Clinton and the State Department, this is the French Government that decided years ago, this is the very government that decided years ago to withdraw its membership from NATO. This is the same French Government that demanded that all United States forces leave France within 60 days. And as I recall history, Mr. Speaker, our President, through Secretary of State Dean Rusk, personally hand-carried a letter and to let President De Gaulle know in verbatim that also included the 10,000 bodies of Americans who are buried in France who were there to fight, to liberate France from Nazi Germany.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same French Government which 50 years ago by forced deportation of 75,000 French citizens to Nazi concentration camps and as a result only 1,000 of those French citizens survived. What a shame, Mr. Speaker, what a shame. And this is the same French Government who looks upon the 200,000 people who live in French Polynesia and say yes, they are expendable. They are expendable because Paris is 15,000 miles away. The people of France have no concern whatsoever about the leakages of the nuclear contamination. The 200,000 men, women, and children who live in French Polynesia, Mr. Speaker, are deemed expendable by the Chirac government's policy to continue these nuclear bomb explosions, which is madness.

Mr. Speaker, President Chirac drinks his wine. The island of Tahiti is burning right now, at this moment. The total, the whole island is at a standstill. There are blockades now taken at the airport. The airport is burning. As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is just a beginning.

What arrogance, Mr. Speaker. What arrogance on the part of a democratic country like France. It is the best form of true colonialism in its worst example, and I cannot believe that here a democracy of the world is setting the worst example to the rest of the world. When we talk about human rights, when we talk about liberty, when we talk about freedom and these people are suffering and are victims because of this stupid and asinine policy of the French Government to explode nuclear bombs in the Pacific. And the leaders of the world, the community, the world

said if it is so safe, Mr. Chirac, why do you not explode it in France?

We do not need this madness. We do not need this nightmare. I might also, Mr. Speaker, there are only 1.2 million American citizens living in the State of Hawaii. On the State of Hawaii, these are American citizens, Mr. Speaker, and I appeal again to the President, to the State Department, let us not be submissive. Let us not be passive to allow President Chirac to make these kinds of decisions that bring tension, that bring trouble and complete disregard for the concerns and the lives and the health and the welfare of the people who live in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Tahiti just 2 days ago. Never have I witnessed what colonialism really means in the eve of the 21st century. Tahitian people are the least educated. I learned that only a handful, this is after 150 years of French colonialism, I was told by the Tahitians there are less than 10 Tahitians that were ever educated in the field of law. What a shame. What a shame, Mr. Speaker.

I was joined by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance, Mr. Takemura of Japan, quotes that France is losing respect from nations all over the world because of this stupid policy of exploding nuclear bombs in the Pacific. I might also note, Mr. Speaker, that there were parliamentarians from about 20 countries all over the world who were there to lend their support in strong opposition to this stupid policy that President Chirac has established to continue these stupid nuclear tests that we do not need in this world. And why are we reinventing the wheel? We have the technology. We offered it to President Chirac. But he does not want to accept it. What foolishness. And if it is so much to say that President Chirac can get away with this, then, Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for the United States and for France to tell India, to tell Pakistan, to tell Iraq, to tell Iran, you cannot experiment with nuclear bombs. That is nonsense and I urge my colleagues, I urge the American people to help, to help the 200,000 Polynesian Tahitians who are the victims.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, the media has done a disservice to this whole issue of nuclear bomb testings seeking only the opinions of people living in Europe, seeking only the opinions of policymakers but never looking at the situation of the victims, the people, the indigenous people who live in these islands, never, never regarding their concerns and their needs to live. And that is all they want, Mr. Speaker.

They just want to simply live as a people whose lives depend on the ocean, whose lives depend on these atolls and these islands, and I just cannot believe this, Mr. Speaker. I cannot believe this is at the eve of the 21st century we have a country like France, supposedly a democracy, practicing the worst evils of colonialism against these 200,000 people that live there and all they

want in life is just to live in peace. Is that asking too much of President Chirac? Oh, no. President Chirac wants to so that he is a big man now.

□ 2015

He is macho; he is De Gaulle the second. He wants to show that he has got muscle there.

I hope Chancellor Kohl will take notice of this fact. If I were a German citizen, I would be a little concerned about President Chirac's ability to press that nuclear button.

Why should Germany also not have nuclear deterrent force? I say, in every justification, Germany should have that same, but this is a farce that is going on as far as nuclear testing is concerned.

Why should France be the only one? And other democratic countries in Europe, they should also have the same technology. This is what France has done.

Chirac is the leading proponent of nuclear proliferation. What France has done yesterday, it has opened up the nuclear arms tests again, and I call upon President Clinton and Secretary Christopher, let us not be passive about this. This thing concerns the lives and the welfare of the American people just as much as the poor victims who are caught between this whole episode on how one man, not the goodness of the French people, one man and the terrible policy that his government has established since he has been in office for the first 100 days. I cannot believe this, Mr. Speaker; the worst example of colonialism on the eve of the 21st century that we find a democratic country like France totally disregarding world opinion, totally disregarding the wishes of the local people who are going to be most impacted. Yet this man still went ahead and exploded that nuclear bomb yesterday. I cannot believe this, Mr. Speaker.

I ask the American people, you know, there is one thing I have learned about American tradition. Mr. Speaker, they always like to support the underdog because we were the underdogs when we were colonies and happened to be going against the greatest power, that happened to be the British empire. Who would dare challenge the British empire for its form of colonialism? This exactly is the situation facing the Polynesians, 200,000 people who do not have guns, grenades. They are still paddling canoes to make a living, enjoying what nature has given them, enjoying what God has given them.

Is it asking so much that these people want to live as any others, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, what nonsense, what madness that the President of France has the gall, the mitigated gall, to press that nuclear button yesterday.

If the Tahitians get killed and wounded, if that place is burning, I say this should be on the head of President Chirac, that he should be taking full responsibility for this.

I call upon my colleagues and the goodness of the American people, do

not buy French products, do not buy French perfume, do not buy French wines. Send a strong message to President Chirac that the world community and the American people support the victims of this whole thing, and this is the only way that that man is going to listen to the wishes of the world community.

Mr. Speaker, 63 percent of the people of France do not support nuclear testing. The vast majority of the Tahitian Polynesians, 200,000 men, women, and children who live in this area of the world, do not support nuclear testing.

Yet because of the strong military lobby, the corporate lobby in France that probably supported President Chirac during his campaign, is getting a payoff. That is what this is about. The corporate lobby in France is getting a payoff because of its support of President Chirac in his election campaign this year. What a shame, Mr. Speaker. What a shame this is the kind of policy the President of France adheres to despite the wishes not only of the people, the victims who live in these islands; they are getting nothing but the worst example of colonialism in the middle of the 20th century.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to my colleagues and the American people, do not buy French foods, do not buy French products. This is the only way that President Chirac is going to listen to common sense, listen and be a little more sensitive to the wishes of the people who live there.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RIGGS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. SISISKY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. TUCKER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. MFUME (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of district business.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of family medical emergency.

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. BRYANT of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BRYANT of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. WARD, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. LOFGREN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCARBOROUGH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILBRAY, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DICKS, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and on September 7.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, on September 7.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KING.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. WISE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WAXMAN.
 Mr. LEVIN.
 Mr. HAMILTON in five instances.
 Mr. LANTOS.
 Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
 Mr. CARDIN.
 Mr. STARK.
 Mr. POMEROY.
 Mr. MARTINEZ in three instances.
 Mrs. SCHROEDER.
 Mr. FOGLIETTA in three instances.
 Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 Mr. TORRES in two instances.
 Mrs. LINCOLN in two instances.
 Mr. VISCLOSKY in two instances.
 Mrs. MALONEY.
 Mr. MINETA.
 Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HUNTER.
 Mr. OXLEY.
 Mr. RADANOVICH.
 Mr. GILMAN.
 Mr. SPENCE.
 Mr. QUILLEN.
 Mr. QUINN.
 Mr. EMERSON in two instances.
 Mr. EHRLICH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. OWENS.
 Mr. VENTO.
 Mr. MFUME.
 Mr. REED.
 Mr. RICHARDSON.
 Mr. BEREUTER.
 Mr. PARKER.
 Mr. SAXTON.
 Mr. MENENDEZ.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 369. An act to designate the Federal Courthouse in Decatur, Alabama, as the "Seybourn H. Lynne Federal Courthouse", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 965. An act to designate the United States Courthouse for the Eastern District of Virginia in Alexandria, Virginia, as the Albert V. Bryan United States Courthouse; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal; to the Committee on International Relations.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1225. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt employees who perform certain court reporting duties from compensatory time requirements applicable to certain public agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2161. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until October 1, 1995, and for other purposes;

H.R. 535. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas;

H.R. 584. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a fish hatchery to the State of Iowa;

H.R. 614. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Minnesota the New London National Fish Hatchery production facility;

H.R. 2077. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 33 College Avenue in Waterville, Maine, as the

"George J. Mitchell Post Office Building"; and

H.R. 2108. An act to permit the Washington Convention Center Authority to expend revenues for the operation and maintenance of the existing Washington Convention Center and for preconstruction activities relating to a new convention center in the District of Columbia, to permit a designated authority of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for the preconstruction activities relating to a sports arena in the District of Columbia and to permit certain revenues to be pledged as security for the borrowing of such funds, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On August 11, 1995:

H.R. 2161. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until October 1, 1995, and for other purposes.

On August 28, 1995:

H.R. 2108. An act to permit the Washington Convention Center Authority to expend revenues for the operation and maintenance of the existing Washington Convention Center and for preconstruction activities relating to a new convention center in the District of Columbia, to permit a designated authority of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for the preconstruction activities relating to a sports arena in the District of Columbia and to permit certain revenues to be pledged as security for the borrowing of such funds, and for other purposes;

H.R. 584. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a fish hatchery to the State of Iowa;

H.R. 2077. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 33 College Avenue in Waterville, Maine, as the "George J. Mitchell Post Office Building";

H.R. 614. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Minnesota the New London National Fish Hatchery production facility;

H.R. 535. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Corning National Fish Hatchery to the State of Arkansas; and

H.R. 1225. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt employees who perform certain court reporting duties from the compensatory time requirements applicable to certain public agencies, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 7, 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:

1310. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the "Packers and Stockyards Licensing Fee Act of 1995"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1311. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Omnibus User Fee Act of 1995"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1312. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the fiscal year 1996 appropriations requests for the Department of Energy, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 104-110); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1313. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of August 1, 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 104-112); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1314. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the 185th Fighter Group in the Iowa Air National Guard [ANG], pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1315. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Foreign Military Sales [FMS] Trust Fund, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1316. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting selected acquisition reports [SAR's] for the quarter ending June 30, 1995, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on National Security.

1317. A letter from the Principal Deputy General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to consolidate provisions of law regarding international defense acquisition into a new defense trade and cooperation chapter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security.

1318. A letter from the Vice-Chairman and Chief Operating Officer, Export-Import Bank of the United States; transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Philippines, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1319. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Mexico, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1320. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting the Energy Information Administration's annual energy review 1994, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(2); to the Committee on Commerce.

1321. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the price and availability report for the quarter ending June 30, 1995, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2768; to the Committee on International Relations.

1322. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification that the Department of Defense has completed delivery of defense articles, services, and training on the attached list to Bangladesh, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2318(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

1323. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Saudi Arabia

(Transmittal No. 35-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1324. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Kuwait for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-33), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1325. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Oman (Transmittal No. 26-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1326. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to France (Transmittal No. 34-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1327. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning a cooperative project with the Netherlands (Transmittal No. 10-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

1328. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination that the Government of the Russian Federation has, on or after October 24, 1992, knowingly transferred to another country missile technology inconsistent with the guidelines and parameters of the Missile Technology Control Regime, also the Secretary's determination that it is important to the national interest of the United States to furnish assistance that would otherwise be prohibited, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2295a(b)(3) and 22 U.S.C. 2295a(c)(1); to the Committee on International Relations.

1329. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 95-34: Determination to Authorize the Furnishing of Emergency Military Assistance to the United Nations for Purposes of Supporting the Rapid Reaction Force in Bosnia Under Section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2348a; to the Committee on International Relations.

1330. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3 of the AECA concerning the unauthorized transfer of U.S.-origin defense articles, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2314(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1331. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3 of the AECA concerning the unauthorized transfer of U.S.-origin defense articles, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2314(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1332. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3 of the AECA concerning the unauthorized transfer of U.S.-origin defense articles, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2314(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1333. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 95-36: Suspending Restrictions on U.S. Relations with the Palestine Liberation Organization, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 583(b)(2) (108 Stat. 489); to the Committee on International Relations.

1334. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bi-

monthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1335. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the emergency regarding export control regulations is to continue in effect beyond August 19, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d) (H. Doc. No. 104-109); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1336. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1337. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1338. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that a reward has been paid pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2708(h), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2708(h); to the Committee on International Relations.

1339. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the cumulative incremental cost of all United States activities in Haiti subsequent to September 30, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 104-6, section 107(a) (109 Stat. 80); to the Committee on International Relations.

1340. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an alternative plan for a Federal employees' pay adjustment to become effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period on or after January 1, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5305(c)(1) (H. Doc. No. 104-111); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and ordered to be printed.

1341. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-128, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 4337 S.O. 94-163, Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1342. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-129, "Advisory Neighborhood Commission Vacancy Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1343. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-130, "Omnibus Sports Consolidation Act of 1994 Temporary Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1344. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-131, "Extension of the Moratorium on Retail Service Station Conversions Temporary Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1345. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-132, "Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1995 for the Department of Human Services and Department of Corrections Temporary Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1346. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report

entitled "Review of the Water and Sewer Utility Administration's Participation in the District's Cash Management Pool," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1347. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in July 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1348. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1349. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 1995 through June 30, 1995, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 104-113); to the Committee on House Oversight and ordered to be printed.

1350. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1351. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1352. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice on leasing systems for the western Gulf of Mexico, Sale 155, scheduled to be held in September 1995, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(8); to the Committee on Resources.

1353. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 28th in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 1993 through September 30, 1994, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1354. A letter from the Secretary-Treasurer, Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the annual financial report of the Society for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(19) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1355. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "the Emergency Leasing Act of 1995"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1356. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary (Environmental Security), Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Defense Environmental Restoration program for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2706(a)(1); jointly, to the Committees on National Security and Commerce.

1357. A letter from the Secretaries of Agriculture and Transportation, transmitting a copy of a study on aviation inspections, pursuant to section 306 of the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Agriculture.

1358. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for human space flight, science, aeronautics, and technology, mission support, and inspector general, and for other pur-

poses, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Science and Government Reform and Oversight.

1359. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report entitled "Financial Audit: Examination of IRS' Fiscal Year 1994 Financial Statements" (GAO/AIMD-95-141), pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 305 (104 Stat. 2853); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and 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:

[Omitted from the Record of August 4, 1995]

Mr. WALKER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1815. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-237 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted September 1, 1995]

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities. H.R. 1594. A bill to place restrictions on the promotion by the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies and instrumentalities of economically targeted investments in connection with employee benefit plans; with an amendment (Rept. 104-238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted September 6, 1995]

Mrs. MEYERS: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 2150. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to reduce the cost to the Federal Government of guaranteeing certain loans and debentures, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of August 4, 1995]

H.R. 1815. Referral to the Committee on Resources extended for a period ending not later than September 22, 1995.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 2259. A bill to disapprove certain sentencing guideline amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 2260. A bill to establish America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership in Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. BRYANT of Texas (for himself, and Mr. OBEY):

H.R. 2261. A bill to provide for the regulation of lobbyists and gift reform; to the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, 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. CALLAHAN (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 2262. A bill to designate the U.S. post office building located at 218 North Alston Street in Foley, AL, as the "Holk Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mrs. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 2263. A bill to compensate agricultural producers in the United States for damages incurred as a result of trade embargoes that include agricultural commodities and products produced in the United States among the prohibited trade items; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 2264. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that civilian employees of the National Guard may not be required to wear military uniforms while performing civilian service; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FUNDERBURK (for himself, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. JONES, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MICA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BURR, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BARR, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee):

H.R. 2265. A bill to prohibit the regulation of any tobacco products, or tobacco sponsored advertising, used or purchased by the National Association of Stock Car Automobile Racing, its agents or affiliates, or any other professional motor sports association by the Secretary of Health and Human Services or any other instrumentality of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2266. A bill to establish the Hudson River Valley American Heritage Area; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

H.R. 2267. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to prevent the construction of a gas recovery treatment facility at the OII site east of downtown Los Angeles; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCHALE (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MINGE, Mr. KLUG, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. LUTHER):

H.R. 2268. A bill to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2269. A bill to guarantee the provision of minimum child support benefits and to reform the child support enforcement system; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in

addition to the Committees on Commerce, Banking and Financial Services, Agriculture, and Economic and Educational Opportunities, 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. SHADEGG:

H.R. 2270. A bill to require Congress to specify the source of authority under the U.S. Constitution for the enactment of laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2271. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require radio and television broadcasters to provide free broadcasting time for political advertising; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 2272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for that portion of a governmental pension received by an individual which does not exceed the maximum benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act which could have been excluded from income for the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 2273. A bill to ensure that Federal employees will be paid for any period during which they are furloughed as a result of any lapse in appropriations for fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. BRYANT of Texas (for himself and Mr. OBEY):

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution providing for corrections in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Oversight, and Standards of Official Conduct, 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. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. WILSON):

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the national security policy of the United States should be based upon a national strategy for peace through strength; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H. Res. 213. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit consideration of a conference report on any legislative branch appropriation bill until all other regular appropriation bills for that fiscal year are enacted into law; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. WALDHOLTZ (for herself, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MINGE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Ms. DUNN of Washington):

H. Res. 214. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for gift reform; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

155. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Alabama, relative to expressing opposition to Congress of pending bills to reduce benefits for coal miners; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

156. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of the Mariana Islands, relative to expressing the support of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for the Republic of China to regain admission to the United Nations General Assembly; to the Committee on International Relations.

157. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to recognize U.S. Merchant Marine veterans of World War II with full veteran status; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 42: Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 44: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 65: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FRAZER, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 92: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 103: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. KING, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 109: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 118: Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 123: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 218: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 303: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 390: Mr. Hastert and Mr. Hastings of Washington.

H.R. 393: Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 407: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 468: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 475: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 497: Mr. HILLEARY and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 528: Mr. COBLE, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 549: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 580: Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EWING, Mr. TALENT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FRAZER, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 739: Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 743: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 752: Mr. DIXON, Mr. MINGE, Mr. YATES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. NEY, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 788: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 789: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 861: Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 863: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 896: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 899: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 958: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 989: Mr. FORBES and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1005: Mr. ROTH and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1007: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FRAZER, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1021: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1023: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1061: Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 1078: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. FOX, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 1143: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1144: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1145: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1226: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 1297: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1446: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 1462: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SABO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1482: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1483: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1527: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1593: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1595: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CANADY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SHAW, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MCHALE, and Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 1619: Mr. YATES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1627: Mr. ROTH, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 1636: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TALENT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HASTERT, and Ms. DUNN of Washington.

H.R. 1733: Mr. CANADY and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1744: Mr. DURBIN, Ms. COLINARI, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FOX, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 1745: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1747: Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 1757: Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1758: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1776: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 1778: Mr. HEINEMAN.

H.R. 1810: Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 1834: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1846: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MILLER of California, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 1853: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1872: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 1876: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1885: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 1897: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1947: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1950: Mr. YATES and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1951: Mr. MANTON and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1972: Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1974: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 1994: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 2010: Mr. MARTINI.

H.R. 2013: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 2019: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2032: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2072: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 2081: Mr. COOLEY and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2137: Mr. NEY, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 2143: Mr. REED, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2144: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 2146: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2147: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 2190: Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BUNN of Oregon,

Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BURR, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2195: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. BROWNBACK.

H.R. 2219: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 2224: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. FOX.

H.R. 2237: Mr. SABO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. OLVER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 2252: Mr. FATTAH.

H.J. Res. 70: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TUCKER, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H. Con. Res. 26: Ms. FURSE, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. OLVER.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. REED.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. COLEMAN.

H. Res. 36: Mr. STARK and Mr. McDERMOTT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of July 28, 1995]

H.R. 1289: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

35. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Avoyelles Parish Police Jury, Marksville, LA, relative to Federal support programs for sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

36. Also, petition of the Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, relative to religious liberty and world evangelization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

37. Also, petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to memorializing the U.S. Senate to defeat revisions to the Clean Water Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

AMENDMENT No. 80. Page 94, after line 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "Procurement of Ammunition, Army" may be obligated or expended for the procurement of munitions unless such acquisition fully complies with the Competition in Contracting Act.

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. MARKEY

AMENDMENT No. 81. On page 28, line 24 strike "\$9,029,666,000" and insert "\$8,579,666,000."

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT No. 82. Page 94, after line 3, add the following new section:

SEC. 8107. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MRS. SCHROEDER

AMENDMENT No. 83. Page 8, line 1, strike "\$18,999,825,000" and insert "\$18,994,225,000".

Page 8, line 13, strike "\$20,846,710,000" and insert "\$20,840,710,000".

Page 8, line 19, strike "\$2,508,822,000" and insert "\$2,506,622,000".

Page 9, line 4, strike "\$18,894,397,000" and insert "\$18,888,197,000".

Page 9, line 11, strike "\$9,958,810,000" and insert "\$9,978,810,000".

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MRS. SCHROEDER

AMENDMENT No. 84: Page 94, after line 3, insert before the short title the following:

SEC. 8107. The amounts otherwise made available by this Act are revised by increasing the aggregate amount made available in title II for "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE" by, and reducing the amounts made available in title II for the following accounts and activities by the sum of, \$20,000,000, the reductions to be allocated as follows:

(1) "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY", decrease of \$5,600,000.

(2) "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY", decrease of \$6,000,000.

(3) "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE", decrease of \$6,200,000.

(4) "OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS", decrease of \$2,200,000.

H.R. 2126

OFFERED BY: MRS. SCHROEDER

AMENDMENT No. 85: Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 8107. (a) LIMITATION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY CONTRACTORS FOR POLITICAL ADVOCACY.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by any Federal contractor for an activity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the activity is any of the following:

(1) Carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence Federal, State, or local legislation or agency action, including any of the following:

(A) Monetary or in-kind contributions, endorsements, publicity, or similar activity.

(B) Any attempt to influence any legislation or agency action through an attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any segment thereof, including any communication between the contractor and an employee of the contractor to directly encourage such employee to urge persons other than employees to engage in such an attempt.

(C) Any attempt to influence any legislation or agency action through communication with any member or employee of a legislative body or agency, or with any governmental official or employee who may participate in the formulation of the legislation or agency action, including any communication between the contractor and an employee of the contractor to directly encourage such employee to engage in such an attempt or to urge persons other than employees to engage in such an attempt.

(2) Participating or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements) any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office, including monetary or in-kind contributions, endorsements, publicity, or similar activity.

(3) Participating in any judicial litigation or agency proceeding (including as an amicus curiae) in which agents or instrumentalities of Federal, State, or local governments

are parties, other than litigation in which the contractor or potential contractor is a defendant appearing in its own behalf; is defending its tax-exempt status; or is challenging a government decision or action directed specifically at the powers, rights, or duties of that contractor or potential contractor.

(4) Allocating, disbursing, or contributing any funds or in-kind support to any individual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for political advocacy for the previous Federal fiscal year exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that Federal fiscal year.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO AWARD CONTRACTS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to award a contract when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the expenditures of the potential contractor (other than an individual person) for activities described in subsection (a) for any one of the previous five Federal fiscal years (excluding any fiscal year before 1996) exceeded the sum of—

(A) the first \$20,000,000 of the difference between the potential contractor's total expenditures made in the fiscal year and the total amount of Federal contracts and grants it was awarded in that fiscal year, multiplied by .05; and

(B) the remainder of the difference calculated in subparagraph (A), multiplied, by .01;

(2) the potential contractor has used funds from any Federal contract to purchase or secure any goods or services (including dues and membership fees) from any other individual, entity, or organization whose expenditures for activities described in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1995 exceeded 15 percent of its total expenditures for that Federal fiscal year; or

(3) the potential contractor has used funds from any Federal contract for a purpose (other than to purchase or secure goods or services) that was not specifically permitted by Congress in the law authorizing the contract.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The activities described in subsection (a) do not include an activity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the activity is any of the following:

(1) Making available the results of non-partisan analysis, study, research, or debate.

(2) Providing technical advice or assistance (where such advice would otherwise constitute the influencing of legislation or agency action) to a government body or to a committee or other subdivision thereof in response to a written request by such body or subdivision, as the case may be.

(3) Communications between a contractor and its employees with respect to legislation, proposed legislation, agency action, or proposed agency action of direct interest to the contractor and such employees, other than communications described in subparagraph (C).

(4) Any communication with a governmental official or employee, other than—

(A) a communication with a member or employee of a legislative body or agency (where such communication would otherwise constitute the influencing of legislation or agency action); or

(B) a communication the principal purpose of which is to influence legislation or agency action.

(5) Official communication by employees of State or local governments, or by organizations whose membership consists exclusively of State or local governments.