United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1995 No. 175

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 7, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable CHRISTOPHER SHAYS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] for 5 minutes.

H.R. 1833, THE PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1995

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the National Abortion Rights Action League has called H.R. 1833, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995, ''[O]ne of the most extreme, outrageous, and anti-choice measures ever to come before Congress.''

Mr. Speaker, this must come as news to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN], and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY], three of the many staunchly pro-choice Members who voted for the bill.

One Member who had a 100-percent voting record with the National Abortion Rights Action League said, and I quote, ''I'm not just going to vote in such a way that I have to put my conscience on the shelf.'' He continued by stating that it ''undermines the credibility of the pro-choice movement to be defending such an indefensible procedure.''

So, how have abortion advocates mounted a defense of such an indefensible procedure? They do so by ignoring the painful reality, by denying the undeniable truth, and by twisting and distorting the well-established facts.

Abortion advocates claim that H.R. 1833 would jail doctors who perform lifesaving abortions. This statement makes me wonder whether the opponents of H.R. 1833 have even bothered to read the bill. H.R., 1833 makes specific allowances for a practitioner who reasonably believes a partial-birth abortion is necessary to save the life of a mother. No one can be prosecuted and convicted under this bill for performing a partial-birth abortion which is necessary to save the life of the mother. Anyone who has any doubt about that should take a look at the text of the bill itself.

Of course, there is not a shred of evidence to suggest that a partial-birth abortion is ever necessary to save a mother's life. In fact, the American Medical Association Council on Legislation, which includes 12 doctors, voted unanimously to recommend that the AMA board of trustees endorse H.R. 1833. The council ''felt [partial-birth abortion] was not a recognized medical technique and agreed that the procedure is basically repulsive.'' In the end, the AMA board decided to remain neutral on H.R. 1833, but it is significant that the council of 12 doctors did not recognize partial-birth abortion as a proper medical technique.

The truth is that the partial-birth abortion procedure is never necessary to protect either the life or the health of the mother. Indeed, the procedure poses significant risk to maternal health, risks such as uterine rupture and the development of cervical incompetence.

Dr. Pamela Smith, director of medical education at the department of obstetrics and gynecology at Mount Sinai Hospital in Chicago has written, and I quote, ''There are absolutely no obstetrical situations encountered in this country which require a partially-delivered human fetus to be destroyed to preserve the health of the mother. Partial-birth abortion is a technique devised by abortionists for their own convenience, ignoring the known health risk to the mother. The health status of women in this country will only be enhanced by the banning of this procedure.''

Proponents of the partial-birth abortion method have also claimed that the procedure is only used to kill babies with serious disabilities. Focusing the debate on babies with disabilities is a blatant attempt to avoid addressing the reality of this inhuman procedure.

Remember the brutal reality of what is done in partial-birth abortion. The baby is partially delivered alive, then stabbed through the skull. No baby's life should be taken in this manner, whether that baby is perfectly healthy or suffers from the most tragic of disabilities.

Further, neither Dr. Haskell nor Dr. McMahon, the two abortionists who have publicly discussed their use of this procedure, claim that this technique is used only in limited circumstances. In fact, Dr. Haskell told the American Medical News, and I quote, ''I'll be quite frank: Most of my abortions are elective in that 20- to 24-week range. Probably 20 percent are for genetic reasons and the other 80 percent are purely elective.''

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Dr. McMahon claims that most of the abortions he performs are nonelective, but his definition of nonelective is extremely broad. He describes abortions performed because of a mother's youth or depression as ''nonelective.'' I do not believe that the American people support aborting babies in the second and third trimesters because the mother is young or suffers from depression.

Dr. McMahon sent me a graph which shows that even at 26 weeks of gestation, half the babies he aborted were perfectly healthy, and many of the babies he described as flawed had conditions that were compatible with long life, either with or without a disability. For example, Dr. McMahon listed nine partial-birth abortions performed because the baby had a cleft lip.

The National Abortion Federation, a group representing abortionists, has admitted that partial-birth abortions are performed for many reasons. In 1993, the National Abortion Federation counseled its members, and I quote, ''Do not apologize. This is a legal abortion procedure,'' and stated, ''There are many reasons why women have late abortions: Life endangerment, fetal indications, lack of money, health insurance.'' All of these are reasons that are advanced, and have been advanced in the past, these are not reasons that justify this terrible procedure. This procedure should be banned by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the supporters of partial-birth abortion seek to defend the indefensible by misrepresentations and deception. But House Members, who voted by more than two-thirds in favor of H.R. 1833, did not fall victim to the ferocious campaign of deceit waged by the supporters of partial-birth abortion. It is my hope that Members of the Senate will also see the truth and support H.R. 1833.

In the October 16 issue of the New Republic, feminist author Naomi Wolf made an observation that I think should be taken to heart by abortion advocates as the Senate considers the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. Ms. Wolf wrote:

> What Norma McCorvey [the plaintiff in Roe v. Wade] wants, it seems, is for abortion-rights advocates to face, really face, what we are doing. ''Have you ever seen a second-trimester abortion?'' she asks. ''It's a baby. It's got a face and a body, and they put him in a freezer and a little container.'' Well, so it does; and so they do.

In a partial-birth abortion, a baby—who has a face and a body—is delivered, feet first, until all but the baby's head is outside the womb. The abortionist then forces blunt scissors through the base of the baby's skull creating a hole. The abortionist then inserts a suction catheter and extracts the baby's brains. Mr. Speaker, it is time for abortion advocates to admit the truth about this terrible procedure—and to stop their campaign to conceal the truth from the American people.

GOVERNMENT ATTACKS ON AMERICAN INDIANS

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1995, I and my good friends, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, Mr. BILL RICHARDSON, Mr. PAT WILLIAMS, and Mr. PETER DEFAZIO, introduced the Indian Federal Recognition Administrative Procedures Act of 1995. H.R. 671, is an effort to create an efficient and fair procedure for extending Federal recognition to Indian tribes. In my remarks at that time, I stated that introduction of the legislation was only the starting point for further discussions and debate and that I looked forward to the advice and input of colleagues, the agency, and tribes. I hope to continue to work with Chairman MCCAIN Cochairman INOUYE, and the members of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs to craft a bill which provides a fair and timely procedure to provide Federal recognition to Indian tribes.

Mr. Speaker, the current test is not fair, nor is it administered in a timely manner. I have recounted from this floor many times the process we have put Indian tribes through. The current recognition process requires tribes to provide written records of tribal governments during periods when the U.S. Government disbanded the tribes and told them to assimilate into the larger society. Decades after we told them to stop keeping records and assimilate, now we tell them they are not Indian because they do not have written proof of tribal activities during these periods. The poor Lumbee Indians of North Carolina have been seeking recognition for over 100 years, and even though they have been Indians all that time and much longer before that, the Bureau of Indian Affairs thinks the current system of recognizing tribes is just fine as it is.

Mr. Speaker, the current system is terrible, and I intend to fix this deplorable mess. I am making every effort to see this bill become law during the 104th Congress so we can replace the current process created by administrative regulation with a system approved by elected officials.

Mr. Speaker, I also feel compelled to comment on how repugnant I find the process of having to go through any form of recognition process. The racist 50-percent blood test, the measurement of teeth and head shape is demeaning and meaningless. We need to move forward, and while we should have done so years ago, it does not mean we should not take action now.

Mr. Speaker, since January a number of occurrences have provided me with some of the discussion and input that I was looking for on the acknowledgement process. The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs held a hearing in July on S. 479, a bill very similar to H.R. 671. Nonrecognized and recognized tribes, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian organizations, and experts submitted testimony on the bill and the existing recognition process. In addition, the White House has held a number of meetings with nonrecognized tribes so that they could discuss recognition with administration officials. As a direct result of those meetings, the Department of the Interior set up a task force of administration people and representatives of nonrecognized tribes to assist the Department in formulating a position on whether the recognition criteria could be improved. Further, only this month an administrative law judge, in the first challenge to a decision against recognition, has essentially reversed the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In doing so, the judge was critical of the Bureau's methodology and interpretation of their own criteria. The judge's views of the existing criteria can be considered a suggestion that the criteria could be improved.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed all of those developments and taken into account the views of the interested parties. As a result, I have modified H.R. 671 to improve both the procedures and the criteria that were in the original bill. The modifications will advance the goals of recognition reform legislation—providing a more objective, consistent, and streamlined standard for acknowledging groups as federally recognized Indian tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I have made the following changes to H.R. 671. The procedures under which the independent commission would hear and decide petitions for recognition have been slightly modified. Provisions that would have excluded groups from petitioning for recognition or continuing to seek recognition have been removed. Most importantly, the criteria for recognition have been improved. The improvements take into account the almost unanimous view of the experts and affected tribes that the criteria used in the existing administrative process, which were carried into H.R. 671, do not really test whether a group should be recognized or not and that it is only through these changes that we will enact a process that is both fair and able to resolve the recognition issue in the time frame anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, the changes I have outlined this afternoon and which will be incorporated into legislation I am introducing today are important because there are 545 Indian nations within our country, plus scores of tribes seeking recognition, all of which will be affected in one way or another by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to take a few minutes to speak out in opposition to the proposed tax on Indian gaming.

The history of how this Nation has treated the American Indians is deplorable. We have taken their lands again and again, and we have negotiated treaties and reneged those same treaties again and again. I thought those times had passed, but even as I speak, the assault continues.

Last month the House adopted a tax on Indian gaming as part of its budget reconciliation bill. For the first time

the Congress is considering taxing other governmental entities on income which is used for governmental purposes such as building roads, hospitals, medical clinics, and providing education to children. My analysis of why this tax of up to 35 percent of net revenue is being considered only on Indian tribes, and not on the gaming activities of State and local governments, lead me to the conclusion that our new majority believes they can use the Indians yet again as a political punching bag to beat up on and take advantage of. Why is it that the party which comes to this well everyday to decry the ''tax and spend Democrats'' is so anxious to raise a new tax, but only on American Indians?

I was not surprised when the Washington Post published an editorial in opposition to this proposed tax, but today even the Washington Times editorialized against the idea. When this action is considered in the context of the 11-percent cut in funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs contained in the Interior appropriations conference report we will consider later today, it is clear that the assault on America's favorite whipping boy has resumed. This action is especially hard to accept when money which could be used to provide educational opportunities to the poor, the same problem our Speaker spoke so forcefully in favor of last week, will be used to give tax breaks to those making up to $200,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the course we should be taking, and I urge my colleagues to vote against these attacks on the American Indians.

Mr. Speaker, I also urge my colleagues to provide a better procedural format so that Indians could be recognized. Mr. Speaker, we have 545, to my last reading, sovereign Indian tribes as part of our Nation's heritage. Yet, after these processes over the years, our first policy was let us kill off the Indians, then let us assimilate and make them part of the American society; and then after that, no, let us terminate them. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going through the process of let us recognize them again.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we make these changes to better the needs of the first Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following editorial for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Times, Nov. 7, 1995]

TAXING THE TRIBES

Given all the hype about gambling on Indian reservations, it's Foxwoods—the wildly successful casino complex run by the Pequot tribe in Connecticut—that probably comes to mind when the subject comes up.

But Foxwoods is not representative of all tribal gaming efforts. Most reservations are in remote locations, far from the sort of densely populated cities that provide customers for the Pequots; without the same volume of business enjoyed by the Pequots, most tribes' casinos struggle to produce modest revenues. Even so, conferees on the budget reconciliation bill will be deciding whether to impose a new federal tax on those gaming revenues, a tax that will range from 15 percent to 35 percent of casino income. The Republican Congress should not be in the business of instituting new taxes: The Indian gaming tax should be discarded in conference.

House tax writers seem to have fixed on tribal gaming as a convenient source of revenue for the federal Treasury. In political terms it is understandable: At least at Foxwoods and a few other well-placed Native American casinos, there is a lot of money being generated; and Indians are not a potent voting bloc. In other, substantial cash can be had without generating substantial constituent backlash. But in constitutional terms, the tax is dubious at best.

The way the tax is written, tribal governments are treated as non-profit organizations, and the gaming revenues are treated as ''unrelated business income.'' It must be news to the tribes that they are mere charities, rather than sovereign governmental entities. On reservations, tribal authorities are the local governments, both in fact and in well-established law. Yet the House would treat these recognized governments differently than every other non-federal governmental entity: That is, there is no proposal to tax the gaming revenues produced by state-sponsored gambling.

Tribal governments have been struggling for decades to develop businesses and enterprise on reservations, often with little luck. Conditions are bleak enough on many reservations that alcoholism is high and life expectancy is low. Gambling may not be an economic panacea, but the casino business has helped provide an economic base that many tribes have used for building prosperous communities with diverse industries. When tribal governments use gaming revenues to build housing and infrastructure and employment, they are engaged in legitimate governmental activities, not unlike states that use their lottery proceeds for road construction, prison building or education.

The more that tribes are able to build thriving economies in their own territories, the less they will be dependent on funding from Washington. This is not just an issue of whether in the long run the balance sheet will be positive or negative with new Indian gaming taxes, it is an issue of paternalism. Even if Washington were to return to the tribes, in the form of aid, all the money it takes away in taxes—frankly, an unlikely prospect—the problem would remain that the federal government would be hindering Indian self-sufficiency.

Most tribes engaged in federally approved gaming already pay taxes of benefits of one sort or another to the states in which their reservations are located. Foxwoods, for instance, pays the state of Connecticut some $200 million. To add a federal tax to that burden, especially when the state's competing lottery games are not taxed, is simply unfair. The Senate version of the spending bill does not call for the new tax on the tribes. If for no better reason than that Republicans should not be in the business of increasing anybody's taxes, conferees should stick with the version and jettison the House tax on Indian gaming.

A DARK DAY FOR WOMEN ON CAPITOL HILL

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for recognition, and I rise to say this is really a very dark day for women in this Capitol, because is appears that what we did with such rush in this House last week is going to be rushed through the Senate even faster; that they are going to move expeditiously to outlaw a certain procedure and criminalize doctors that to it for late-term abortions, without having any hearings.

Mr. Speaker, in this House we acted on a 2-hour hearing where only one of the two panels was able to participate. The doctor who was accused was not able to come, and may other things; with drawings that have been discredited. Now, they seem to be actively moving to only compound the error.

Mr. Speaker, I must say no matter what anyone's position on abortion is, I feel these are ones that if you sat down and gave the life stories and the circumstances around them, almost every family, almost every grandmother in America would feel that the woman and her family had the right to that kind of medical treatment.

I have just come from a rally going on outside the Supreme Court where, again, women came forward and explained their very, very tragic circumstances around having to have this procedure.

Today a woman named Vicki Seles stood up and said she was diabetic. Everything went very well until about her 28th week, and at that point they realized that the fetus had so many anomalies they were totally inconsistent with life and that her life too could be threatened, because being a diabetic they had to be very careful about what kind of procedures she could and could not go through. And so it was with great pain, great sorrow, great everything that this pregnancy was ended with this method which was determined to be the safest for her because it preserved her reproductive organs. It kept the bleeding to a minimum, which is so important for diabetics and so many other things. But I do not want to pretend that I am practicing medicine without a license because obviously I do not have a medical license.

□ 1245

But she stood out there on the steps of the Supreme Court saying she is now 30 weeks pregnant with a healthy fetus, that this is going along well, how excited she it. She has had this opportunity to once again try to become a mother and that she and her husband have been so excited about this happening. It appears now that all of this is going well and that she would not have had that option had the fetus died in utero, which it appeared it could, and then all sorts of emergency procedures start happening and probably in all instances her entire reproductive system would have been removed in some kind of an emergency procedure.

Now, these are the types of things that we criminalized last week. We did not even allow an amendment for the life of the mother or the future health of the mother to be considered. I find

that absolutely astounding that this body would shut off that kind of debate and ram it through here only to be even more astounded this week that the other body is going to ram it through even faster it they possibly can.

I think the real reason this issue is so terribly painful is that you are talking about the life of the mother plus a future life of a potential fetus. But do we really as a Congress, men and women, think we have the right to come down and make that determination, and do we really have the right to criminalize any doctor, to excuse him of being a criminal for providing that procedure. If you read the bill, it is very clear that the doctor can only use the woman's life as a defense after he is arrested and on trial and then only if that doctor alleges there was no other procedures available, not a safer procedure, just no other procedure.

Of course, you can have a total removal of the organs; you could have all sorts of other procedures that might be much more dangerous for the women, but that is not a defense. So I must say, it is a sad day, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter that I have sent to Members of the other body about this issue and another letter dealing with the inaccuracies of the drawings this body was exposed to last week done by a doctor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 6, 1995.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: I understand that H.R. 1833, the Canady-Smith bill to ban late term abortion procedures, will be before the Senate tomorrow. The issue before you is about one of the greatest tragedies that can befall a family—a wanted pregnancy that goes terribly wrong, either because serious fetal anomalies are discovered late in the pregnancy, or because the woman develops a life-threatening medical condition that is inconsistent with continuing the pregnancy.

The bill you will debate on Tuesday would horribly burden these families. It would preclude many women from having access to the best option available to them in terms of reducing the risk to their lives, their health, and their future fertility. Please, on the behalf of these families, send this bill back to the appropriate Senate committee for thorough hearings.

The House bill is based upon an incomplete hearing record and a cursory House debate. The legislation criminalizing an abortion procedure is unprecedented and demands a hearing record and debate more thorough than the House conducted.

As a member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I can attest that the hearing record was incomplete. First, we held only one two-hour hearing. Two panels were originally scheduled to testify. The hearing was cut short and the scheduled second panel to deal with legal issues did not occur. The only scheduled witness was to present the proponents' legal interpretation of the bill. Only the Ranking Democrat, Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA), was allowed to ask questions of the first panel. It was only after considerable protest that I or any other members opposed to the legislation were allowed to ask further questions.

Second, no one with first-hand experience with the procedure testified. Dr. Martin Haskell, whose words were taken out of context and used as arguments to pass the legislation, never got a chance to testify, although as the enclosed letter explains, was willing to.

Further, proponents of H.R. 1833 pointed as reasons for passing the bill, an ''eyewitness'' account by Nurse Brenda Shafer who worked for three days as a temporary nurse in Dr. Haskell's office, yet Ms. Shafer never testified and her account has been contradicted and discredited by both Dr. Haskell and his head nurse Christie Gallivan, who supervised Ms. Shafer.

Third, throughout the hearing, proponents of H.R. 1833 displayed an illustrator's interpretation of the procedure. Yet, the illustrations were never medically certified by a qualified physician with first hand knowledge of the procedure attesting to its medical accuracy. In fact, Dr. J. Courtland Robinson, an M.D., M.P.H. from Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health, has labeled these illustrations ''highly imaginative and misleading.'' (See attached letter.)

The rule in the House barred any amendments from being offered and provided only one hour of debate. Opponents of the bill were not able to offer amendments to allow doctors the discretion to use the proposed banned procedures if the life or health, including a woman's future fertility, were endangered. The short time allotted for debate did not allow opponents time to discuss the type of health problems that would cause a family to consider this procedure. Nor did it give us any time to discuss why this option for some women may be the safest option for their situation.

It would be a legislative travesty if this bill is hurriedly passed based upon the House's deficient hearing process. American families who may find themselves in these tragic situations deserve better.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA SCHROEDER,
Member of Congress.

JUNE 28, 1995.

Hon. CHARLES CANADY,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANADY: I would like to submit, for the record, a clarification regarding statements I made in the House Judiciary subcommittee hearing on H.R. 1833, July 15, 1995. Evidently these statements are being misinterpreted by those who support your legislation to imply that I revised earlier comments submitted to Members of Congress. These interpretations are incorrect.

When discussing drawings presented to the hearing which purport to be depictions of an intact D&E or, as it is sometimes called, a D&X abortion, I stated that the drawings presented were ''technically correct.'' This is true—the drawings are ''technically correct'' in that they represent a rough characterization of what is present, and in what position, during such a procedure. A representation—in words of pictures—can be technically accurate, however, and still fall far from the mark in representing the truth of what it describes.

There are many substantive inaccuracies in the drawings presented. For example, the clear implication of the drawings is that the fetus is alive until the end of the procedure, which is untrue. The stylized illustrations further imply that the fetus is conscious and experiencing pain or sensation of some kind—which is also obviously untrue. Finally, the fetus depicted is shown as perfectly formed (indeed, proportionally larger in relationship to the woman than it ought to be), when in fact a great number of such procedures are performed on fetuses with severe genetic or neurological defects. All of these factors, as well as the rudimentary, even crude, nature of the sketches added up to a picture that is, as I previously stated, highly imaginative and misleading.

Just as the drawings presented misrepresent the nature and practical reality of the surgery, your edited public distribution of some of my words misrepresents the substance of my statements. I would respectfully request that you and your staff refrain from further mischaracterizations of my comments and my medical opinion on this matter. Please include this letter as part of the formal record of the above-mentioned hearing.

Sincerely,

J. COURTLAND ROBINSON, MD, MPH.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The Chair will remind the Member not to characterize the action of the other body, the Senate.

MORE ON H.R. 1833, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to come down and speak this morning on behalf of the bill that passed this House last week by an overwhelming majority. In fact, what is known up here as a veto-proof majority, one that would survive a President's veto, should the President veto it.

This is H.R. 1833, the bill that has already had some comments from this House floor this morning. I was proud to support this bill because I think it is a fair bill, and I think it is one that does away with a very grisly medical procedure. By the number of votes that it had last week in its passage in this body by a margin of 288 to 139, we see that there were Members on both sides of the aisle who joined in in support of this bill.

I am proud to say that I do not particularly like labels, but if you want to use pro-choice and pro-life labels up here in Washington, which is apt to happen on occasion, there were many, I would be pro-life in that category. There were many on the other side who were pro-choice, I am proud to say, many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are pro-choice who voted in support of this amendment. In fact, it is a procedure that is grisly, that is gruesome.

Probably, taking aside all the issues of morality or lack of morality of choice or of no choice, taking religion out of this issue, I think one of the most persuasive factors that caused Members to vote for this was the vote that the AMA's own Council on Legislation had on this particular bill. This is a group of 12 doctors, the Council on Legislation, as a part of the American Medical Association. The American

Medical Association, of course, long ago recognized abortion rights. So they are no great fan of the so-called pro-life movement. In fact, they have supported abortions over the years. They, as a body, took a neutral stance on this bill, but again, at the recommendation of their own Council on Legislation, which voted 12 to zero to endorse this bill, 1833.

This particular council endorsed the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CANADY's bill, 1833. I know for a lot of us that took away some of the sting of these arguments that we hear about how doctors are going to have to make terrible decisions and how they are going to be confronted with the idea that they may go to jail and how women's lives are going to be put at risk. To me it is important to see doctors who represent doctors who perhaps do this procedure take this type of stance that they know that it is such a terrible procedure, and they know that many of these things that are being said simply are not true or else they chose to ignore them because again they voted 12 to 0 in favor of endorsing, in favor of supporting this bill. Some even said that this procedure had no recognized medical value.

I think one on that council called it repulsive. So I think for a lot of us, again, on both sides of the aisle, on both sides of the pro-choice, pro-life issue, this support from the Council on Legislation, which again is a body within the AMA, meant a lot to a lot of people.

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

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. I will yield briefly, if the gentlewoman can be brief. She had her 5 minutes, and I want as much of my 5 minutes as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both Members will suspend. Time is not being deducted from the gentleman. He has the floor. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor and has not yielded.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Let me finish because I had one other major point I would like to make. This is, talking about this procedure, I alluded to this when I spoke originally on the floor in support of the 1833 bill. That was the manner of this technique is so gruesome that as a person who is a former prosecutor and familiar with the death penalty and all those things that go with it, I think I can stand up here and say in an unqualified fashion that this particular partial birth abortion procedure would never be used as a form or as a means of execution in a capital murder case. Even the most gruesome murderer, and I mentioned, I believe, Charles Wayne Gacey and Ted Bundy who have been executed, even they had certain basic rights of due process of law and an infliction of a capital punishment, a method that was not so cruel and inhuman as to violate the Constitution.

Recently in Washington State, a man out there very overweight was able to avoid hanging because of the fact he might be decapitated. Again, I am proud to support this bill H.R. 1833 and hope that it will pass through both bodies and the President will sign it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

During these times when so much of our consciousness reflects on the violence and the outrage of past days, we pause in prayer to commit ourselves to patterns of peace in all we do or say or think. Your word, O gracious God, a word of shalom, of peace, of understanding, is a word that commits us to be Your messengers of accord in our Nation and Your stewards of good will in all the world. May Your spirit, O God, remind us to use our voices in ways that bring tolerance and greater understanding so that our actions will be deeds of justice and righteousness, now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. COOLEY. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed until later today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio 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 a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2546. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2546) ''An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District 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. JEFFORDS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. INOUYE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution honoring the life and legacy of Yitzhak Rabin.

REPORT TO THE HOUSE ON THE TRIP TO JERUSALEM AND THE FUNERAL FOR PRIME MINISTER RABIN

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a minute to brief my colleagues on the trip to Jerusalem and on the funeral for Prime Minister Rabin. Let me say that I commend the President for having put together, on very short notice, a very powerful bipartisan delegation. The leadership of the Congress on both sides of the aisle were there, and President Carter, President Bush, former Secretary Shultz, and former Secretary Vance. I was told personally last night by acting Prime Minister Perez that it was a very powerful symbol of our commitment to stability and our commitment to the peace process that such a strong delegation would go to represent the United States in a tragic moment.

I think we all have to recognize that even with all of the violence which has occurred in the Middle East, the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin was

an unusually shocking moment which has left the people of Israel, I think, genuinely in a state of deep mourning and, frankly, deep shock that it could have happened within Israeli society.

I believe for our part, we in the Congress have an obligation to continue to work toward the dream of a peaceful and prosperous Middle East, a Middle East in which Israeli's national security is ensured within a framework of friendship and comity with its neighbors. It is a long and a difficult process, but I think any Member or citizen of this country who watched on television, who listened to the heart-rending personal statement of Prime Minister Rabin's granddaughter, anyone who saw the historic moment in which the Russian Prime Minister stood next to the American President, who stood next to the premier of Spain, who stood next to the King of Jordan; to see King Hussein back in that part of Jerusalem for the first time since his grandfather was killed while seeking peace, and then to see President Mubarak of Egypt, it was truly a historic moment, a moment that I think must have made Rabin proud to know that he had contributed with his life's work and ultimately with his life to begin to move the Middle East toward peace.

I hope all Members will join in expressing our commitment and support. I hope all of us will remember that one person can make a difference, and that this sacrifice does not have to have been in vain. I hope all of us will continue to work to strengthen the prospects of having a genuine and lasting peace in the Middle East.

LET US DEDICATE OURSELVES TO THE CAUSE OF PEACE TO ENSURE THAT PRIME MINISTER RABIN DID NOT DIE IN VAIN

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the violent death of Israel's Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin is a tragedy, not only for his family and for Israel, but for the entire world. His life spanned Israel's painful struggle for birth and survival.

His military background gave him the credentials to lead Israel in search of a secure peace. General Rabin knew how to wage war. Prime Minister Rabin knew how to make peace.

In the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln, he has given the last full measure in his devotion to peace for Israel.

We can ensure that Yitzhak Rabin will not have died in vain if we the living rededicate ourselves to the cause of peace, to carry the torch that Yitzhak Rabin held high on the road to peace for Israel and for her neighbors throughout the Middle East.

YITZHAK RABIN: WARRIOR FOR PEACE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from Israel, where I attended the funeral of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin.

Today our condolences and our hearts go out to the people and friends of Israel, the Rabin family, and lovers of peace everywhere.

Prime Minister Rabin was a great man, a great statesman, and a great peacemaker. He lived his life protecting the people of Israel and gave his life trying to bring an end to the cycle of violence that has plagued his nation. He was a warrior for peace and that will be his legacy. No assassin's bullet can extinguish the flame, the dream, that Yitzhak Rabin ignited in the hearts and minds of his people. Yitzhak Rabin may no longer be with us, but his dream for a safe, secure Israel, an Israel at peace with itself and its neighbors, lives on.

We have all lost a great leader, a great man, a man of peace. Bless him.

EMULATING THE COURAGE AND DEDICATION OF PRIME MINISTER RABIN IN SUPPORTING THE PEACE PROCESS

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

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, today we all come together, Christian and Jew and Moslem. We come together as people of different races and ethnicities, but we come together as Americans all, to join in mourning the tragic death of Israel Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. There is absolutely no question, Mr. Speaker, of the singular greatness of Prime Minister Rabin. He was always a man of strength who lived a life of conviction and courage. Yitzhak Rabin gave his life in a passionate search for peace for all people in the Middle East.

The only question, the only question that remains: Will we who live on be as courageous and as dedicated in picking up where he left off, in standing up for a real and just peace in the Middle East?

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

(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, I commend all the previous speakers for their eloquence on the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin.

Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will consider for the second time the conference report on H.R. 1977. Even though this bill was sent back to committee, the new reported version is still completely unacceptable.

This conference report undermines our commitments to native Americans, our National Park System, and our precious national culture.

This bill slashes the budget of the National Park System at a time when more of our constituents are using the parks.

In this bill the budget for the National Park System is cut by $68 million.

This bill provides only $1 for management of the Mojave National Preserve, a newly established California park.

It eliminates $15 million for efforts to improve visitor safety and security at National Parks.

Despite public outcry about exploiting our national resources, this bill allows clearcutting in the Tongass National Forest.

This bill also undermines our commitments and treaty obligations to native Americans.

In this conference report native American programs will be cut by $184 million from last year's levels.

The crippling reductions targeted at tribes will significantly reduce support for essential tribal government services such as law enforcement, housing improvement, health care, Indian child welfare, and adult vocational training.

This conference report cuts $136 million more from Indian programs than the original House bill.

Make no mistake that this bill also jeopardizes the ability to provide important cultural, education, and artistic programs for communities across this country.

This bill eliminates 39 percent of funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. These cuts mean less dollars for communities in your district to help them bring ballet and orchestra, opera, and theatre performances to your constituents.

I urge my colleagues to do what is right to protect our environment, to do what is right for native American children and our cultural heritage. Vote ''no'' on the Interior appropriations conference report.

IT IS TIME TO SAY GOODBYE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. Speaker, when this historic Congress convened, a number of us in the new majority promised our constituents that we would work hard to eliminate wasteful Federal agencies that cater to special interests. Soon we will have an opportunity to do just that by eliminating the Department of Commerce.

The Commerce Department, which was ostensibly created to promote American business interests, has evolved into a mish-mash of ineffective

and outmoded programs which soak the American taxpayer for hundreds of millions of dollars while providing precious little in return.

We promised we would balance the budget, not by raising taxes but by cutting wasteful spending. This is a perfect example, the Department of Commerce, of wasteful spending.

Mr. Speaker, we have to crack down on corporate welfare, and the Department of Commerce is a good place to begin. It is little more than a welfare department for big corporations. We should have the courage to eliminate it.

ART MODELL MUST OBEY CLEVELAND'S LAWS

(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, year in and year out, the Cleveland Browns averaged 70,000 paying fans a game, but owner Art Modell says that is not enough. He said he is losing money. Who is kidding whom? This move to Baltimore is nothing but a sweetheart deal for Modell and a raw deal for the city of Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, what is the surprise? Anyone who would fire Paul Brown, trade Paul Warfield, and cut outright Bernie Kozar does not know the meaning of loyalty or community. I am asking the Ohio attorney general to enforce the contract between Cleveland Browns and the city of Cleveland. If the fine print is binding on those in the dog pound and Mayor White, the fine print should be binding on Art Modell.

THE DEMOCRATS' STRANGE VIEW OF THE BUDGET PROCESS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks, we have heard some fascinating dialog as we have discussed the budget. I think it has been particularly interesting. The Democrats, bless their hearts, have a very strange view of this whole budget process.

For example, when we actually cut spending, as we are doing in the Defense Department, so we are spending less in 1995 or in 1996 than we spent in 1995, they call that an increase; but when we increase spending in programs like Medicare above what we are spending in 1995, they call that a cut. No wonder the budgets of the United States were so screwed up for 40 years while they managed this place.

THE REPUBLICANS' ONGOING WAR AGAINST MEDICARE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago this Congress cut $270 billion in Medicare while increasing Pentagon spending $7 billion more than the Pentagon itself even asked for. Why? The Speaker has said and the Republican majority has said they want to preserve and protect Medicare. They want to save it by cutting it.

Let us look at a bit to history. In 1965, when Medicare was created, 87 percent of Republicans voted against its creation.

□ 1415

In the next 20 and 30 years, Republican Members of Congress continued to try to cut Medicare. In this year, Speaker GINGRICH said, now, we did not get rid of Medicare in round one because we do not think that is politically smart, but we believe it is going to wither on the vine. That is why they are cutting Medicare. They are cutting Medicare in order to let it wither on the vine and they are cutting Medicare in order to give $245 billion in tax cuts to the wealthy. Mr. Speaker, it simply does not make sense.

NOW IS THE TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, the discussion going on here in Congress about balancing the Federal budget will continue on the floor this week. I think it is important to remember that every day, all across this country, millions of American families gather at the kitchen table to balance the family budget. They do not make excuses, they just do the right thing for the family.

I believe now is the time for the House and Senate to gather around the kitchen table of America and do what is right for America's future. We need to balance the budget, reform welfare, and cut taxes so that the American family will be able to keep more of their own, hard-earned paycheck. The growing expectation for a balanced budget has already caused long-term interest rates to fall, according to Alan Greenspan.

No more talking about balancing the budget, no more reading about it. Let's just do it. Let's work together at the kitchen table for the good of our Nation.

HOSPITALS WILL BE FORCED TO CHARGE MORE

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is not just seniors who will be asked to pay more under the Republican Medicare bill. Businesses and working people can expect to see that their health care costs are going to rise as well. In today's health care system, private patients and their insurers pay the price for the uninsured. This cost shifting will accelerate under the Republican Medicare proposal.

According to a story that ran this weekend in the New York Times, as Medicare payments fall short of covering the cost of care, hospitals will be forced to make up the difference by charging their private patients more. Many people who work for small businesses could also lose their insurance altogether.

An independent health care research firm, Lewin VHI, estimates that $66 billion will be shifted on to the privately insured. That is too big of a burden for our small businesses, and yet another reason to oppose the Republican Medicare cuts.

A HERO IN WAR, HE DIED FOR PEACE

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the epitaph of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin could fill volumes. He served his country tirelessly. He helped lead her to triumph in the 1967 war. He won the Nobel Prize for his efforts to bring her an everlasting peace.

Prime Minister Rabin had the rare ability to bring diverse people together in the pursuit of peace. He earned the admiration and the respect of the people of Israel and people throughout the world. I am shocked and saddened that such a brave man would be brought down so brutally.

So, in the great shadow of his loss, this is a sad time for Israel, America, and the world. Our thoughts and prayers are with Mr. Rabin's family and with the people of one of America's closest allies, Israel. He will go down in history as a hero in war, he died for peace.

DAVID ROHDE HELD HOSTAGE

(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, as the peace negotiations between the warring parties in the Bosnian conflict continue in Dayton, an American journalist continues to be incarcerated and held hostage by the Bosnian Serbs.

David Rohde, a journalist for the Christian Science Monitor, was responsible for exposing the killing fields near Srebrenica in eastern Bosnia. He is now being held in captivity, detained by those responsible, the Bosnian Serbs. They have charged him with, and I quote, ''Illegal border crossings and falsifying documents.'' He has been tried and convicted by what our own State Department has called, rightfully, a kangaroo court. He has, Mr.

Speaker, become a pawn of the Serbs in their peace negotiations.

I suspect that Milosevic and his gang think they can use David Rohde as a bargaining chip in order to have us reduce our demands that the Serbs remove war criminals Karakzic and Mladic from their commands as part of any peace agreement. They are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I am today urging the Clinton administration to demand that David Rohde and other noncombatant personnel, including all U.N. military and civilian personnel, be immediately released.

CONGRESSIONAL LIBERALS VOICE BOGUS CLAIM

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, liberals here in Congress and in the White House love to claim that Republicans are raising taxes on the poor because of our efforts to reform the earned income tax credit. This claim is bogus and is an outright scare tactic.

EITC was set up in the 1970's to help working, poor families. It was designed to be a tax refund program. Since then, EITC has turned into a welfare program. In fact, only one-quarter of the $21 billion spent on EITC actually go to tax refunds. The other three-fourths go to welfare grants. The program has expanded far beyond its original intent.

In the last 10 years, spending on the program has increased 1,220 percent. This is unsustainable growth.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know that we are not raising taxes on poor people. Every family covered by EITC will receive the $500 per-child tax credit and it is an outright fabrication to suggest that reforming EITC is a tax increase.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION AND AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE DIFFERENT PRIORITIES

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration's top concern these days seems to be raising the debt ceiling; in other words, increasing the Government's credit limit, which will be paid by our grandchildren.

For 11 months now, the Republican Congress has been writing a budget which will be balanced in 7 years. Throughout the whole process, the President has been missing the whole point. He needs to build consensus and accept the agenda of the American people.

Now the President wants us to raise the debt limit when he has not even stated he will sign the balanced budget amendment over a 7-year period, nor has he said he will sign legislation to save Medicare or reform welfare. He wants to increase the debt ceiling and he is fighting nearly every Republican proposal to cut spending and reduce the size of Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration's priorities are not the same as the American people. The American people want to clean up this fiscal mess, not increase the Government's credit limit without balancing the budget.

YITZHAK RABIN DEDICATED TO LASTING PEACE

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of one of the giants of the 20th century, a true hero, Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin.

Prime Minister Rabin, who was tragically taken from us over the weekend, could best be described as one of the Founding Fathers of the State of Israel, and a man dedicated to lasting peace in the Middle East.

As a soldier, he led troops during Israel's War of Independence in 1948. As chief of staff of the Israel Defense Forces, he led Israel to a victory over Arab forces in 1967. As Defense Minister, he strengthened Israel's armies to defend against external threats, and as Prime Minister, he pursued peace with Israel's enemies. Above all else, he was a true patriot, whose commitment to the people of Israel and a secure future for all of its generations to come was unequivocal.

For those of us here in America, he was a friend, a comfortable friend, who we came to know during his time as Israeli Ambassador to the United States.

This past August, my wife, Barbara and I, had the good fortune of spending some time with the Prime Minister and his lovely wife, Leah. During that visit as I toured Israel, it was clear that Prime Minister Rabin was undergoing tremendous pressure from external forces as well as internal forces, as he so valiantly pursued the process of peace. This and so much more shall serve as an enduring legacy of hope and optimism that characterized the rich and full life of Prime Minister Rabin. Our prayers are with the Prime Minister's family and with all Israelis during the most difficult time.

PRIME MINISTER'S LEGACY TO MOVE FORWARD FOR PEACE

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the congressional delegation that attended Mr. Rabin's funeral, let me share with you some of my observations from returning from Jerusalem.

Mr. Rabin was truly a unique individual who pursued peace, and his loss will be deeply felt in the peace process, make no mistake about that. We have lost a unique individual who was committed to bringing about peace.

As President Clinton remarked and as King Hussein of Jordan remarked, the legacy of Mr. Rabin must be to move forward in the peace process. The best way to honor Mr. Rabin's memory is for all of us to rededicate ourselves to peace in the Middle East.

My observations of what is happening in Israel today is that the Israelis are more united, more committed to peace than ever before, and I think that is a fitting tribute to Mr. Rabin's work.

YITZHAK RABIN'S ASSASSINATION

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 4, the world suffered a great loss. Prime Minister Rabin's leadership and commitment to peace in the Middle East will be missed.

His untimely death is nothing less than tragic, not only to his family and the people of Israel, but to everyone who yearns for the end of bloodshed in the Middle East.

The United States has always stood beside Israel. Now more than ever, we must reaffirm our commitment to the parties involved in the peace process to ensure that Yitzhak Rabin's vision becomes a reality.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts and prayers go out to the people of Israel and Prime Minister Peres.

The challenges of the future are large, but not insurmountable. Mr. Rabin has shown us that courage and perseverance can win the day. Let us learn from his example.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

REAPPOINTMENT OF HOMER ALFRED NEAL TO THE SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 69) providing for the reappointment of Homer Alfred Neal as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 69

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Homer Alfred Neal of Michigan on December 6, 1995, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent for a term of six years, effective December 7, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 69 which provides for the reappointment of Homer Alfred Neal to the Smithsonian Institution's Board of Regents.

□ 1430

The Smithsonian is governed by a 17-member board composed of the Chief Justice, the Vice President of the United States, three Members of the House of Representatives, three Members of the Senate, and nine citizen members.

Homer Neal will complete his first 6-year term as a citizen regent on December 6. His extensive knowledge about science and his expertise as vice president for research and professor of physics at the University of Michigan have provided a significant contribution to the Smithsonian as a regent. Mr. Neal is being renominated for an additional 6-year term.

Mr. Speaker, regents oversee America's preeminent cultural institution. the Smithsonian's museums preserve, study, and present our cultural and scientific heritage through the vast collections that they hold in trust for the Nation. The Smithsonian is also a leading research center for the arts, history, and science, with facilities, as we know, here in the District of Columbia along the Mall but also in eight other States and in the Republic of Panama. We are most familiar with the Smithsonian based upon its exhibitions, 16 museums, galleries, and of course the National Zoo. They receive 29 million visitors every year, and every one of those visitors visit for free.

The Smithsonian is in essence the Nation's attic. They preserve unique records of art, history, plant and animal life. The total number of objects is estimated at more than 140 million. Some 120 million of those objects are specimens in the National Museum of Natural History, and there are more than 16 million postage stamps and related objects at the National Postal Museum.

The Smithsonian is a unique American institution. The Board of Regents are an important functioning aspect of the Smithsonian.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], one of the regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Oversight for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank him also and also the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the ranking member, who cannot be here today, for moving these regent nominations so quickly through their committee and onto the House floor. The actions we take today will allow the Board of Regents to have a full complement as the Smithsonian begins to celebrate its 150th anniversary this January.

The Board of Regents is indeed, as the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has pointed out, the governing body for the Smithsonian Institution. Its 17 members include the Vice President, Chief Justice, three Senators, three Members of the House, and nine citizen regents. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and I are honored to be two of those regents.

A replacement will soon be named for Norm Mineta, who resigned on October 10. The nine citizen regents are appointed by joint resolution of Congress for 6-year terms.

The caliber of the people who are willing to serve in these positions reflects well upon the Smithsonian Institution, and each of the appointments will ensure that the Smithsonian continues its 150 years of success. Each of the joint resolutions that we will consider today, as the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will explain in detail, will appoint nationally respected individuals who are leaders in their respective fields. Each are distinguished Americans. I am honored to serve with them all.

Mr. Speaker, I will not elaborate on the individual nominees since the gentleman from California on each of the resolutions will do that. But I would be remiss if I did not add that I will be introducing a bill later this week to allow for a commemorative coin to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Smithsonian. The proceeds from the coin will help to pay for sending Smithsonian exhibits across the country over the next 2 years to celebrate the 150th anniversary and to display the Smithsonian's treasures for many communities across America. For the first time we will help the Nation's coin collectors by devoting 15 percent of the proceeds for the numismatic collection at the Museum of American History.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the chairman and the ranking member for their speedy consideration of the bill. I urge the adoption and the appointment of the citizen regents.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and that sounds like we have at least one more object to add to the Smithsonian's collection coming soon.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support House Joint Resolution 69.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from California in support of the four joint resolutions before us today. They were all passed out of committee unanimously and will serve to continue the excellent stewardship that has been the tradition of the Smithsonian Institution.

The four resolutions before us are complementary and will bring a diverse group of skills and experience to the board. Together, the nominees bring backgrounds in the sciences, arts, business, and the Federal Government.

The Smithsonian Institution is the crown jewel among our Nation's fine museums and research facilities. Every day, hundreds of Americans, and indeed, visitors from around the world, visit the Smithsonian museums and marvel at their wonders. Whether it is school children seeing the remarkable pictures from the Hubble telescope at the Air and Space Museum and starting on their journey into the marvels of science or a grandmother seeing Dorothy's red shoes that she first saw years ago on the magical silver screen, the Smithsonian is like no other place.

The first resolution, House Joint Resolution 69, reappoints Homer A. Neal, vice president for research at the University of Michigan. House Joint Resolution 110 appoints Howard Baker, former Senator and Chief of Staff to President Reagan. House Joint Resolution 111 appoints Anne Harnoncourt, the director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and House Joint Resolution 112 appoints Louis Gerstner, chairman of the board and CEO of IBM Corp.

The Smithsonian is governed by a 17-member board and all of these nominations are noncontroversial and worthy of this House's full support. I urge my colleagues to support each of these measures and am pleased to join my friend from California in recommending these distinguished nominees to the House.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 69.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., TO SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 110) providing for the appointment of Howard H. Baker, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 110

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Jeannine Smith Clark of the District of Columbia on August 25, 1995, is filled by the appointment of Howard H. Baker, Jr. of the District of Columbia. The appointment is for a term of six years and shall take effect on the date on which this joint resolution becomes law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 110, which provides for the appointment of Howard Baker, Jr., to the Smithsonian Institution's Board of Citizen Regents.

I do not have to tell anyone that Howard Baker has had a long and distinguished career in public office. He served in the U.S. Senate from 1967 to 1985. He was President Ronald Reagan's Chief of Staff from February 1987 to July 1988.

Mr. Speaker, rather than go into a more detailed background, it is my privilege to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HILLEARY], who represents the once and current home of Howard Baker.

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

Mr. HILLEARY. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor today to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 110 which provides for the appointment of Howard H. Baker, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

It is a pleasure and honor to be able to call Senator Baker my friend. He is a true patriot who has had a long, dedicated career in public service.

I believe one of the earliest offices he held was that of student body president at the University of Tennessee in 1949. After receiving his law degree from UT, he began a career as an attorney and businessman in Huntsville and Knoxville, TN, where he soon developed an outstanding reputation in these communities and throughout the State.

In 1966 Senator Baker was first elected to the U.S. Senate. He was the first Republican since Reconstruction to be elected to the Senate from Tennessee. Later he was reelected twice more by the people of Tennessee, in 1972 and 1978.

While he is known to us in Tennessee as being instrumental in building it into a two-party State, the country knows him better for his dedication to setting partisanship aside for the good of our country.

As vice chairman of the Senate Watergate Committee in 1973, he shouldered the difficult and unpleasant task of investigating a Republican White House. The leadership he provided on that committee propelled him into the national spotlight. His goal was the truth, wherever it might have led.

Senator Baker then served as Senate Republican leader, first in the minority from 1977 through 1980, and then later in the majority from 1981 until he retired in 1984.

Senator Baker brought people together. When important legislation got bogged down in the Senate, he used his personal talent for bringing opposing factions together at the bargaining table to reach compromise suitable to all sides.

In 1988 President Reagan asked Howard Baker to take over as his White House Chief of Staff, and always being the willing patriot, he readily accepted. His presence as the head of the White House staff gave it instant credibility and integrity. He completed his task given to him by President Reagan, and again retired from public service.

He may no longer hold any public office, but his knowledge and understanding of both Tennessee and Washington continues to have tremendous influence. It is with great pride that I pay this tribute to my most famous and most distinguished constituent, Howard H. Baker, Jr. He is a great man who has dedicated his life to public service and we all owe him a great debt of gratitude.

Senator Baker is interested in serving on the Smithsonian Board of Regents, and this country could not have a better person to serve there. It is with great pleasure that I urge all of my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 110 to appoint Howard H. Baker, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us know that Howard Baker is also an avid photographer and I look forward to being able to view future pictures of the Smithsonian from the inside out. I urge Members to support House Joint Resolution 110.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise once again in behalf of this resolution. On our side of the aisle, we know Howard Baker to be a partisan Republican, but he was much more and is much more than that. He was appropriately, as a leader in his party, partisan when partisanship was called for. But he was, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, an American first, not only a great leader in his own right but the son-in-law of a great Republican leader as well, Everett Dirksen.

Howard Baker is the kind of politician that America needs. In a time when we tend to yell and scream at one another, in a time when we tend to try to embarrass one another and show one another up, Howard Baker is an example of the best of public service.

Howard Baker revered the U.S. Senate, and in his career brought luster to that institution as well as to his own name, because Howard Baker understood that Americans expected us and expect us still to work together, recognizing our differences but recognizing that consensus in the final analysis is the way we make progress.

Therefore, as a member of the other party, if you will, but a friend of Howard Baker, and not only that, an admirer of Howard Baker, and an admirer of that for which he stood as a public servant, I gladly, on behalf of my party as well as on behalf of the Democratic side of the aisle and the committee, rise in support of this resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 110.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1445

APPOINTMENT OF ANNE D'HARNONCOURT TO THE SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 111) providing for the appointment of Anne D'Harnoncourt as a citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 111

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with

section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Samuel Curtis Johnson of Wisconsin on December 4, 1995, is filed by the appointment of Anne D'Harnoncourt of Pennsylvania. The appointment is for a term of six years and shall take effect on December 5, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Joint Resolution 111 provides for the appointment of Anne D'Harnoncourt to the Smithsonian Institute's Board of Regents. Ms. D'Harnoncourt serves as the director of the Philadelphia Museum of Art. In addition to her current position, she has worked at the Tate Gallery in London and the Art institute of Chicago. The knowledge she possesses from her vast arts background will obviously prove beneficial to the Smithsonian's Board. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 111.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and join my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], in strong support of this resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 111.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF LOUIS GERSTNER TO SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have moved to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 112) providing for the appointment of Louis Gerstner as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the resignation of Ira Michael Heyman of California on May 27, 1994, is filled by the appointment of Louis Gerstner of Connecticut. The appointment is for a term of six years and shall take effect on the date on which this joint resolution becomes law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

House Joint Resolution 112, which provides for the appointment of Louis Gerstner to the Smithsonian Institution's Board of Regents is, I think, equally luminous. Louis Gerstner's impressive credentials begin with his current position as chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the IBM Corp. Prior to his work at IBM, Mr. Gerstner has held top positions at RJR Nabisco, American Express, and the management consulting firm of McKinsey & Co.

While Mr. Gerstner obviously offers a diverse and impressive business background, I think it is especially significant with his appointment as a regent of the Smithsonian to emphasize that Mr. Gerstner, throughout his lifetime, has had a continuous commitment to improving our system of education, and this seems to be an excellent appointment as a citizen regent. I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 112.

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

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

Once again I am pleased to join the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, Mr. THOMAS, in support of this resolution. The nominee will, I am sure, make a very outstanding contribution to the work of the Smithsonian Board of Regents.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 112.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Joint Resolution 69, House Joint Resolution 110, House Joint Resolution 111, and House Joint Resolution 112, the resolutions just considered.

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

There was no objection.

LAND CONVEYANCE TO CITY OF SUMPTER, OR

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass bill (H.R. 1581) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture to the City of Sumpter, Oregon.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1581

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

SECTION 1. LAND CONVEYANCE, CITY OF SUMPTER, OREGON.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall convey, without consideration, to the city of Sumpter, Oregon (in this section referred to as the ''City''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property of approximately 1.43 acres consisting of all of block 8 of the REVISED PLAN OF SUMPTER TOWNSITE in the City, as shown in plat recorded March 6, 1897, in Plat Book 3, page 26; including the alley running through such block, vacated by Ordinance No. 1966–3, recorded December 14, 1966, in Deed 66–50–014.

(b) ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) consists of the same property that was deeded to the United States in the following deeds:

(1) Warranty Deed from Sumpter Power & Water Company to the United States of America dated October 12, 1949, and recorded in Vol. 152, page 170 of Baker County records on December 22, 1949.

(2) Warranty Deed from Mrs. Alice Windle to the United States of America dated October 11, 1949, and recorded in Vol. 152, page 168 of Baker County records on December 22, 1949.

(3) Warranty Deed from Alice L. Windle Charles and James M. Charles to the United States of America dated August 8, 1962, and recorded in Book 172, page 1331 on August 27, 1962.

(c) CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the City use the conveyed property only for public purposes, such as a city park, information center, or interpretive area.

(d) RELEASE.—Notwithstanding the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), upon making the conveyance required by subsection (a), the United States is relieved from liability for any and all claims arising from the presence of hazardous materials on the conveyed property, and the City shall thereafter be liable for any and all such claims.

(e) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—If the Secretary of Agriculture determines that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used in accordance with the condition specified in subsection (c) or that the City has initiated proceedings to sell, lease, exchange, or otherwise dispose of all or a portion of the property, then, at the option

of the Secretary, the United States shall have a right of reentry with regard to the property, with title thereto revesting in the United States.

(f) AUTHORIZED SALE OF PROPERTY.—Notwithstanding subsections (c) and (e), the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the City to dispose of the real property conveyed under subsection (a) if the proceeds from such disposal are at least equal to the fair market value of the property and are paid to the United States. The Secretary shall deposit amounts received under this subsection into the special fund in the Treasury into which funds are deposited pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967 (16 U.S.C. 484a), commonly known as the Sisk Act. The disposal of the conveyed property under this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of Agriculture may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon, [Mr. COOLEY].

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1581, sponsored by myself, which would authorize the transfer of the Sumpter Guard Station in my district from the U.S. Forest Service to the city of Sumpter, OR.

The Sumpter Guard Station was established in the 1940's, and the site consists of three very primitive buildings. Two of the buildings, made from railroad boxcars, are considered usable if the electrical wiring is brought up to current standards. The third building is a small outhouse and is not longer usable.

The station is located on 1.43 acres of land in the city of Sumpter, OR, and the site and buildings were recommended for disposal when the real property utilization survey was completed in 1988. Disposal of the property was contingent upon a thorough inventory of the cultural resource values and an assessment of any hazardous wastes at the site.

The Oregon State Historic Preservation Officer has concurred that the site is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and that transfer of ownership would not be an adverse effect. The hazardous materials report has been completed; no hazardous materials remain on the site.

The U.S. Forest Service fully supports the transfer, has no further use of the Sumpter Guard Station, and wishes to dispose of the property. The city of Sumpter, on the other hand, is eager to receive the property and utilize it immediately for public benefit as a park facility.

H.R. 1581 was reported favorably by the Committee on Resources by voice vote, and is noncontroversial. This is very sensible legislation for all interests, and I urge the Members of the House to support this measure.

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

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation. Basically what it is is a conveyance from the Secretary of Agriculture to the city of Sumpter, OR, all right, title and interest of the United States to a parcel of land that is approximately 1.43 acres, as described in the bill. The conveyance will be subject to the condition that the city use the conveyed property for only public purpose, such as a city park, information center, or interpretive area.

The United States is relieved of liability for claims arising from the presence of hazardous materials on the conveyed property. If the city does not use the property in accordance with the conditions of the bill, then the Secretary has the option to take possession of the property, and, notwithstanding any provisions of the bill, the Secretary may authorize the city to dispose of the property.

The Secretary of Agriculture may require additional terms and conditions as are appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1581.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1995

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 207) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a land exchange involving the Cleveland National Forest, California, and to require a boundary adjustment for the national forest to reflect the land exchange, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 207

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Cleveland National Forest Land Exchange Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE, CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.—

(1) CONVEYANCE.—In exchange for the conveyance described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall convey to the Orange County Council of the Boy Scouts of America all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of land described in paragraph (2) located in the Cleveland National Forest. The parcel conveyed by the Secretary shall be subject to valid existing rights and to any easements that the Secretary considers necessary for public and administrative access.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF PARCEL.—The parcel of land referred to in paragraph (1) consists of not more than 60 acres of land in Section 28, Township 9 South, Range 4 East, San Bernardino Meridian, in the unincorporated territory of San Diego County, California.

(b) CONVEYANCE BY THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA.—

(1) CONVEYANCE.—In exchange for the conveyance described in subsection (a), the Orange County Council of the Boy Scouts of America shall convey to the United States all right, title, and interest to the parcel of land described in paragraph (2). The parcel conveyed under this subsection shall be subject to such valid existing rights of record as may be acceptable to the Secretary, and the title to the parcel shall conform with the title approval standards applicable to Federal land acquisitions.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF PARCEL.—The parcel of land referred to in paragraph (1) shall be approximately equal in value to the lands described in subsection (a)(2) and shall be at least the Southerly 94 acres of the Westerly ½ of Section 34, Township 9 South, Range 4 East, San Bernardino Meridian, in the unincorporated territory of San Diego County, California.

(c) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—Upon the completion of the land exchange authorized under this section, the Secretary shall adjust the boundaries of the Cleveland National Forest to exclude the parcel conveyed by the Secretary under subsection (a) and to include the parcel obtained by the Secretary under subsection (b). For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 460l–9), the boundary of the Cleveland National Forest, as modified by this Act, shall be considered the boundary of the forest as of January 1, 1965.

(d) INCORPORATION INTO CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST.—Upon acceptance of title by the Secretary, the parcel obtained by the Secretary under subsection (b) shall become part of the Cleveland National Forest and shall be subject to all laws applicable to such national forest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

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

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 207, sponsored by Mr. COX, which would clear up a problem between the Boy Scouts and the Cleveland National Forest. The Lost Valley

Scout Reservation, located in a remote area of northern San Diego County and bordered by the Cleveland National Forest, is the principal summer camp for the 80,000 youth now served annually by the Orange County Council of the Boy Scouts of America. This 1,400-acre property was acquired by the council in 1956 through deeds based on an 1880 survey.

In 1987, the Forest Service surveyed the shared boundaries, and finding the 1880 surveys to be inaccurate, discovered a number of encroachments on Forest Service land. These included permanent buildings, a year-round residence, an unauthorized road, and buried water and electrical lines. The land is also heavily impacted by Scout use, as it lies between two camp activity centers.

The bill would authorize the exchange of the 43 acres of the Cleveland National Forest presently encroached upon or heavily impacted by the Lost Valley Scout Reservation for 94 acres now owned by the council.

H.R. 207 is noncontroversial and was reported favorably by the House Resources Committee by voice vote. I commend the sponsor for his work on this measure and urge the Members of the House to support this bill.

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

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

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

□ 1500

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, we will be supporting this bill. This is a good piece of legislation. I think, as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] explained, the Lost Valley Scout Reservation in California was built according to an 1880 survey. In 1987, a survey conducted by the Forest Service found that the Boy Scouts had encroached onto Cleveland National Forest in several locations. These locations include a year-round residence, an unauthorized road, and buried electrical and water lines.

Further, the land has been heavily impacted from Boy Scout use. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange the encroached land to the Boy Scouts for land owned by the Scouts elsewhere in Orange County.

Mr. Speaker, I support this transfer which will allow the Orange County Council of Boy Scouts of America to use this land unencumbered for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to pass good legislation that benefits the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], the Boy Scouts, and does away with unneeded bureaucracy.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], the author of this legislation.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], for the kind words that they have just spoken in behalf of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it should not take an act of Congress for kids to go to summer camp, but that really is what this bill is going to facilitate. For several years, the facilities used by up to 10,000 Boy Scouts in the Orange County area have been deteriorating. They have been unable to build improvements on their land because a master plan cannot be approved by San Diego County until this boundary dispute, which as the gentleman states goes back to 1880, is resolved.

Mr. Speaker, like good neighbors, the Boy Scouts who discovered this problem with their property some 30 years after acquiring it from the Federal Government, worked with the Forest Service in good neighborly fashion to resolve it and they have now done so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like especially to take a moment to thank Mike Harrison, Kent Gibbs, and Craig Reide of the Orange County Council of the Boy Scouts of America for the extraordinary work they have done in getting this bill this close to passage. I am also grateful to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and other members of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands.

Mr. Speaker, I first introduced this bill in 1992, along with California Senator John Seymour. It has taken us a great deal of hard work and effort to get to this point. Instrumental in our success was the work of my colleague, the gentleman from southern California [Mr. CALVERT], who also authored this legislation with me, and who has worked tirelessly to make certain that Members of this body recognize the special urgency of this legislation. While the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] wanted to be here to mark the passage of this legislation, he has been unavoidably detained off the Hill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 207 may not be the most significant piece of legislation that this Congress considers, but it will have an immediate, tangible, and lasting positive impact on the lives of the thousands of Boy Scouts who spend their summers at the Lost Valley Scout Reservation.

H.R. 207 is the legislative route to implement the agreement that has been reached by the Boy Scouts and the Federal Government. Under the bill, up to 60 acres of the Cleveland National Forest presently encroached upon or heavily impacted by the Lost Valley Scout Reservation will be exchanged for 94 acres now owned by the Boy Scouts. The 94 acres of land do border the existing national forest and will expand the size of the Cleveland National Forest. Additionally, the Boy Scouts have agreed, at their own expense, to pay for new surveys and place monuments which will clearly mark the new boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 207 is supported by the Forest Service, which testified earlier this year that enactment of this legislation will ''benefit the management of the National Forests by solving boundary, encroachment issues.''

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I cannot stress enough the special urgency of this legislation. The county of San Diego has denied building permits for needed improvements at Lost Valley Scout Reservation, pending a master land use plan as I have mentioned. That master land use plan depends on passage of this bill. For all of these reasons, time is of the essence.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the leadership of this Congress has made passage of H.R. 207 a priority and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with me in supporting a bill that is good for our national parks, good for the Federal Government, and good for the Boy Scouts and good for about 10,000 campers.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today we will have the opportunity to bring an ongoing boundary issue to rest. H.R. 207, introduced by my colleague, Congressman COX, is long overdue and reinforces the Republican-led Congress' commitment to the concerns of ordinary citizens.

As a former Boy Scout myself, I understand the importance of the Lost Valley Scout Reservation to the tens of thousands of young people in southern California served by the facility since 1954. In 1987, the U.S. Forest Service conducted a border survey and found that a small portion of land in use by the Boy Scouts was actually on Federal land. Since that time, the camp has been denied permits by the county of San Diego to make necessary repairs to the facility until the property rights issue was resolved.

This no-nonsense legislation simply exchanges land between the Forest Service and the Boy Scouts. As simple as that may sound, it has taken a considerable amount of time for the bill to be considered. It was first introduced in 1992, but no action was taken by the Democrat-controlled Congress. It was again introduced in the 103d Congress, but efforts were stalled by the Clinton administration's refusal to issue an official Forest Service opinion.

I applaud Congressman COX for his tenacity and commitment to our young people. I urge all of my colleagues to put aside petty politics and support the Cleveland National Forest land exchange.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 207 as introduced by my esteemed colleague from California [Mr. COX]. This is a matter of importance to my district and with that in mind I ask for passage of this bill.

Time is of the essence in this case. The county of San Diego has decided to disallow all building permits on the Lost Valley Scout Reservation until a master land plan is approved. This approval cannot come until this boundary dispute is resolved.

Lost Valley needs building permits now. The scout population at Lost Valley has increased 150 percent in just the past 3 years. As a result, repairs, and capital improvements must quickly commence. The Reservation is in dire need of 18 new staff cabins and a new dinning hall. In fact, the local health department has only allowed the existing dining hall's continued operation with the understanding that it will be replaced in the near future.

This bill is a fair settlement to end this boundary dispute and I urge its passage.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, as I stated, I strongly support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] for introducing this legislation. I think it is a very worthy cause, and I urge my colleagues also to support this.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 207, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION OF WILD HORSES IN THE OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 238) to provide for the protection of wild horses within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways and prohibit the removal of such horses, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 238

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

SECTION 1. FREE-ROAMING HORSES.

Section 7 of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the establishment of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes'', approved August 27, 1964 (16 U.S.C. 460m–6), is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary, in accordance with this section, shall allow free-roaming horses in the Ozark National Scenic Riverways. Within 180 days after enactment of this section, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Missouri Wild Horse League or another qualified nonprofit entity to provide for management of free-roaming horses. The agreement shall provide for cost-effective management of the horses and limit Federal expenditures to the costs of monitoring the agreement. The Secretary shall issue permits for adequate pastures to accommodate the historic population level of the free-roaming horse herd, which shall be not less than the number of horses in existence on the date of enactment of this section nor more than 50.

''(b) The Secretary may not remove, or assist in or permit the removal of, any free-roaming horses from Federal lands within the boundary of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways unless the entity with whom the Secretary entered into the agreement under subsection (a), following notice and a 180-day response period, substantially fails to meet the terms and conditions of the agreement or in the case of an emergency as defined in the agreement.

''(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed as creating additional liability for the United States for any damages caused by the free-roaming horses to property located inside or outside the boundaries of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 238, legislation which would direct the Secretary of the Interior to permit free-roaming horses to continue to inhabit Ozark National Scenic Riverway.

Free-roaming horses have existed in the vicinity of Ozark National Scenic Riverway for at least 50 years. For nearly 25 years after the park was established in 1964, the National Park Service coexisted in apparent harmony with the small number of horses which roam on lands both inside and outside the park boundary. Then suddenly, in about 1990, the National Park Service decided that the horses would have to be completely removed.

The only reason cited by the National Park Service to justify removal of the horses is that agency policy calls for removal of non-native plants and animals. However, the agency policy also calls for the National Park Service to conduct research to determine the effects of non-native animals on the park prior to initiating any such removal. The National Park Service has never conducted the required research, and has been unable to supply the committee with any scientific evidence documenting the impacts of these horses on park resources. Further, while the Park Service claims that the removal action is required under their policy, there are at least six areas in the park system where the National Park Service permits free roaming horses to exist, with no attempts to remove them. In other words, it appears that the national policies of this agency are applied on an arbitrary and selective basis by the field managers.

When the National Park Service attempted to remove these animals, they encountered massive public opposition from all corners within the State of Missouri. That opposition was ignored. Volunteer groups appeared at the doorstep of the National Park Service and offered to manage the horses at no cost to the Federal Government. The door was slammed in their face. In fact, the National Park Service testified before our subcommittee that the only way to prevent future removal of the horses was to enact this legislation.

I know that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] has worked long and hard on this issue, an am witness to his extensive efforts to resolve this administratively. While such a solution may have been preferable, it is apparently not possible. Therefore, I commend this bill to my colleagues, urge they support it, and recommend its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, for decades now locals and visitors to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways have come to enjoy the sight of the free-roaming horses which inhabit the area. When the National Park Service recommended removal of the horses in order to protect the riverways area, a fierce debate broke out.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the National Park Service and the local community work together to allow a small number of horses the freedom to roam the area unencumbered. The bill before us will allow for the Wild Horse League of Missouri, or a similar group, to manage and care for the feral horses in the area. The Wild Horse League, or similar groups, will also be responsible for any damage caused by the horses. Further, the bill directs the National Park Service to provide grazing land for the horses.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the author of this bill, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and I see that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is here and will be speaking on the bill. Both gentlemen are outstanding Members of this body. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] has had wide interest in this issue. We are going to make sure that this bill passes. We hold the gentleman in extremely high regard. We wish the gentleman a very, very speedy recovery. We see the gentleman here.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], the author of this bill.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank the manager of the bill, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] for their diligent work in bringing this bill before us today. I also thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG],

chairman of the full Committee on Resources, for moving this bill through the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, the Ozark Wild Horses Protection Act of 1995 is of high importance to the folks in my congressional district in southern Missouri, and to the folks in the district of my neighbor and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], who represents the neighboring district. Mr. Speaker, I am just delighted to have the gentleman, and our other Ozark colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK], as cosponsors of this legislation. We can say we have all of the Missouri Ozarkian Congressmen behind this particular measure.

The Ozark Wild Horses Protection Act has been around a while, but it should be noted that it is a very straightforward measure. It combines common sense and the will of the people to answer what has turned into a very, very complex problem.

Mr. Speaker, in order to fully explain why my legislation is necessary, I want to give a little brief history about the wild horses that freely roam the Ozark scenic riverways. There are about 25 to 30 animals in the herd which have been around for 60 years or more, if not longer. Some new horses have been born into the herd while others have died off. In this time, however, the animals have never become overpopulated nor a physical nuisance to the lands or waters in which they roam. In fact, the folks of southern Missouri, the people who live there and own the land there, want the horses to stay for future generations to enjoy. They, as I, want this legislation to become law in order to protect the wild horses from being rounded up and carted away.

Mr. Speaker, all told, the wild horses have become a symbol of American freedom and certainly a case in point of the little guy versus government bureaucracy. It is very clear that the horses should be allowed to freely roam the scenic riverways, but due to an arbitrary decision by a local park superintendent some time ago, the National Park Service and the Interior Department, the issue now demands and deserves congressional resolution.

Remember, one of the goals of the 104th Congress is to return power to the people, government to the governed, and by passing the Ozark Wild Horses Protection Act we will be doing just that.

Members should know that there is precedence for allowing horses to remain in a National Park. In the 1980's, a similar case occurred in the Roosevelt National Park in North Dakota where the NPS wanted to proceed with removal, but the local folks wanted them to stay because of their image of the ''roughrider spirit.'' In the final analysis, the Park Service relented and allowed them to remain, because NPS determined that the wild horses are scenic, historic, and cultural.

Unfortunately, in our case, congressional action has been deemed necessary by the Interior Department bureaucracy. Since 1990, park officials have been so adamant about removing the Ozark's wild horses and, I might add, changing their rationale every time as to why they want to, that they have spent countless taxpayers' dollars to take the issue up the court of appeals ladder.

□ 1515

Additionally, this entire time an unwieldy bureaucracy was fighting an amenable, rational, no cost solution strongly and vocally urged by the Missouri Wild Horse League and the public at large—that rationale being simply leave the horses alone.

In fact, on one, including myself, necessarily wanted to pursue legislative action; however, we were forced to seek this route. In a three-page letter dated September 28, 1994, the Park Service stated that ''any amendatory or corrective legislation would have to be initiated by the U.S. Congress'' to keep them from rounding up the horses. Thus, representing the folks of southern Missouri together with the gentlemen from Missouri, Mr. SKELTON and Mr. HANCOCK, I had no other choice but to proceed with this legislation to amend the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act.

In closing, let me say that the horses are a strong part of the regional lore, scenic beauty, and culture in southern Missouri. They also serve as a meaningful attraction for vacationing visitors who come to our area to fish, hunt, canoe, raft, or simply take in the great outdoors. The Ozark Wild Horses Protection Act will hopefully provide justice—once and for all—for the horses and the people who have stood beside them throughout these legal and bureaucratic hurdles.

I urge strong passage of the Ozark Wild Horses Protection Act today, so that the measure can be pursued in Congress' other body. I have been working with our two Senators, Senator BOND and Senator ASHCROFT, and they are ready to proceed with similar legislation in their Chamber following successful action today in the House. We must invoke the will of people unto the bureaucracy and not the other way around. As one of the slogans about the horses back home goes: ''Wild and Free—Let 'em Be.''

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding time to me.

First, let me commend my friend, my colleague, the gentleman from southeast Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], for this piece of legislation. But let me tell Members, it is a shame. It is a shame, Mr. Speaker, that this has to be done. The National Park Service, using good judgment, in its bureaucracy should have let the horses stay where they have been for some 60 years. And now they say, the only way they are going to stay, to our friend, the gentleman from southeast Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], is to get legislation passed.

To his credit, he is doing it. I certainly hope we will pass it here in the House unanimously. I certainly hope that the U.S. Senate will follow suit.

There is such a thing as tradition in this country. There is such a thing as seeing things as they were in yesteryear in this country. We want tourists to come to Missouri. We want tourists to come to this country. We want them to see what happens, what has been around, what makes Americans Americans and Missouri Missouri. And the people understand that who live in our State.

The Missouri Wild Horse League is going to work with the National Park Service under this bill, no expense to the Federal Government. Shame on the bureaucracy and the National Park Service. Let us get this done. And hooray and congratulations to our friend, BILL EMERSON, from the State of Missouri.

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

Again, I urge passage of this bill. I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] for excellent work and the eloquence of these two gentlemen from Missouri is nonpareil. I would like to simply add, let the horses go wild and free.

Mr. Speaker, for decades now locals and visitors to the Ozark National Scenic Riverways have come to enjoy the sight of the free-roaming horses which inhabit the area. When the National Park Service recommended removal of the horses in order to protect the riverways area, a fierce debate broke out.

I would like to see the NPS and local community work together to allow a small number of horses the freedom to roam the area unencumbered. The bill before us will allow for the Wild Horse League of Missouri or a similar group to manage and care for the feral horses in the area. By taking on the management of these horses, the Wild Horse League or similar group will also be responsible for any damage caused by the horses. Further, the bill directs the National Park Service to provide grazing land for the horses.

I support passage of this bill.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wanted to commend the gentlemen from Missouri, both of them on both sides of the aisle for putting forth, especially Mr. EMERSON, this legislation. I think it is good legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it unanimously as well.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 238, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND EXCHANGE AT FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1163) to authorize the exchange of National Park Service land in the Fire Island National Seashore in the State of New York for land in the village of Patchogue, Suffolk County, NY, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1163

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF EXCHANGE.

The Secretary of the Interior may exchange all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain National Park Service lands in the Fire Island National Seashore in the State of New York, described in section 2, for all right, title, and interest of the Village of Patchogue, Suffolk County, New York, in and to certain lands in the Village of Patchogue, described in section 2, without further consideration.

SEC. 2. DESCRIPTION OF LANDS TO BE EXCHANGED.

(a) NATIONAL PARK LANDS.—The National Park Service lands in the Fire Island National Seashore, in the State of New York, referred to in section 1 are the lands generally depicted on the map entitled ''Fire Island National Seashore Land Exchange—Proposed'', dated October 1994.

(b) VILLAGE OF PATCHOGUE LANDS.—The lands in the Village of Patchogue, Suffolk County, New York, referred to in section 1 are the lands generally depicted on the map entitled ''Village of Patchogue Land Exchange—Proposed'', dated October 1994.

(c) MAPS.—The maps referred to in subsections (a) and (b) shall be on file and available for inspection in the Office of the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 3. LANDS ACQUIRED BY SECRETARY.

The lands in the Village of Patchogue that are acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under section 1 shall be added to and administered as part of the Fire Island National Seashore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1163, sponsored by Mr. FORBES, which would authorize the exchange of National Park Service land in the Fire Island National Seashore in the State of New York for land in the village of Patchogue, Suffolk County, NY.

H.R. 1163, introduced by Mr. FORBES authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to exchange approximately 8 acres of riverfront property currently within the Fire Island National Seashore for approximately 2 acres owned by the village of Patchogue, NY.

The village of Patchogue intends that the riverfront area be lightly developed with retail shops and restaurants. Currently, the Patchogue land consists of a large paved area and a few buildings. Fire Island needs the property for overflow parking, vehicle maintenance, and perhaps some office space.

I urge the Members of the House to support this measure that was favorably reported by the House Resources Committee by unanimous voice vote and commend its sponsor for his hard work.

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

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the exchange of land located in Fire Island National Seashore for land owned by the village of Patchogue, NY. This is a good bill. It is a good exchange between the local and Federal governments with respect to the area.

It is a good tradeoff for both sides. It is expected that Fire Island National Seashore would use the acquired land to address the needs for overflow parking, vehicle maintenance, and office space, while the village of Patchogue would use its acquired land for commercial development, including retail shops and restaurants. As I said, this bill will satisfy the needs of both the local and the Federal governments with respect to the area, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES].

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues on the Committee on Resources for their expeditious handling of this vital piece of legislation.

H.R. 1163 would authorize an exchange of two small parcels in the district I am privileged to represent on eastern Long Island. It would be basically an even exchange involving no money.

Mr. Speaker, the Fire Island National Seashore, which is one of the pristine parks on Long Island, and the village of Patchogue have worked hand in hand to bring about this exchange of land. The first parcel is about 1½ acres. It is undeveloped property along the Patchogue River with literally about 20 percent of the parcel under water. And it currently is part of the Fire Island National Seashore.

The second parcel is 1.1 acres and it is a paved area currently owned by the village of Patchogue and being used as a parking lot. The Fire Island National Seashore is in need of a facility, a paved facility, where they can administer their vehicles and have a storage area and for other activity such as overflow parking, storage, et cetera, and a parcel of land, that they do not want to be dependent upon a waterfront location.

Likewise, the village of Patchogue would like riverfront parcels for the purposes of providing for economic development. Patchogue has fallen on difficult times in recent years, and working hand in hand with the mayor of Patchogue, Franklyn S. ''Whitey'' Lewendowsky, and the village board, they are working tirelessly to look for ways for economic development in the village of Patchogue. The village of Patchogue, being affectionately referred to as the downtown area of Brookhaven town.

Patchogue is hoping that this responsible economic redevelopment with the use of capital and job creation will help put a shot in the arm for Patchogue and help to revitalize this critical area in my district.

The exchange is supported by all sides. This is certainly a wonderful example of where local and Federal Government can work hand in hand for the benefit of all the people. The Park Service has several compliance measures that they need to deal with before the actual exchange can take place, but if we authorize it today, everything will be in order when the Park Service completes those vital steps.

I ask for unanimous consent to pass this important piece of legislation.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their assistance in making possible the passage of this measure.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

I would like this body to note the outstanding bipartisanship, especially exhibited by the minority, in the passage of all of these majority Republican bills that are going through and the equanimity and the collegiality in making these bills a reality.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his benevolence. I do appreciate that very much. I also want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] for this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1163, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODOC NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1585) to expand the boundary of the Modoc National Forest to include lands presently owned by the Bank of California, N.A. Trustee, to facilitate a land exchange with the Forest Service, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1585

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Modoc National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Certain private lands presently owned by the Bank of California, N.A. Trustee, are adjacent to the Modoc National Forest and are logical extensions of the forest.

(2) A boundary adjustment will facilitate a land exchange which involves approximately 4,240 acres of National Forest land and 11,804 acres of private land, of which only 760 acres are outside the present Modoc National Forest boundary.

(3) Bank of California, N.A. Trustee, and the Forest Service are prepared to exchange these lands under existing authority of the Secretary of Agriculture which will benefit both the private landowners and the United States by consolidating their respective landownership patterns, providing reduced costs for each party in implementing their land management objectives, providing increased recreation opportunities and fishery habitat for the American public, and providing commercial timber lands to the private landowners.

SEC. 3. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Modoc National Forest is hereby modified to include and encompass 760 acres, more or less, on the following described lands: Mount Diablo Meridian, Lassen County, California, T. 38 N., R. 10 E., sec. 5, SE¼NW¼, E½SW¼; sec. 8, E½NE¼, NE¼NW¼, NE¼SE¼, sec, 16, W½; sec, 25, Lots 13, 14 and 15 (S½SW¼, SW¼SE¼); T. 37 N., R. 11 E., Sec. 20, NW¼SE¼.

(b) RULE FOR LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For the purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–9), the boundary of the Modoc National Forest, as modified by this Act, shall be considered to be the boundary of that National Forest as of January 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1585, sponsored by Mr. HERGER, which would expand the boundary of the Modoc National Forest to include lands presently owned by the Bank of California, N.A., Trustee, and to facilitate a land exchange with the Forest Service.

The Ash Creek Exchange was entered into by the Bank of California, N.A., Trustee [BankCal], and the Forest Service to consolidate their respective holdings in parts of the Lassen, Modoc, and Plumas National Forests. Because certain private lands subject to the exchange were outside but contiguous to the boundary of the Modoc National Forest, the exchange was structured in two phases.

The first phase was completed in June 1993. In phase 1 of the transaction, 11,044 acres of private land were exchanged for 3,757 acres of Forest Service land. Phase 2 of the transaction, which is the subject of this legislation, would transfer approximately 11,804 acres of private land to the Forest Service and approximately 4,240 acres of Forest Service land to private ownership.

The remaining 760 acres of private land is located outside, but contiguous to, the proclamation boundary of the Modoc National Forest. The proposed boundary adjustment will provide for these lands to be acquired by the Forest Service.

H.R. 1585 was favorably reported by the Committee on Resources by unanimous voice vote. I commend the work of my friend, Mr. HERGER, on this measure and urge the Members of the House to support this bill.

□ 1530

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

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this authorization will authorize the final phase of a two-step process to consolidate lands in parts of the Lassen, Modoc, and Plumas National Forests. It will facilitate the transfer of approximately 11,804 acres of private land to the Forest Service in exchange for the 4,240 acres of Forest Service land to be transferred to private ownership. This bill has been worked out with all interested parties and is supported by the administration.

It is a good bill, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], who has worked very hard on this issue. We welcome passing this legislation.

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], the sponsor of this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1585. I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] for their strong support, and also the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] on the minority side.

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial bill that completes an equal value land exchange between the Modoc National Forest and the Bank of California. This legislation enjoys strong support from the Forest Service and local communities in the Lassen and Modoc Counties of northern California.

The land exchange was commenced by the Bank of California and the Forest Service to consolidate their respective holdings in parts of the Lassen, Modoc, and Plumas National Forests. Because the transaction would require a boundary change in the Modoc National Forest, the exchange was structured in two phases. The first phase was completed in June 1993. This legislation will help complete phase 2 of the transaction. The land that will be added to the Modoc National Forest is currently used for grazing and tree production, both of which are consistent with the current land management plan.

Mr. Speaker, this exchange will not adversely affect any existing property or land use rights, and will complete a reasonable and fair transaction. By consolidating Federal landholdings, it will reduce land management costs, increase fishery habitat, and provide additional recreational opportunities within the Modoc National Forest.

Mr. Speaker, I give this bill my full endorsement, and strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of final passage.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1585.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITH THE WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON COUNTY, UT

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1838) to provide for an exchange of lands with the Water Conservancy District of Washington County, UT.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1838

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

SECTION 1. EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITH THE WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this Act, if within 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Water Conservancy District of Washington County, Utah, offers to transfer to the United States all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the Bulloch Site, the Secretary of the Interior shall, in exchange, transfer to the

District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Sand Hollow Site, the Quail Creek Pipeline and Quail Creek Reservoir, subject to valid existing rights.

(b) WATER RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE BULLOCH SITE.—The water rights associated with the Bulloch Site shall not be included in the transfer under subsection (a) but shall be subject to an agreement between the District and the Secretary that the water remain in the Virgin River as an instream flow from the Bulloch Site to the diversion point of the District at the Quail Creek Reservoir.

(c) WITHDRAWAL OF MINERAL INTERESTS.—Subject to valid existing rights, the mineral interests underlying the Sand Hollow Site, the Quail Creek Reservoir, and the Quail Creek Pipeline are hereby withdrawn from disposition under the public land laws and from location, entry, and patent under the mining laws of the United States, from the operation of the mineral leasing laws of the United States, from the operation of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970, and from the operation of the Act of July 31, 1947, commonly known as the ''Materials Act of 1947'' (30 U.S.C. 601 et seq.).

(d) GRAZING.—The exchange of lands under subsection (a) shall be subject to agreement by the District to continue to permit the grazing of domestic livestock on the Sand Hollow Site under the terms and conditions of existing Federal grazing leases or permits, except that the District, upon terminating any such lease or permit, shall fully compensate the holder of the terminated lease or permit.

SEC. 2. EQUALIZATION OF VALUES.

The value of the lands transferred out of Federal ownership under section 1 either shall be equal to the value of the lands received by the Secretary under section 1 or, if not, shall be equalized by—

(1) to the extent possible, transfer of all right, title, and interest of the District in and to lands in Washington County, Utah, and water rights of the District associated thereto, which are within the area providing habitat for the desert tortoise, as determined by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management;

(2) transfer of all right, title, and interest of the District in and to lands in the Smith Site and water rights of the District associated thereto; and

(3) the payment of money of the Secretary, to the extent that lands and rights transferred under paragraphs (1) and (2) are not sufficient to equalize the values of the lands exchanged under section 1.

SEC. 3. MANAGEMENT OF LANDS ACQUIRED BY UNITED STATES.

Lands acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, in accordance with the provisions of law generally applicable to the public lands, including the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SEC. 4. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.

The exchange of lands under this Act is not subject to section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332).

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Water Conservancy District of Washington County, Utah.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) BULLOCH SITE.—The term ''Bulloch Site'' means the lands located in Kane County, Utah, adjacent to Zion National Park, more particularly described as follows:

BULLOCH SITE

	Section		Acres
T 39 S R 9 W (Private)	32	S½	320
	33	SW¼, S½ SW¼ NW¼	180
		Total	500
T 40 S R 9 W (State)	5	S½, SW¼ NE¼, NE¼ NE¼	400
	6	S½, NE¼	480
		Total	880
		GRAND TOTAL	1,380

(4) SAND HOLLOW SITE.—The term ''Sand Hollow Site'' means the lands located in Washington County, Utah, more particularly described as follows:

SAND HOLLOW RESERVOIR SITE

	Section		Acres
T 42 S R 14 W	13	SW¼	160
	23	E½, E½ W½	480
	24	All	640
	26	NE¼, E½ NW¼, N½ SE½	320
	25	All	640
T 42 S R 13 W	19	W½, SW¼ SE¼	360
	30	W½, W½ NE¼	400
		GRAND TOTAL	3,000

(5) QUAIL CREEK PIPELINE.—The term ''Quail Creek Pipeline'' means the lands located in Washington County, Utah, more particularly described as follows:

QUAIL CREEK PIPELINE

	Section		Acres
T 41 S R 12 W River-pipeline	30	NW¼ NW¼	40
		Total	40

(6) QUAIL CREEK RESERVOIR.—The term ''Quail Creek Reservoir'' means the lands located in Washington County, Utah, more particularly described as follows:

QUAIL CREEK RESERVOIR

	Section		Acres
T 41 S R 14 W	23	Tract 38	9.51
	23	Lot 2	40.00
	23	SW¼ SW¼ SE¼ SE¼	2.50
		Total	52.01
	25	W½ SW¼ NW¼	20
	25	SE¼ SW¼ NW¼	10
	25	W½ SE¼ SE¼ NW¼	5
	25	NW¼ SW¼	40
	25	W½ W½ NE¼ SW¼	10
		Total	85
	26	Lot 1	15.97
	26	Lot 8	40.00
	26	Lot 12	17.45
	26	Lot 15	42.23
	26	Lot 16	42.39
	26	SE¼ NE¼	40.00

QUAIL CREEK RESERVOIR—Continued

	Section		Acres
		Total	198.04
	35	E½ E½ NW¼	40.00
	35	SW¼ NE¼	40.00
	35	W½ SE¼ NE¼	20.00
	35	NE¼ SE¼ NE¼	10.00
	35	N½ NW¼ SE¼	20.00
	35	NW¼ NE¼ SE¼	10.00
	35	N½ SE¼ NW¼ SE¼	5.00
		Total	145.00
		Grand Total	480.05

(7) SMITH SITE.—The term ''Smith Site'' means the lands located in Washington County, Utah, adjacent to Zion National Park and more particularly described as follows:

SMITH PROPERTY

	Section	
T 40 S R 11 W	5	Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, & 11 E½ SW¼, SE¼ NW¼
	6	Lot 1, S½, NE¼ and beginning at a point 2 rods west of the northeast corner of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter; thence east 2 rods; thence south 80 rods; thence west 16 rods; thence in a northeasterly direction to the point of beginning
	8	E½ NW¼, E½ SW¼ and lots 1 & 2 excepting the south 1200 feet of the SE¼ SW¼
T 39 S R 11 W	30	W½ NE¼, W½ SE¼, SE¼ SW¼, W½ SE¼ NE¼, W½ E½ SE¼
	31	E½, E½ SW¼ and lots 3 & 4
	32	SW¼
		Containing 1,550 acres more or less

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1838, sponsored by Mr. HANSEN, which would allow the Water Conservancy District of Washington County, UT, and the Department of the Interior to achieve a number of high priority objectives. As a result of the legislation, the conservancy district will be authorized to acquire lands needed for the proposed Sand Hollow offstream water storage reservoir and lands inundated by the existing Quail Creek Reservoir and other lands essential to reservoir operation.

In exchange, the Department of the Interior would receive the Bulloch water storage reservoir site and other lands adjacent to Zion National Park, which are important to preserve

instream flows and operation of the natural hydrograph of the North Fork of the Virgin River through the park. Exchange of these lands is an essential component in the resolution of the parks water flow agreement with the State of Utah. The exchange will also allow the Department of the Interior to acquire critical habitat for the desert tortoise, a threatened species.

The Bulloch Reservoir site lies above Zion National Park and its acquisition has been a goal of the National Park Service for many years. Locating an alternative water storage site in Sand Hollow is a good-faith effort by the water district to accommodate this concern.

This noncontroversial bill was favorably reported by the Committee on Resources by voice vote. I commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his excellent work on this measure and urge the Members of the House to support this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this land exchange will allow the Department of the Interior to acquire needed land for the Bulloch Water Storage Reservoir Site as well as lands adjacent to the Zion National Park in exchange for lands needed by the Washington County Water Conservancy District for water storage. The exchange will also provide the Department of the Interior with critical habitat lands for the desert tortoise.

The administration supports this land exchange, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1838.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN GILPIN COUNTY, CO

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2437), to provide for the exchange of certain lands in Gilpin County, CO, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2437

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds and declares that—

(1) certain scattered parcels of Federal land located within Gilpin County, Colorado, are currently administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the Royal Gorge Resource Area, Canon City District, United States Bureau of Land Management;

(2) these land parcels, which comprises approximately 133 separate tracts of land, and range in size from approximately 38 acres to much less than an acre have been identified as suitable for disposal by the Bureau of Land Management through its resource management planning process and are appropriate for disposal; and

(3) even though the Federal land parcels in Gilpin County, Colorado, are scattered and small in size, they nevertheless by virtue of their proximity to existing communities appear to have a fair market value which may be used by the Federal Government to exchange for lands which will better lend themselves to Federal management and have higher values for future public access, use and enjoyment, recreation, the protection and enhancement of fish and wildlife and fish and wildlife habitat, and the protection of riparian lands, wetlands, scenic beauty and other public values.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to authorize, direct, facilitate and expedite the land exchange set forth herein in order to further the public interest by disposing of Federal lands with limited public utility and acquire in exchange therefor lands with important values for permanent public management and protection.

SEC. 2. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The exchange directed by this Act shall be consummated if within 90 days after enactment of this Act, Lake Gulch, Inc., a Colorado Corporation (as defined in section 4 of this Act) offers to transfer to the United States pursuant to the provisions of this Act the offered lands or interests in land described herein.

(b) CONVEYANCE BY LAKE GULCH.—Subject to the provisions of section 3 of this Act, Lake Gulch shall convey to the Secretary of the Interior all right, title, and interest in and to the following offered lands—

(1) certain lands comprising approximately 40 acres with improvements thereon located in Larimer County, Colorado, and lying within the boundaries of Rocky Mountain National Park as generally depicted on a map entitled ''Circle C Church Camp'', dated August 1994, which shall upon their acquisition by the United States and without further action by the Secretary of the Interior be incorporated into Rocky Mountain National Park and thereafter be administered in accordance with the laws, rules and regulations generally applicable to the National Park System and Rocky Mountain National Park;

(2) certain lands located within and adjacent to the United States Bureau of Land Management San Luis Resource Area in Conejos County, Colorado, which comprise approximately 3,993 acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled ''Quinlan Ranches Tract'', dated August 1994; and

(3) certain lands located within the United States Bureau of Land Management Royal Gorge Resource Area in Huerfano County, Colorado, which comprise approximately 4,700 acres and are generally depicted on a map entitled ''Bonham Ranch-Cucharas Canyon'', dated June 1995: Provided, however, That it is the intention of Congress that such lands may remain available for the grazing of livestock as determined appropriate by the Secretary in accordance with applicable laws, rules, and regulations: Provided further, That if the Secretary determines that certain of the lands acquired adjacent to Cucharas Canyon hereunder are not needed for public purposes they may be sold in accordance with the provisions of section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and other applicable law.

(c) SUBSTITUTION OF LANDS.—If one or more of the precise offered land parcels identified above is unable to be conveyed to the United States due to appraisal or other problems, Lake Gulch and the Secretary may mutually agree to substitute therefor alternative offered lands acceptable to the Secretary.

(d) CONVEYANCE BY THE UNITED STATES.—(1) Upon receipt of title to the lands identified in subsection (a) the Secretary shall simultaneously convey to Lake Gulch all right, title, and interest of the United States, subject to valid existing rights, in and to the following selected lands—

(A) certain surveyed lands located in Gilpin County, Colorado, Township 3 South, Range 72 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Section 18, Lots 118–220, which comprise approximately 195 acres and are intended to include all federally owned lands in section 18, as generally depicted on a map entitled ''Lake Gulch Selected Lands'', dated July 1994;

(B) certain surveyed lands located in Gilpin County, Colorado, Township 3 South, Range 72 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Section 17, Lots 37, 38, 39, 40, 52, 53, and 54, which comprise approximately 96 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled ''Lake Gulch Selected Lands'', dated July 1994; and

(C) certain unsurveyed lands located in Gilpin County, Colorado, Township 3 South, Range 73 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Section 13, which comprise approximately 11 acres, and are generally depicted as parcels 302–304, 306 and 308–326 on a map entitled ''Lake Gulch Selected Lands'', dated July 1994: Provided, however, That a parcel or parcels of land in section 13 shall not be transferred to Lake Gulch if at the time of the proposed transfer the parcel or parcels are under formal application for transfer to a qualified unit of local government. Due to the small and unsurveyed nature of such parcels proposed for transfer to Lake Gulch in section 13, and the high cost of surveying such small parcels, the Secretary is authorized to transfer such section 13 lands to Lake Gulch without survey based on such legal or other description as the Secretary determines appropriate to carry out the basic intent of the map cited in this subparagraph.

(2) If the Secretary and Lake Gulch mutually agree, and the Secretary determines it is in the public interest, the Secretary may utilize the authority and direction of this Act to transfer to Lake Gulch lands in sections 17 and 13 that are in addition to those precise selected lands shown on the map cited herein, and which are not under formal application for transfer to a qualified unit of local government, upon transfer to the Secretary of additional offered lands acceptable to the Secretary or upon payment to the Secretary by Lake Gulch of cash equalization money amounting to the full appraised fair market value of any such additional lands. If any such additional lands are located in section 13 they may be transferred to Lake Gulch without survey based on such legal or other description as the Secretary determines appropriate as long as the Secretary determines that the boundaries of any adjacent lands not owned by Lake Gulch can be properly identified so as to avoid possible future boundary conflicts or disputes. If the Secretary determines surveys are necessary to convey any such additional lands to Lake Gulch, the costs of such surveys shall be paid by Lake Gulch but shall not be eligible for any adjustment in the value of such additional lands pursuant to section 206(f)(2) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (as amended by the Federal Land Exchange Facilitation Act of 1988) (43 U.S.C. 1716(f)(2)).

(3) Prior to transferring out of public ownership pursuant to this Act or other authority of law any lands which are contiguous to North Clear Creek southeast of the City of Black

Hawk, Colorado in the County of Gilpin, Colorado, the Secretary shall notify and consult with the County and City and afford such units of local government an opportunity to acquire or reserve pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 or other applicable law, such easements or rights-of-way parallel to North Clear Creek as may be necessary to serve public utility line or recreation path needs: Provided, however, That any survey or other costs associated with the acquisition or reservation of such easements or rights-of-way shall be paid for by the unit or units of local government concerned.

SEC. 3. TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EXCHANGE.

(a) EQUALIZATION OF VALUES.—(1) The values of the lands to be exchanged pursuant to this Act shall be equal as determined by the Secretary of the Interior utilizing comparable sales of surface and subsurface property and nationally recognized appraisal standards, including, to the extent appropriate, the Uniform Standards for Federal Land Acquisition, the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, the provisions of section 206(d) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(d)), and other applicable law.

(2) In the event any cash equalization or land sale moneys are received by the United States pursuant to this Act, any such moneys shall be retained by the Secretary of the Interior and may be utilized by the Secretary until fully expended to purchase from willing sellers land or water rights, or a combination thereof, to augment wildlife habitat and protect and restore wetlands in the Bureau of Land Management's Blanca Wetlands, Alamosa County, Colorado.

(3) Any water rights acquired by the United States pursuant to this section shall be obtained by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with all applicable provisions of Colorado law, including the requirement to change the time, place, and type of use of said water rights through the appropriate State legal proceedings and to comply with any terms, conditions, or other provisions contained in an applicable decree of the Colorado Water Court. The use of any water rights acquired pursuant to this section shall be limited to water that can be used or exchanged for water that can be used on the Blanca Wetlands. Any requirement or proposal to utilize facilities of the San Luis Valley Project, Closed Basin Diversion, in order to effectuate the use of any such water rights shall be subject to prior approval of the Rio Grande Water Conservation District.

(b) RESTRICTIONS ON SELECTED LANDS.—(1) Conveyance of the selected lands to Lake Gulch pursuant to this Act shall be contingent upon Lake Gulch executing an agreement with the United States prior to such conveyance, the terms of which are acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, and which—

(A) grant the United States a covenant that none of the selected lands (which currently lie outside the legally approved gaming area) shall ever be used for purposes of gaming should the current legal gaming area ever be expanded by the State of Colorado; and

(B) permanently hold the United States harmless for liability and indemnify the United States against all costs arising from any activities, operations (including the storing, handling, and dumping of hazardous materials or substances) or other acts conducted by Lake Gulch or its employees, agents, successors or assigns on the selected lands after their transfer to Lake Gulch: Provided, however, That nothing in this Act shall be construed as either diminishing or increasing any responsibility or liability of the United States based on the condition of the selected lands prior to or on the date of their transfer to Lake Gulch.

(2) Conveyance of the selected lands to Lake Gulch pursuant to this Act shall be subject to the existing easement for Gilpin County Road 6.

(3) The above terms and restrictions of this subsection shall not be considered in determining, or result in any diminution in, the fair market value of the selected land for purposes of the appraisals of the selected land required pursuant to section 3 of this Act.

(c) REVOCATION OF WITHDRAWAL.—The Public Water Reserve established by Executive order dated April 17, 1926 (Public Water Reserve 107), Serial Number Colorado 17321, is hereby revoked insofar as it affects the NW¼ SW¼ of Section 17, Township 3 South, Range 72 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, which covers a portion of the selected lands identified in this Act.

SEC. 4. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this Act:

(1) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The term ''Lake Gulch'' means Lake Gulch, Inc., a Colorado corporation, or its successors, heirs or assigns.

(3) The term ''offered land'' means lands to be conveyed to the United States pursuant to this Act.

(4) The term ''selected land'' means lands to be transferred to Lake Gulch, Inc., or its successors, heirs or assigns pursuant to this Act.

(5) The term ''Blanca Wetlands'' means an area of land comprising approximately 9,290 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled ''Blanca Wetlands'', dated August 1994, or such land as the Secretary may add thereto by purchase from willing sellers after the date of enactment of this Act utilizing funds provided by this Act or such other moneys as Congress may appropriate.

(b) TIME REQUIREMENT FOR COMPLETING TRANSFER.—It is the intent of Congress that unless the Secretary and Lake Gulch mutually agree otherwise the exchange of lands authorized and directed by this Act shall be completed not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act. In the event the exchange cannot be consummated within such 6-month-time period, the Secretary, upon application by Lake Gulch, is directed to sell to Lake Gulch at appraised fair market value any or all of the parcels (comprising a total of approximately 11 acres) identified in section 2(d)(1)(C) of this Act as long as the parcel or parcels applied for are not under formal application for transfer to a qualified unit of local government.

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF LANDS ACQUIRED BY UNITED STATES.—In accordance with the provisions of section 206(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(c)), all lands acquired by the United States pursuant to this Act shall upon acceptance of title by the United States and without further action by the Secretary concerned become part of and be managed as part of the administrative unit or area within which they are located.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2437, sponsored by Mr. MCINNIS, which would authorize an equal-value exchange under which the United States would transfer about 300 acres of BLM-managed public lands near the city of Black Hawk, in Gilpin County, CO, to a named company, which would transfer to the U.S. specified lands, amounting to about 8,739 acres, elsewhere in Colorado.

The Gilpin County lands are 133 parcels, ranging from 38 acres to .01 acre; 90 are less than 1 acre. They were originally acquired by the United States from France in the Louisiana Purchase. From extensive gold discoveries, the area is criss-crossed with patented mining claims; the 133 parcels are intermingled fragments that are essentially unmanageable, and have been identified as suitable for disposal by the Bureau of Land Management. However, the U.S. cannot readily realize their fair-market value through normal BLM disposal procedures because of the high costs of surveys and other necessary administrative expenses. H.R. 2437 is intended to enable the U.S. to obtain the value by the acquisition of designated lands.

The lands that have been identified for the U.S. to receive would include about 40 acres within the Rocky Mountain National Park, nearly 4,000 acres in Conejos County, and about 4,700 acres—known as Bonham Ranch—intermingled with BLM-managed lands along Cucharas Canyon in Huerfano County, CO.

H.R. 2437 was reported favorably by the Committee on Resources by voice vote. I commend the sponsor of this bill on his hard work and urge the Members of the House to support this measure.

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

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], the author of this bill, who developed this legislation, shepherded it, and it is in his congressional district. I wish to commend the gentleman from this good piece of legislation, which he has been working on for many years.

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] for his help in moving this legislation, as well as the help of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY], in managing this bill today. I especially appreciate, as well, the assistance of my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], who is the sponsor of this legislation. I have been very glad to have the chance to work with him on this bill.

As the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] indicated, this is a pretty straightforward proposition, one that I think serves both the local and the national interest in a nice way. We are exchanging some 300 acres in 133 separate parcels near the town of Blackhawk, CO, in my congressional

district, for some 8,700 acres of now privately-owned land in other parts of the State of Colorado.

The current BLM-owned lands near Blackhawk are very fragmented and unmanageable, and really do not lend themselves at all to the normal sorts of appraisal and transfer processes that involve expensive surveys and all the rest. This bill enables both the Government and some interests that are proposing private development near Blackhawk to make a match that will be in everyone's long-term interest.

The three major tracts that will be acquired by the Federal Government in exchange for these properties involve a very important 40 acres within Rocky Mountain National Park known as the Circle C Church Camp, an area that the Park Service has been anxious to bring under Park Service management for a long time; about 4,000 acres along the La Jara Canyon in Conejos County, again, important for both management, wildlife, and recreational purposes; and some 4,700 acres in Huerfano County, again involving very important scenic, recreational, and wildlife habitat areas in a beautiful canyon there.

This is legislation that I think has no opponents and has all of the right proponents, including all of the interested parties in the State of Colorado, the local governments, and all the rest. Again, I thank all involved in this on the Committee on Resources for their assistance in moving it along, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. HANSEN, and Ranking Member BILL RICHARDSON for bringing this bill to the floor today. I appreciate their good work, and I also greatly appreciate all that my colleague from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS, has done in connection with this legislation that affects both our districts. I am very glad to have had the chance to work with him on this bill.

This is a straightforward and I believe a noncontroversial measure. It provides for a land exchange under which the public will receive more than 8,700 acres of Colorado lands that are important for recreational and environmental purposes, in exchange for about 300 acres near the town of Black Hawk, in Gilpin County, that are appropriate for development.

Under the exchange, the Gilpin County lands, located in my congressional district, would be transferred from Federal ownership to Lake Gulch, Inc., a private firm, in exchange for Lake Gulch's transfer to the United States of the other lands specified in the bill.

These Gilpin County lands comprise 133 separate parcels, ranging in size from 38 acres to one one-hundredth of an acre—in fact, 90 of them are less than an acre. These lands were originally acquired by the United States from France through the Louisiana Purchase. After the discovery of gold in Gilpin County, most of the immediately adjacent lands—also Federal public domain lands acquired in the same way—were claimed under the mining laws and thus passed into private ownership.

However, the 133 parcels covered by the bill are still in the public domain. For the most part, they are left-over fragments, intermingled with private lands. They are essentially unmanageable, and have been identified as suitable for disposal by the Bureau of Land Management. That means that BLM has the legal authority to dispose of them for fair market value.

The problem, though, is that the fragmented nature of the lands, and the resulting very small size of many tracts, makes it very difficult for the Government to obtain that fair market value because of the high costs of surveys and other necessary administrative expenses.

This bill responds to that problem. It will enable the United States to realize the value of these Gilpin County lands by transferring them to the Lake Gulch corporation in exchange for other lands of equal value that have resources, including potential for recreational uses, which give them priority status for acquisition by Federal land-management agencies.

These lands that the United States will receive include: About 40 acres within Rocky Mountain National Park—known as the ''Circle C Church Camp'' tract—that has been a long-time acquisition priority for the National Park Service; nearly 4,000 acres in Conejos County—known as the Quinlan Ranches parcel, bordering on the scenic La Jara Canyon, that is intermingled with Federal lands managed by the BLM and the Forest Service and that has recreational values as well as elk winter range and other wildlife habitat; and about 4,700 acres—known as the Bonham Ranch, now intermingled with BLM-managed lands along Cucharas Canyon in Huerfano County, whose acquisition will enable BLM to protect more than 5 miles of the scenic canyon, with its important wildlife habitat—including raptor nesting areas, cultural resources, and recreational uses.

The bill also would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to agree to transfer certain additional adjacent Gilpin County lands in exchange for additional lands acceptable to the Secretary or payment of the fair market value of any such additional Gilpin County lands.

I want to stress that the bill authorizes only an equal-value exchange. If it's determined that the value of the Gilpin County lands is greater than the value of the lands transferred to the United States, Lake Gulch will be required to pay the difference. Any such payment would be used to acquire from willing sellers land or water rights in the BLM-managed Blanca wetlands near Alamosa, an area with crucial winter habitat for bald eagles and a very productive area for ducks and geese.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is good for economic development in Gilpin County and good for the environment and outdoor recreation in Colorado. The administration supports the bill, and it also has the support of Governor Romer, the Colorado Division of Wildlife, and affected local governments including Black Hawk, Central City, and Gilpin County, as well as local and national environmental and conservation organizations. I urge its passage by the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Gilpin County land parcels currently managed by the BLM consist of 133 parcels ranging in size from one-tenth acre to 38 acres. I think, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] mentioned, this bill is pretty straight forward. These are fragments scattered in an area crisscrossed with patent and mining claims, making their management extremely difficult.

What this legislation does, it would authorize an equal value land exchange, and my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], as I said, has worked for some time on this issue with the administration and the local parties affected. I commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS], too, for his efforts, and my colleagues on the majority side. This bill has wide support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I want to state that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] wanted to be here, but he could not make it here today. I would note that for the record. I also want to thank the gentlemen from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. SKAGGS, for their cooperative work on this issue. I think it is time we straightened up these small parcels and get some uniformity. I think this is a good piece of legislation, and I appreciate the statements made by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I think it is helpful in a bipartisan way to get some of this straightened out.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2437, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1545

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the 7 measures just considered.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule 1, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1802

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS] at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on approval of the Journal and then on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: Approval of the Journal de novo; House Joint Resolution 69, by the yeas and nays; House Joint Resolution 110, by the yeas and nays; House Joint Resolution 111, by the yeas and nays; and House Joint Resolution 112, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

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

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

REAPPOINTMENT OF HOMER ALFRED NEAL TO THE SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 69.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 69, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 765]

YEAS—386

Abercrombie
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—46

Ackerman
Andrews
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Bartlett
Clay
Collins (MI)
Deal
Ehlers
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Gallegly
Hoke
Inglis
Jacobs
Kennedy (MA)
Klink
Lincoln
Lowey
Manton
McDade
McKinney
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Molinari
Myrick
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Rush
Slaughter
Stokes
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Walsh
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson

□ 1825

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 765. I missed the vote due to cancellation of one airplane flight and mechanical problems requiring the delay of another flight. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

APPOINTMENT OF HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., TO SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 110.

The clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 110, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 766]

YEAS—389

Abercrombie
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—43

Ackerman
Andrews
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Bartlett
Clay
Collins (MI)
Deal
Ehlers
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Gallegly
Hoke
Inglis
Jacobs
Klink
Lincoln
Lowey
Manton
McDade
McKinney
Menendez
Molinari
Myrick
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Rush
Slaughter
Stokes
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Walsh
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson

□ 1835

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolutin was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 766, I missed the vote due to cancellation of one airplane flight and mechanical problems requiring the delay of another flight. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

APPOINTMENT OF ANNE D'HARNONCOURT TO THE SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 111.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 111, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 767]

YEAS—389

Abercrombie
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker

Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—43

Ackerman
Andrews
Baker (LA)
Barr
Bartlett
Clay
Collins (MI)
Deal
Ehlers
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Gallegly
Hoke
Inglis
Jacobs
Klink
Lincoln
Lowey
Manton
McDade
McKinney
Menendez
Molinari
Myrick
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Rush
Slaughter
Stokes
Studds
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Walsh
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson

☐ 1842

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 767, I missed the vote due to cancellation of one airplane flight and mechanical problems requiring the delay of another flight. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

APPOINTMENT OF LOUIS GERSTNER TO SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 112.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 112, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded this is a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 768]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—42

Ackerman
Andrews
Baker (LA)
Barr
Bartlett
Bateman
Clay
Collins (MI)
Deal
Ehlers
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Gallegly
Inglis
Jacobs
Klink
Lincoln
Lowey
Manton
McDade
McKinney
Menendez
Molinari
Myrick
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Slaughter
Stokes
Studds
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Walsh
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson

☐ 1850

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 768, I missed the vote due to cancellation of one airplane flight and mechanical problems requiring the delay of another flight. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it was this Member's intent to vote ''aye'' on October 31, 1995, on H.R. 1905, the fiscal year 1996 Energy and Water Appropriation Conference Report. This Member was present and attempted to vote in favor of the conference report, but apparently for some technical reason the vote was not recorded.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 395, ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION ASSET SALE AND TERMINATION ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–314) on the resolution (H. Res. 256) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 395) 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT OF 1994 EXTENSION

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2589) to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until December 31, 1995, and for other purposes, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2589 temporarily extends the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 which expired on November 1, 1995. That act was previously extended by Public Law 10417, by Public Law 10422, and by Public Law 10430. H.R. 2589 extends the act until December 31, 1995, and includes the transition provision to permit the President to immediately exercise the authorities granted him by this extension.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 927, CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY (LIBERTAD) ACT OF 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? The Chair hears none, and without objection appoints the following conferees: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Messrs. KING, DIAZ-BALART, HAMILTON, GEJDENSON, TORRICELLI, and MENENDEZ.

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 1995, CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31, HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF YITZHAK RABIN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Wednesday, November 8, 1995, to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 in the House, and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the resolution to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question, except 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

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

There was no objection.

EDIBLE OIL REGULATORY REFORM ACT

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 436), to require the head of any Federal agency to differentiate between fats, oils, and greases of animal, marine, and vegetable origin, and other oils and greases, in issuing certain regulations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, after ''to'' insert: ''the transportation, storage, discharge, release, emission, or disposal of''.

Page 2, line 9, strike out ''any'' the second time it appears and insert ''that''.

Page 2, line 18, strike out ''such'' and insert ''that''.

Page 2, line 22, strike out ''different'' the first time it appears.

Page 2, line 23, strike out ''as provided'' and insert: ''based on considerations''.

Page 3, line 12, strike out ''carrying oil in bulk as cargo or cargo residue''.

Page 3, line 13, after ''carried'' insert ''as cargo''.

Mr. BILBRAY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] so that he could tell us the changes made in the Senate version as related to the original House revision.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has included the reference in the first section A to include the transportation, storage, discharge, and release of emissions or disposal thereof, which actually was part of our original bill that came out of committee. They have retained the other sections, except for in reference to cargo and transportation.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, we have no objection.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, today the U.S. House of Representatives has an opportunity to finally remedy one of the unnecessary and illogical Federal regulations that led to the creation of corrections day. H.R. 436, the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act, which I introduced early this year, along with Ms. DANNER of Missouri, will restore common sense to the Federal regulatory process by requiring Federal agencies to recognize the obvious differences between edible oils and toxic oils when issuing and promulgating regulations.

In addition to thanking Ms. DANNER, I also want to thank Speaker GINGRICH, who deserves special credit for establishing the corrections day process which allows the Congress to take expedited action to correct unnecessary, and sometime foolish, regulations which hurt our economy and frustrate the American public. Lastly, I want to thank Chairman BLILEY, Chairman ROBERTS, Chairman SHUSTER, and the corrections day task force for all of their cooperation and assistance, which has allowed the House to reach this point, adopt H.R. 436, and send the bill to the President for his signature.

The agricultural oils covered by H.R. 436 are nontoxic, natural products, like cooking and salad oils, which many of us eat every day. Their unnecessarily stringent regulation forces producers, shippers, and manufacturers to comply with costly and counterproductive requirements, without providing any additional measure of protection to the environment or enhancing the health and safety of our citizens.

Simply stated, H.R. 436 will require Federal agencies to differentiate between edible oils and petroleum-based oils when promulgating regulations under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990. This common sense legislation does not change or weaken the underlying principles of the Oil Protection Act of 1990 or other related statutes like the Clean Water Act.

In passing H.R. 436, Congress is sending a strong message to Federal regulators. It is the Congress' intent for Federal agencies to recognize, and not ignore, the differences between animal fats and vegetable oils and all

other oils, including toxic petroleum oil. Specifically, H.R. 436 requires Federal agencies charged with regulation of the transportation, storage, discharge, release, emission, or disposal of oil to establish a separate class for animal fats and vegetable oils and to consider the differences in characteristics of these edible oils and other types of oils.

While an agency may consider the characteristics of animal fats and vegetable oil and determine that for a particular regulation no differentiation is required, the agency may only do that where there are no differences in the characteristics that are relevant to that regulation. For example, in the case of regulations dealing with oil spill response, common sense dictates that the non-toxic, biodegradable, and nonpersistent characteristics of animal fats and vegetable oils be recognized and reflected in the oil spill response regulations. It seems clear to everybody except Federal regulators that the Oil Pollution Act was designed to reduce the risk of, improve the response to, and minimize the impact of catastrophic oil spills like the one in Prince William Sound, Alaska—not to regulate edible agricultural products.

In fact, vegetable oils have been used to help clean up beaches fowled with petroleum, and vegetable oils are also being explored as substitute lubricants for machinery in environmentally sensitive areas. This not only demonstrates the significant difference between vegetable oils and petroleum oils, it highlights the fact that animal fats and vegetable oils do not pose the same risk to human health and the environment, and should not be treated the same way.

The financial responsibility relief provided in H.R. 436, as amended, applies only to exclusive shippers of animal fats and vegetable oils, and it brings industry insurance and bonding requirements back into line with the value of the product. Like the rest of H.R. 436, nothing in this section exempts edible oils from all regulatory requirements. The net effect will be to place transporters of edible oils on par with other shipments of nontoxic products, and it will allow U.S. agricultural oils to be more competitive in world markets.

Although the House has already acted three times on this issue in the 104th Congress, H.R. 436 should be adopted as a stand-alone measure because similar language was adopted twice in the House and once in the Senate during the 103rd Congress, only to see the underlying bills die at the end of 1994. I know of no objection to the substance of H.R. 436 from any Member of this body, or from the administration. H.R. 436 passed on voice votes in both the Commerce and Agriculture Committees, and in the House on October 10. In fact, judging from the bipartisan mix of cosponsors, H.R. 436 enjoys broad support and is absolutely non-controversial.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the Members—from both sides of the aisle—who have worked hard to see H.R. 436 enacted, for their input and cooperation on this issue. It is time to finally solve this problem.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 436.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 436, the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act, as amended by the Senate. The legislation passed the House, as part of the Corrections Day Calendar, on October 10, 1995. The Senate passed the bill with minor amendments on November 2, 1995.

The bill embodies the overwhelming sentiment that Congress can and should interject common sense into various Federal regulations.

H.R. 436, requires that Federal regulations differencies between animal fats and vegetable oils on the one hand, and petroleum products on the other. It does not exempt animal fats and vegetable oils from any regulatory requirement. The bill simply requires Federal regulators to consider the different physical, biological, and chemical properties of these oils as opposed to petroleum based oils.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has already passed language very similar to H.R. 436 in two separate contexts: section 413 of H.R. 1361, the Coast Guard Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, and section 506 of H.R. 961, the Clean Water Amendments of 1995. Both bills subsequent passed the House of Representatives by wide margins.

Over the last several years, the Committee has gathered testimony and other data indicating that the need for this legisaltion stems primarily from the current or proposed regulations under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and the Clean Water Act—statutes which are under the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

When Congress passed the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, in the wake of the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill, the focus was on crude oil and other petroleum products, not on animal fats or vegetable oils. Although the definition of oil under both the Oil Pollution Act and the Clean Water Act can be read to include these products, regulating them under standards developed for petroleum oils make no sense. This is a prime example of the kind of regulation run amok that has given rise to the corrections calendar.

This is a common sense reform. It does not say that animal fat and vegetable oil should be exempt from regulation. It merely requires Federal agencies to take a second look at these substances and regulate them according to their relative threat to the environment.

We believe substances that are biodegradable, nonpersistent in the environment, and are essentially components of human and wildlife diets should not be treated the same as crude oil. It's that simple. In addition, these products are shipped in much smaller quantities than petroleum based products and they have a safety record that is the envy of the marine industry. Only 4 tenths of 1 percent of the spills from 1986–1992 were from animal fats or vegetable oils.

I would also add a note of thanks to the bill's primary sponsors, Representative EWING and Representative DANNER, and other supporters, for their efforts. Because it was drafted in a generic, agency-wide manner, H.R. 436 was initially referred to the Commerce and Agriculture Committees. All of us know, however, that the primary purpose of the bill is to address problems under the Oil Pollution Act and the Clean Water Act, which are under the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Therefore, I also want to thank the leadership of both Committees for their cooperation in getting this important legislation to the House floor, through the other body, and—I hope—on its way to the President.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 436, and the Senate amendments thereto.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 2126

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds, and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule 28, clause 1(c), I am announcing that tomorrow I will offer a motion to instruct the House conferees on the bill, H.R. 2126, to insist on sections 8102 and 8111 of the House-passed bill.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. METCALF moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the bill H.R. 2126 be instructed to insist on sections numbered 8102 and 8111 of H.R. 2126 as passed by the House restricting the deployment of United States Armed Forces in the former Yugoslavia.

□ 1900

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). 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.

IN MEMORY OF YITZHAK RABIN

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the tragic assassination of Israel's Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. I offer my sympathies to the Rabin family, to the Israeli people, and to all who mourn the loss of this great man.

Yitzhak Rabin was an Israeli patriot and courageous leader whose life will

be forever intertwined with the history of Israel. As a general, he led the heroic effort to secure Israel's existence. As a statesman, he made the historic decision to seek peace for his nation. Only a man who so fully understood the struggle to create a secure and democratic Israel could seize the moment to pursue peace.

It is tragically fitting that Prime Minister Rabin's last act was to speak in support of the peace process—a difficult yet vital process to which he devoted the past 2 years of his life.

I can add little to the words Yitzhak Rabin spoke on his last day. He said: ''I was a military man for 27 years. I waged war as long as there was no chance for peace. I believe there is now a chance for peace, a great chance, and we must take advantage of it for those who are standing here, and for those who are not here—and they are many. I have always believed that the majority of the people want peace and are ready to take a chance for peace.''

Yitzhak Rabin has done as much as anyone to build the Jewish state, defend it in time of need, and foster relationships with Israel's neighbors so that future generations will know peace instead of war. We mourn the loss of Yitzhak Rabin and pray that his life's work may continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CALLING FOR ABOLITION OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE

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. Mr. Speaker, 1 year from now, 1 year from this week, the entire Nation will be watching the results of the 1996 presidential election. As 1992 had a lot of suspense to it, including three candidates, 1996 could be a real roller coaster ride.

That is why I am introducing legislation today that would amend the Constitution of the United States to do away with the Electoral College and the winner-take-all system that says that a presidential candidate who wins even by 1 percent of the votes in a State therefore takes all the electoral votes in that State.

The reason I am calling to do away with the Electoral College is because I think 1 year from today we should not have the kind of possible suspenseful outcome that could happen. Because, Mr. Speaker, 1 year from today, as I read the newspapers and as I look at the tea leaves, we could have as many as four presidential candidates on the ballot.

We could have the Democratic nominee, presumably William Clinton. We could have the Republican nominee. We could have the Independent United We Stand nominee, Ross Perot or someone else. I have heard talk of Jesse Jackson running as an Independent candidate. And who knows who else that may be running and winning a significant number of votes? As the system stands, if there is no one that is a clear winner in the Electoral College, then that election comes to the House of Representatives.

In 1992, if that had been the outcome, I suspect that the Republican candidate would have been concerned about coming into the House of Representatives, which was controlled by the Democratic Party. And so in 1996 it is fair to say the Democratic candidate may have some hesitation about coming to the House of Representatives controlled by the Republican Party. But I will tell you who really ought to be upset, would be an Independent candidate who has to come to a House that they do not have any votes, Republican or Democrat, in.

Why do we not end this anachronism, this vestige of the past, this Electoral College, by simply saying that the candidate that gets over 40 percent of the vote, the popular vote, is the winner. And indeed, if no candidate gets 40 percent of the vote, then the top two vote-getters have a runoff until one wins. That is what the American people deserve.

Some will say, well, if you do away with the Electoral College, this winner-take-all system whereby, if a presidential candidate gets 1 more vote in the State of West Virginia than the other candidates, that presidential candidate takes all 5 of our State's electoral votes, or if they get 1 more vote of the popular vote in the State of California, they get all 54 of those electoral votes, some say that small States may lose out on this. I do not buy that.

First of all, to be honest with you, presidential candidates do not drop in a great deal on us small States. They may fly through occasionally, have a tarmac press conference at the airport, but they are not spending a lot of time. They are going after the big populous States.

But the second thing is this. Why is it that if I vote and I vote for the winning candidate in West Virginia, my vote in effect is multiplied times five? My vote equals five electoral votes. But somebody with the winning candidate in California, their vote is multiplied by 54, the number of electors from California.

So for these reasons, I think it is essential that we make sure that the American public feels secure about the election process, and understands that it cannot be taken away and that the person who gets the most votes is the person who ends up being elected President; not the person getting the most votes, perhaps getting outdone and politically outmaneuvered in the House in a later election.

That is why I hope that we can pass this constitutional amendment to do away with the Electoral College once and for all. This is a college that ought to lose its certification.

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

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

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

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

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

[Mrs. SEASTRAND addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TOLEDO COMMUNITY REMEMBERS AND PAYS TRIBUTE TO YITZHAK RABIN

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last evening on November 6, the greater Toledo community gathered at Temple Shomer Emunim to pay tribute to the heroic life of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. Our citizenry humbly assembled—Jew, Muslim, Hindu, Christian, people of all faiths and denominations—to stand together as free people, of diverse heritage, to light candles of commemoration and of peace. Our people wished to demonstrate that here in the United States—a Nation dedicated to justice, human betterment, and ''E Pluribus Unum''—One from many—we stand at one with people of peace, wherever they reside.

We witness through our unity as well as our deep sorrow that the hope for peace for which Prime Minister Rabin laid down his life will enlarge the resolve of the entire world to bring its human and spiritual resources to bear on the Middle East peace process. May the cause for which he so nobly shed his blood be sanctified.

The heartfelt remarks of Rabbi Alan Sokobin, cochair community relations of the Jewish Federation of Greater Toledo, delivered with eloquence, offered deep comfort and inspiration. Let them be inserted in this RECORD as historical evidence of the international understanding of our Toledo community and the deep desire of all our people for reconciliation.

Those officiating at the ceremony included: Michael Berebitsky, president of the Jewish Federation of Greater Toledo; Rabbi Samuel Weinstein, Temple Shomer Emunim; Cantor Judy Seplowin, Temple Shomer Emunim; Cantor David Friedes, Temple Bnai Israel; Rabbi Arnold Bienstock, Temple Bnai Israel; Judah Segal, executive director of the Jewish Federation of Greator Toledo and Jewish community representatives; Cantor Evan Rubin, Congregation Etz Chayim; Rabbi Edward Garsek, Congregation Etz Chayim; and Rabbi Sokobin.

Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Sokobin spoke on behalf of our entire community when he said of the death of Prime Minister Rabin: ''We all now share a pain which will not go away.''

Then he reminded us of the life of Prime Minister Rabin:

[All his life, almost all his years were years of war. He was a first generation Sabra born of parents who fled persecution in Europe. His parents met when they fought side by side defending the Jews of the Old City who were defenseless when attacked in the orchestrated riots, the pogroms, of 1920. As a child of the thirties he was aware of tragedy enveloping the Jews of Europe. In Palestine, there were descriptions of horror as European Jewry was being wrapped in bloody shrouds of hatred. He was very conscious, deeply affected, by both the hatred of Jews in Europe and the enmity of Arabs.

His youthful passion was agronomy. He wanted to plant, to cultivate, to inspire the sacred soil to flourish. A young man of exceptional intelligence, at Kadoorie Agricultural School, he was the number one student. He achieved the highest score, comparable to one SAT scores, in Palestine. But he gave up his personal dream and accepted onerous responsibility. He became a soldier. He dropped the plowshare and took up the sword. His adult life was the sword. His army service was dedicated to killing. As a young man he killed, personally. Later, as a military commander he directed others that they might kill. He was well acquainted with death.

His final evening of life, at a rally for peace he joined in singing the song: Shiru shir la-shalom, sing a song of peace].

Mr. Speaker, it is our desire as the Toledo community on an interfaith and interdenominational basis to journey to the Middle East and to Israel as we recommit ourselves as witnesses to peace and in his memory and in our own way help Prime Minister Rabin's dream of peace reach ultimate fulfillment.

May God rest his soul and give comfort to his family, the people of Israel, and peace-loving peoples everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I include the remarks of Rabbi Sokobin for the RECORD, as follows:

I have stood before you and represented you in other dolorous occasions. During moments of personal grief when your beloved lay before you and your grief required articulation you turned to me for words to tell of the immensity of your sorrow. I spoke for you other times as well. When we all were gripped by unbearable excruciating communal anguish such as that time of evil when the Israeli athletes were massacred at Munich. Who can forget our emotions when there was that craven attack on Yom Kippur, our holiest of days. We have gathered together as caring community too many times when implacable enemies used the sword and inflicted unbearable pain.

Each time that I spoke to and for the community, I faced my own humanness and my own personal limitations. I could not explain those verities which were beyond my ken. I could not really interpret the activities of others that were outside of my understanding. I could not and still cannot understand, comprehend, the depth of hatred in some that they would wage war and commit terrorism. I could not and still cannot understand the malignity and cruelty of human beings who are willing to, who desire to, inflict excruciating pain on others.

But in the past it was enemies of the Jewish people who were uncompromising and unrelenting in their hostility. It was enemies who had views of destruction on their lips. This is the first time where the ripping, searing pain was caused, generated, not by a foe. What crushes my soul, causing agonizing soul searching, is what so many have said with simple majesty, ''Jews don't kill Jews.'' Until now it has been a truism, an irrefutable axiom, that the political and ideological cannibalism that infects and contaminates other societies has not tainted Jewish life. Until now!

Yitzhak Rabin's life was taken by a senseless, irrational, stupid and unthinking act. That the finger that pulled the trigger had pointed to words in Torah is unthinkable! That a Jew could denigrate all that we represent, our ideals, our sanctified mission, the visions enunciated in our tradition, our God given flawless purposes is monstrous. We all now share a pain which will not go away. That this pain would be generated by the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin is also unthinkable. He in his life represented Israel's and the Jewish people's highest hope. In the moments prior to his death he exemplified and epitomized the torturous path of our people in our generation.

All his life, almost all his years were years of war. He was a first generation Sabra born of parents who fled persecution in Europe. His parents met when they fought side by side defending the Jews of the Old City who were defenseless when attacked in the orchestrated riots, the pogroms, of 1920. As a child of the thirties he was aware of tragedy enveloping the Jews of Europe. In Palestine, there were descriptions of horror as European Jewry was being wrapped in bloody shrouds of hatred. He was very conscious, deeply affected, by both the hatred of Jews in Europe and the enmity of Arabs.

His youthful passion was agronomy. He wanted to plant to cultivate, to inspire the sacred soil to flourish. A young man of exceptional intelligence, at Kadoorie Agricultural School, he was the number one student. He achieved the highest score, comparable to our SAT scores, in Palestine. But he gave up his personal dream and accepted onerous responsibility. He became a soldier. He dropped the plowshare and took up the sword. His adult life was the sword. His army service was dedicated to killing. As a young man he killed, personally. Later, as a military commander he directed others that they might kill. He was well acquainted with death.

His final evening of life, at a rally for peace he joined in singing the song: Shiru, shir la-shalom, sing a song of peace! He was blessed with active intelligence, deep commitment, dedication and unusual ability but he was not endowed with a singing voice. But he sang, Shini Shir la-shalom which is the Israeli equivalent of sixties song. ''All we are asking, is give peace a chance.'' This was his final vision, his hope. He wanted the blessing to live to see his Israel proud, strong, productive, living in amity and concord in the family of nations. He wanted to lead his country and his people who had been tortured by generations of war, a people who knew well the torment of mangled bodies and hasty funerals, to peace. He had walked with grieving families accompanying their loved ones to their place of peace in the military cemetery. Now he asked them to walk with him on a path of hope, not of promises, but trust and faith. He asked them to sing a new song, a song of peace.

We have gathered together on this sorrowful and melancholy evening not to mourn a man. By any measurable standard he was immensely successful and fulfilled. he was a richly loved and loving husband, parent and grandparent. He was an eminent soldier and statesman, honored by the world for his achievements. Beyond these accomplishments, which reflected both his leadership qualities and his humaneness, Yitzhak Rabin fulfilled a fundamental Biblical mandate

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares

And their spears into pruning hooks

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation

Neither shall they learn war anymore. (Micah 4:3)

This memorial service honors Yitzhak Rabin, a planter and a soldier. He protected his people, their ideals, and planted within them new hope. A hope which is ours as Jews. But our service is not only a memorial. It is our response to our initial question. How could a Jew slaughter another Jew? I have heard, as you must have as well, numerous commentators refer to the ''loss of innocence'' in Israel. Innocence meaning naivety, perhaps. But innocence meaning purity, integrity, utopian idealism is not lost. No one can take this from us. Not as long as we maintain those ideals, those sacred purposes. We are a sanctified people. We are not pragmatic: we are prophetic. For us, this is our moment of recommitment. Now we dedicate ourselves to share with our fellow Jews of Israel, our brethren throughout the world in all our habitations to seek a path of reconciliation and equitable peace.

We would have a peace predicated upon the ancient principles enunciated in our sacred tradition. We must devote ourselves to ancient the mandate given us by the great Rabbi Hillel.

Be of the disciples of Aaron.

Love peace, pursue peace.

Reach out to your fellow human being. (Ethics of the Fathers).

We must stretch forth our hands, reaching across the gulf of hostility, to create peace, amity, concord and hope.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MARKING MARINES BIRTHDAY IN LIGHT OF CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTING TROOPS TO BOSNIA

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, November 10 will mark the 220th birthday of the U.S. Marine Corps.

I would like to take this opportunity of the Marine birthday to express some thoughts that have come to mind as we consider a long-term commitment of United States ground forces in Bosnia.

With the dread of flag-draped coffins arriving back to America from the Balkans in mind, I drove to the Beirut Memorial yesterday, and that is at the Marine base at Camp Lejeune, NC.

The Marines have a spirit, and they call it Esprit d'Corps, which bonds all Marines together as they march in lockstep doing their country's bidding overseas. They march forward with a flame in their heart which symbolizes the best of what makes this country great.

When I went to the memorial there in North Carolina, next to the Marine base, there is a wall which memorializes the 240 Marines that were blown up in 1983 when a mad bomber burst into their encampment and blew up the building in which they were sleeping.

These Marines are heroes. Their names are not on the Vietnam Wall, although many of the Marines who were killed were actually Vietnam veterans. One of the Marine names, Sgt. David Battle, was my brother's best friend and our families were very close.

Now as we talk about deploying troops, we should not forget the tragedy of what happened there in Beirut in 1983, over 10 years ago now. It was very similar to what we see in the Balkans. It was a very confusing situation.

In fact, very shortly after the arrival, the political situation was so confused, and the Marines became so entangled, that the State Department set down a policy that the Marines were to have no ammunition, no bullets in their guns. And when eventually a bomber came to break through the perimeter to get to the Marines with a truck laden with explosives, the Marine guard did not have a bullet in his gun to stop that truck.

We did not do right by the Marines by sending them into that situation, and we should keep them in mind and keep in mind that there are people who sacrifice and lose their lives when we make decisions like sending people to the Balkans.

Unless it is in part of America's interest, we should not be putting our people's lives at stake.

Looking at that memorial with the 240 names listed, the statue of the fallen Marine and the words ''They Came in Peace'' on the wall of the memorial this weekend at Camp Lejeune, I wrote the following poem which I would now like to read and have inserted into the RECORD.

It is entitled ''Marines in Beirut.''

□ 1915

I am sorry if it sounds schmaltzy to some people, or if it sounds a little too patriotic or whatever, but this reflects my feelings after having visited this memorial to those Marines who died in Beruit.

MARINES IN BERUIT
(By Dana Rohrabacher)

They came in peace to a distant shore.
The gallant warriors of the Corps
To risk their lives yet once more
Always faithful, ever more.

It's ''Yes sir, can do''
The Marines salute, and then come through.

They landed in Beruit's bloody scene
Such is the life of a Marine.
On deadly turf confused and mean—
Political pawns in a foolish scheme.

But it's, ''Yes sir, can do''
The Marines salute, and then come through.

They knew that something had gone wrong
When their short mission went on and on
With no objective, yet they stayed strong.
Courage sometimes means holding on.

Holding ground where snipers reign,
Hold faith in our country's game,
Their bullets pouched. It's insane,
but Marines take orders and don't complain.

It's ''Yes sir, can do''
The Marines salute, and then come through.

For the fools in charge they had to pay
And on the dawning of that day
Death could not be held at bay
By guards whose bullets were stashed away.

The explosion killed our gallant men.
Yet we know they'd go again
if called by country, or country's friend.
These heroes, alas, won't fight again.

Never send Marines to die
Unless it's clear the reasons why.
for heroes must know that we will try
to take to heart their families' cry.

For it's ''Yes sir, can do''
The Marines salute, and then come through.
We let them down, but we won't do it again.

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

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent to vacate my request for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

BUDGET PLACES WORKER PENSIONS AT RISK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my time this evening, and I am not going to use the entire 60 minutes, I will be discussing the issue in the budget that places at risk worker pensions. I will be discussing that in some detail.

Before beginning that topic, I want to say a couple of things. First, I would

commend my colleague. I thought the poetry which he professes to have authored was excellent. Very, very distinct and captures, I think, a lot of the emotions many of us have around the Lebanon tragedy.

Second, I would also express my deep feelings of sadness about the death of Yitzhak Rabin. I have, as a second term Member of this chamber, heard the presentations of many world leaders from the podium here. No one has so impressed me as Yitzhak Rabin when he spoke about the long march toward peace.

He had committed his life for his country, he had been his country's leading warrior, and now he felt the moment was right for peace. The sheer courage and moral authority he brought to the leadership of his country in trying to react and trying to result in peace was really overpowering. He could convey it personally and he could even convey it through the television, for those of us that watched him in that forum as well.

Mr. Speaker, his loss is a real tragedy to the world.

Now, on to the pension issue.

One of the proposals that concerns me the most, Mr. Speaker, in a budget reconciliation act that is full of proposals that concern me, is a plan that would allow the withdrawal of pension funds across this country of $40 billion. I will be discussing this plan over the next 7, 8, 9, maybe 10 minutes. I have an hour. I invite any Member of this chamber, any Member of the House of Representatives that favors this proposal, to join me on the House floor. Because I would be very happy to debate it in its technical dimension or in its public policy dimension.

So if Members are watching this presentation, I would urge them to come to the floor and try to make their case. I do not think there is much of a case to be made for a proposal that would jeopardize workers' pensions to the tune of $40 billion across this country.

Mr. Speaker, the issue, as I see it, is should protections that presently exist within the law, protecting solvency of pension programs, be maintained. The House budget has proposed eliminating the excise tax that prevents the withdrawal of pension funds exceeding 125 percent of termination liability. They would eliminate the excise tax altogether until July 1 of 1996 and then impose a 6.5-percent tax thereafter.

The process leading up to the inclusion of this provision in the House budget is, in my opinion, truly startling, even for a Congress that is full of startling shortcuts. In process, this one takes the cake. Forty billion dollars in workers' pension funds placed at risk for a proposal that did not have a single hearing. No hearing. It was placed in the Budget Reconciliation Act in the context of a Committee on Ways and Means markup. They eliminated the solvency protections, allowed corporations to grab those excess funds, for any purpose, notwithstanding the fact that there might be a resulting threat to solvency. So much as a 1 percent interest downturn would take these 125 percent of termination liability plans and put them under water. Notwithstanding that risk, no hearings.

Mr. Speaker, when one of the Members offered an amendment that said, well, at least notify the workers that we are going to take their pension funds, that amendment was also defeated. So we have no hearing, no opportunity for public input, the defeat of a provision that would have allowed for at least worker notification if their pension fund is robbed. Then some of us, because of the magnitude of this proposal, and let me tell my colleagues that $40 billion places at risk the pensions of millions of workers, and because of that we sought a rule. We sought a rule that would allow an amendment. Straight-up vote. We think this is a horrible idea, let us air it out on the floor of the House straight up or down. Give us a vote.

We were denied the vote. The Committee on Rules did not allow us to offer an amendment striking this provision out because they wanted it sewn tightly into that huge Budget Reconciliation Act. They wanted to pass it in the sheer weight of this many hundreds of pages of proposals.

I ask myself, Mr. Speaker, why in the world would they put worker pension funds at issue? We recognize as a country we have a savings crisis. People are not saving enough for their own pensions. In fact, this is the very budget that takes a run at Medicare, reduces what people will have under Medicare in the future. So why in the world, if we are going to reduce things like Medicare, which are public programs helping people in their retirement, why would we put at risk their private pension funds?

The answer is one of two. First, let me give you the budgetary answer they have floated. If $40 billion comes out of pension funds, the U.S. Treasury collects a tax on it. It adds about $9 billion to the pension budget picture in the short run. It might strike the American people as more than a little curious that they would jeopardize long-term worker pension needs for a short-term hit to the budget, but that seems to be the gamesmanship underlying this proposal.

Maybe there is another answer. The other thing that I can think of is that somebody has some powerful friends, and that somebody, corporation somewhere, wants to get at their pension kitty, and they have convinced this Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means and congressional leadership, to allow them to get at those pension funds because they want them.

It has to be one of two, a short-term budget gimmick or unbelievable favors for special friends. In any event, it deserves more debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a couple of minutes about the history of this. Having been an insurance commissioner during the eighties, I was responsible for regulating the solvency of insurance companies. As I did that, I also watched carefully what was happening to the solvency of pension plans, and what I saw I did not like; because in the go-go eighties, the mentalities of corporate takeovers, we began to see a run on corporate pensions.

Often predators, trying to buy in a hostile buyout situation, a corporation would use the workers' own pension funds to finance the buyout. The great irony for workers is that their retirement savings, the pension fund, would actually be used to finance the hostile takeover that resulted in their loss of jobs. When the takeover artists enacted their downsizing and their cutbacks, their own pension funds financed the hostile takeover resulting in their loss of a job. Can you imagine anything worse?

Over the 1980s, Mr. Speaker, we began to see acceleration in the tendency of money to flow from pensions. In 1982, $44 million. In 1983, you can see the amounts accelerating, until the total tally of money that flew out of pensions in the 1980s was estimated at $20 billion. Twenty billion dollars. And I will tell the American people, Mr. Speaker, that some of the pension funds that experienced those raids never came back, and some of the employees covered by those pensions did not receive what was owed to them in retirement savings. We can see the dramatically accelerating raid on pensions.

To deal with this situation, past Congresses, operating on a bipartisan basis, because they understood that this country has an interest in having people have healthy pension funds, on three separate occasions enacted restrictions on people's ability to pull money out of their pension funds intended for their workers. First, they enacted an excise tax that was going to slow that up. They enacted a 15 percent excise tax to slow down the growth.

That was not enough, and, as we can see on this chart, money continued to flow out. So they added to that the penalty for withdrawing from the pension funds and the amounts slowed, and the amount virtually stopped at the present protection, 50 percent excise tax on the withdrawal of the excess funds in pension funds. That left, as I mentioned earlier, a total of $20 billion out of those funds. Compare that to the $40 billion projected under the plan to come out if the protections are removed as proposed in the House-passed budget.

Now, the resulting exposure if pension plans start going bust all over the country, because people have pulled out all this $40 billion, hits in two ways. First of all, it hits the worker that does not get their full benefits because the pension plan is under water; second, it hits taxpayers. We all have a

stake in this because the pension programs are guaranteed by an insurance program ultimately funded by taxpayers. Guaranteed by taxpayers kind of like the savings and loan insurance deal that cost taxpayers billions. This is insured by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. The PBGC.

So, ultimately, workers get less on their pensions and taxpayers are asked to pick up the difference. Tremendous future liability exposure to taxpayers under this proposal. That is why, Mr. Speaker, when I first saw the proposal I asked the Pension Benefit Guaranty people what they thought of it. Their response was unequivocal. At the PBGC they believe this proposal places distinctly at risk the pensions of millions of workers across the country.

They have done various studies that show that plans which are healthy today would, if they drew down to the limit allowed in the budget, be in serious financial shape in the future.

□ 1930

This thing has got to be stopped, and I will tell my colleagues my deep concern as we go into conference committee in the budget. It was initially proposed in the Senate as well. Now, the Senate can do something that we cannot in the House. They can have straight-up votes on whether this is a good proposal that ought to move forward. In response to the amendment offered in the Senate that we were precluded, prevented from offering in the House, the Senators voted 95 to 4 to take this out of their proposal.

It is still in the House version, and I have every reason to believe that there is very strong feeling in the House for the passage of this particular proposal. They will try and blow it through in conference committee and tuck it into the folds of this massive Budget Reconciliation Act. And so the time for us, Members of Congress, who have a concern about this raid on workers' pensions is now. We must let the conferees on the budget know that it is not acceptable to place employees' pensions at risk in this fashion.

I would hope that we would be joined in this effort by workers across the country whose future retirement security depends on the solvency of their pension funds. I would like these workers across the country to write to their Congressmen and let them know what they think of a proposal that would allow $40 billion to flow out of that pension fund. Those workers should know, as they write to their Congressman, that if their Congressman happens to be a Republican Member of this body, he or she has already voted for this pension raid. It is not too late to correct this mistake, but we better get after it, every Republican member having voted for this raid on pension funds.

It is unacceptable, and although I have issued an invitation to any Member who cared to come down and debate the other side to supply to us how in the world they would allow a worker pension program to be raided to the tune of $40 billion, what was their motive in doing it, no one has joined me in the well or in the Chamber to conduct that kind of debate.

Mr. Speaker, I let that challenge stand, and I will be back this week on other special order presentations fully prepared to debate with all comers this pension issue. It is a ripoff for working men and women, make no mistake about it, and will happen in one of three ways. Predator companies that want to take over a corporation will assess how fat their pension fund is, how secure their workers' retirement is, and they will base their takeover on whether they can bleed out pension funds to finance the takeover. We have seen it in the eighties, and we are going to see it in the nineties under this proposal.

Second scenario, a corporation that cares a lot about the future retirement of its workers that has really tried to prudently manage their pension plan for solvency, that understands that they succeed as a corporation only because of the work of their workers and wants to be steadfast in their commitment to their retirement, will have to look again at their pension fund because they will know that the predators out there, the ones that I described under the first scenario, are taking a look at whether they can take over this corporation and use the workers' pensions to pay for it. Not only the predators will come after the pension funds, but even excellent corporations that fear takeover are going to have to look at whether they need to draw down in the pension fund, place the workers' pension funds at risk to avoid a hostile takeover.

There is a third scenario, one that I used to watch as insurance commissioner. This is the struggling corporation, a corporation that is being badly managed, needs money, and cannot quite function in terms of meeting operating costs based on revenues. They have a couple of options. They can go to a bank, they can try and raise money privately, stock offerings and the like, but either of those prospects bring questions. How come you are being managed at a cash-flow loss? Why are you not doing more to improve your efficiency and productivity?

Those are questions that go right to the caliber of the leadership of that corporation. Maybe they do not want those questions asked. Maybe the CEO's know they are not going to pass muster. It is real easy to dip in the workers' pension fund and take a little out of the pension kitty to fund cash flow. If they qualify on the reserves, no one is going to look.

I saw this a little bit when I was insurance commissioner. The first indication of an insurance company heading into insolvency was that they would underfund their future liabilities. They would underfund the amount they are expected to pay in the future.

That was a way of reducing the amount they were committing to the future and maximizing what they had available for cash flow, even though that was an incompetent management team that should have been replaced. Well, we are going to see it again. Incompetently run corporations are going to steal from their workers' pension cash kitty, forestalling the day of reckoning that faces that corporation and jeopardizing the solvency of the workers' pension fund while they are at it.

Any way you slice it, these are unacceptable outcomes for our workers. It is unacceptable that Members would propose a $40 billion hit on the private pension funds of our workers and try and justify it. This is a case of where the Republican agenda has gone way too far. This is a case where I cannot understand for the life of me, and I try to be a bipartisan Member of this Chamber, I think we need more of that in the country, not less, but I cannot understand why they would walk lockstep on a proposal that so brazenly assaulted the sanctity of private pension funds necessary for the retirement obligations of their workers.

We have got to stop this proposal, and that is why again in closing I would urge every Member of Congress to write, to contact, to call the House of Representatives in the budget conference on this issue. I would hope that we would be joined in this effort by workers across the country to contact their Member of Congress and say, ''Enough. Enough foolishness out of Washington. Do not place our pension funds at risk.''

IN MEMORY OF YITZHAK RABIN

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to get back from the presidential straw poll in Maine in time to join the CODEL, the congressional CODEL that left a few hours before Air Force One to go over to Jerusalem, the most beautiful city on this small delicate earth and pay my respects to Rabin, but I wanted to share something with my colleagues that I have been sharing with my rather large family all week.

Mr. Speaker, that is for some wonderful reason I had at least 10 minutes, maybe more, alone with Prime Minister Rabin in the old House of Representatives Chamber, Statutory Hall. We both went over to get a Coca-Cola, a Pepsi. I started talking to him and for some reason people respected us engaged in conversation.

Mr. Speaker, I asked him about a line that he made in his closing remarks in the ceremony in our wonderful Rotunda under the Capitol dome for the 3,000th anniversary ceremony here on

Capitol Hill for the founding of the beautiful city of Jerusalem, when David bought a small hilltop from a man named Ornan, O-R-N-A-N.

When I was in Israel on one of my 15 trips there, I obviously memorized that name as I heard it because I put D, for David, in front of Ornan and got DORNAN. That as a way of remembering it. When he bought Mount Zion and Mount Moriah and started that tiny little city, David then still not much older than the shepherd boy who had killed Goliath, the Philistine, little did he know how many times he would offend God or how many times he would please God, or write the most beautiful of all poetry, the Psalms, or that he would father the great Solomon, the next Israeli king after himself.

I pointed out to Mr. Rabin that he had used a line in his remarks in the Rotunda speaking about the chill of the handmade armored cars among the pines.

Mr. Speaker, I knew what he was referencing. In little workshops in Tel Aviv they had built handmade armored cars. They took small, old trucks, some of them pre-World War II trucks, in the 1948 war, put sheets of metal around them. Welded them. They looked for all the world like something out of Jules Verne in the middle of the 1800's.

Then they would take these trucks southeast up from Tel Aviv up to the top of the beautiful mountainous area where Jerusalem is. There are pine trees all along that route. I have been in Israel when it has snowed. It gets extremely cold, biting cold in those hills on the way up to Jerusalem, and that is what Mr. Rabin meant.

Mr. Speaker, I said, ''Were you a brigade commander then?'' And he said, ''Yes, the 10th Brigade. Those were my armored cars.'' I hope they never take them away to widen the road, which was attempted this last year. The rusted armored cars where people where machine gunned and killed in those cars. They are still at several points along that beautiful, winding road up to Jerusalem.

We talked about his age. He was 26 years of age. I said, ''How did you get to be a brigade commander at such a young age?'' And he said, ''Well,'' in that distinctive style of his, ''you must remember the ages of your own revolutionary heroes in your War of Independence.'' And I said, That is right. Hamilton, 23; Lafayette, whose picture is here, the only other person's portrait on the floor other than the father of our country, they were both 23. That is right.

And at 45 years of age he was the overall field military commander for all the Israeli defense forces. I still wear my Israeli defense force belt buckle that they gave me when I flew a Kafir in my freshman year, January 8, 1978, with one of their triple aces, Ovi, last name still to be kept secret for obvious reasons. I talked about how at 45 years of age he commanded it all.

This wonderful moment I will treasure forever. I did not have to be at the ceremony to have tears running down my face, because out of my five children, four are freckle-faced red heads. I have my first freckle-faced red head in a ninth grandchild, Liam, who is staying with me this week. And when his beautiful granddaughter got up, Noa, N-O-A, and said to all the leaders from around the world these simple words: ''Please excuse me for not wanting to talk about the peace. I want to talk about my grandfather.''

Mr. Speaker, I have a tenth grandchild, son or daughter, due in January, and I would like to put all of her words in, Mr. Speaker, that follow from that, because it is the most beautiful eulogy I believe I have ever heard from a child or grandchild about one of their elders in my entire life.

At some point I will read all of her words into the RECORD. I want them to ring forever in this Chamber. Thank you Mr. Speaker, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

GOODBYE TO A GRANDFATHER: WE ARE SO COLD AND SO SAD

The granddaughter of Yitzhak Rabin, Noa Ben-Artzi Philosof, 17, spoke at his funeral. Her remarks were translated and transcribed by The New York Times.

Please excuse me for not wanting to talk about the peace. I want to talk about my grandfather.

You always awake from a nightmare, but since yesterday I was continually awakening to a nightmare. It is not possible to get used to the nightmare of life without you. The television never ceases to broadcast pictures of you, and you are so alive that I can almost touch you—but only almost, and I won't be able to anymore.

Grandfather, you were the pillar of fire in front of the camp and now we are left in the camp alone, in the dark; and we are so cold and so sad.

I know that people talk in terms of a national tragedy, and of comforting an entire nation, but we feel the huge void that remains in your absence when grandmother doesn't stop crying.

Few people really knew you. Now they will talk about you for quite some time, but I feel that they really don't know just how great the pain is, how great the tragedy is; something has been destroyed.

Grandfather, you were and still are our hero. I wanted you to know that every time I did anything, I saw you in front of me.

Your appreciation and your love accompanies us every step down the road, and our lives were always shaped after your values. You, who never abandoned anything, are now abandoned. And here you are, my ever-present hero, cold, alone, and I cannot do anything to save you. You are missed so much.

Others greater than I have already eulogized you, but none of them ever had the pleasure I had to feel the caresses of your warm, soft hands, to merit your warm embrace that was reserved only for us, to see your half-smile that always told me so much, that same smile which is no longer, frozen in the grave with you.

I have no feelings of revenge because my pain and feelings of loss are so large, too large. The ground has been swept out from below us, and we are groping now, trying to wander about in this empty void, without any success so far.

I am not able to finish this; left with no alternative. I say goodbye to you, hero, and ask you to rest in peace, and think about us, and miss us, as down here we love you so very much. I imagine angels are accompanying you now and I ask them to take care of you, because you deserve their protection.

STAY THE COURSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, before I introduce those that are joining me tonight, I am pleased to share with those that might be viewing that tomorrow will be one year since the new Republican Majority was elected. Tonight, I am pleased to have at least five or six of my colleagues, freshmen colleagues from throughout the United States of America. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] the second gentleman from Arizona, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STOCKMAN]. Possibly, before we finish the 1 hour, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, we all are freshmen that were elected last year to help change America. To build a better America, if you will.

□ 1945

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield my time so that the gentleman from Arizona can kind of be the floor leader to keep this dialog for 1 hour going and that we can help to inform the American people that might be watching.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from North Carolina, and I am pleased to join with him and our friend from California and my neighbor from Arizona as well as my good friend from Texas this evening.

History demands that we recall the historic moment that occurred 364 days ago, the first Tuesday following the first Monday of November 1994. An election that literally shook the foundations of this institution, when for the first time in four decades the old order that talked about more and more government spending and more and more debt on our children and more and more authority resting in a massive centralized bureaucracy with little accountability to the people, that philosophy was rejected.

Now as America prepares to confront a new century with leadership truly passed to a new generation, those of us here and assembled on this floor tonight and, Mr. Speaker, I daresay, those who join us via the technology of television, deserve a status report on what has transpired. Forty weeks of governing in the wake of 40 years of liberal rule, and the people need a status report. Though it is not my intent

to go in alphabetical order, Mr. Speaker, I do see my good friend from my neighboring district in Arizona, Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, what is he hearing at home?

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, we just had a townhall this weekend. I think it was our 30th since I was elected to serve in the 104th Congress.

The folks back home are a lot smarter than I think the media gives them credit for. The answer that they gave to me resoundingly was stay the course, stick to your guns. You have started a revolution, but it is just the tip of the iceberg. We expect you to see through to the many promises that you made in the campaign.

No. 1, that you would balance the Federal budget and quit financing failed social programs of yesterday on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. It is immoral, stop it. Get the job done. That is what we sent you there for.

The other thing that I heard, I hear all this rhetoric from folks back here about folks back home not wanting to have tax cuts. As I talked to folks back home, especially those that feel the pinch, those that are trying to raise children in today's society and those that feel that maybe they just know a little bit better than the Federal bureaucrats here what might be best for their family and how their dollars might be spent, I heard again very clearly from them. We are sick and tired of money going back to Washington and going down a rathole. It costs $1.50 to produce 50 cents worth of services at the Federal level, and it has got to stop. We think we are a little bit better qualified to address our family's priorities than some nameless, faceless bureaucrat in Washington, DC.

That is what I heard resoundingly, stick to your guns, stay the course and do what we sent you there to do. If you are going to be like Congresses of old and buckle and put a Band-Aid on problems like Medicare and not really save the program for future generations but put a Band-Aid on so you can get through the next election, if those are the things that you intend to do, you are no different than the Congresses we sent there in the past and we do not want you back.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I see that one of our friends from Florida has joined us who was also a part of that historic night but even more importantly is part of this new history-making majority in the House of Representatives. As we yield to our friend from Florida, I would imagine that, even though the gentleman from Arizona and I reside in neighboring districts and hear much the same message, I have to believe that the gentleman from Florida hears similar things from his constituents.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely amazing. As I campaigned last year, I was an unknown. I had never been involved in any political process. Most of my friends here were never involved in the political process until last year. We campaigned. It was an underfunded campaign, but we believed that we had the ideas that would make a difference in my campaign.

I talked in very general concepts. I talked about the tenth amendment, which I hear all of us talking about, where the tenth amendment says all the powers not specifically given to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and the citizens. I quoted Thomas Jefferson, who said the government that governs least governs best. Perhaps my favorite quote and the centerpiece of my campaign was the James Madison quote which really encapsulated what my campaign was all about.

Madison, who was one of Framers of the Constitution, said all powers not specifically—I am sorry—said, we have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government but upon the capacity of the individual to govern himself, control himself and sustain himself according to the Ten Commandments of God. I thought I was this visionary, that nobody else was talking about the tenth amendment because I did not hear anybody in Congress talking about the tenth amendment. I did not hear anything coming out of Congress or the White House about the tenth amendment or talking about Madison or Jefferson. I thought that these were archaic ideas that our Founding Fathers talked about but that somehow this liberal Congress had forgotten all about.

I come up to Washington, DC and I find out that everybody else, you and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], on the other side of the continent were saying the same exact thing. There was just this undercurrent that swept us into Washington, and people do not understand why we are so committed to do what we promised to do. It is because our people put faith in us when nobody else, when the political pros and the pundits and the New York Times, which personally came to my district and said there is no way you are going to elect radicals like SCARBOROUGH.

I am sure all of my colleagues here have the same stories. Nobody else believed in us, believed in the ideas of Madison and Jefferson. But my constituents did, and I will be darned if I am going to spend my time in Washington compromising with a liberal Democratic Party that never represented my district well and never represented the views and ideals of the Founding Fathers that laid the great foundation of this country. That is my responsibility, to carry through on that promise.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said something very interesting, paraphrasing friends from the fourth estate who sometimes seem to step across that bound of reporting into advocacy for those who always propose bigger government programs and a highly centralized state.

It was interesting to hear that description of your candidacy as radical. Of course, the amazing thing is that only to those who exist inside the beltway were our candidacies or is this new majority in any sense radical. Quite the contrary, to the people in the heartland of America, from California to Florida, through Texas and in Arizona and in the great State of North Carolina, throughout this country, it is not radical; it is rational and reasonable.

And therein we find the difference. Despite what the media axis between New York and Washington would report and promote and quite often distort, the American people in their infinite wisdom cut through all of that and understood what was at stake. I think we have a prime example here on the floor tonight in our good friend from Texas, the pundits called, as you will remember, the giant killer, who was able to win election to the Congress of the United States after many tries and some talk from the pundits that he ought to maybe not think about public life.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, we just had a town hall meeting. We had several town hall meetings. I thought after reading the papers, I stated believing, Mr. Speaker, some of those issues and wrongly so. Some of those issues are, we are doing the wrong thing, we are going in the wrong direction. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say something. I went to those town hall meetings. The chairman, the former chairman of the Democrat Party, the country judge there stood up and he said, sir, I have been a Democrat all my life and I stand behind what you are doing; not because it is Republican, not because it is Democrat, because it is the right thing to do.

I was amazed as people came forward that knew and understood what we were doing and the knowledge that they had. They said to me, please continue what you are doing, do not stop. Quite frankly, I was astounded. I came away from that wondering whether the people that act as our fourth estate really comprehend that the rebellion that took place was at the grassroots level.

Mr. Speaker, we had $1.2 million spent against us, $1.2 million. That is a lot of money. He was going to be the dean of the U.S. House, the dean of the House. Everything was going great. He had been here 42 years, 42 years. You would think that everything, the world was wrapped around his finger; but the people spoke, and the people felt their power for the first time in 42 years and stood up and said, we want change.

When change came, they were standing next to me and saying, keep it up, that is what we voted for. But our friends from the fourth estate say, no, no, no, no. We are losing our grip, we are losing what we fought for, what we got for 40 years. Socialism is slipping away, and we hear those cries back in our district, no, it is not what we want,

socialism. We want you to stay the course.

I know one thing, we are not going to punt. We are not going to punt. We are going to do exactly what this says. Our good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT], freshman, signed it. I said, do not drop the ball. Pass the budget.

I cannot think, Mr. Speaker, of a greater gift for Christmas than to give our children and our grandchildren a balanced budget. I know that, as you know, we are going to stay the course. We are going to give the best Christmas present of all, a balanced budget.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think he absolutely sets forth the dynamic at work here. The question is, Are we willing to love generations yet unborn enough and those youngsters who are now in our homes—and I think of my children, one of them in college but two not even in grade school yet—do we love them enough to leave them a country where they will not continue to pay our debts?

I think the gentleman from Texas offers an embodiment of part of the change that took place last year on that fateful Tuesday in November, a change that continues around the country tonight. Indeed, as I heard the words of my friends from Texas, I thought of my good friend from North Carolina who went on a personal journey, both intellectually, philosophically, and finally politically. For the gentleman from North Carolina had his dad serving in this House, a conservative man who yet sat on the other side of this aisle. I yield to our friend who reserved this special time to talk about what has gone on not only in his own life politically but what has gone on in his district in North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona. I appreciate him making reference to my father who did serve for 26 years in the U.S. Congress representing the First District of North Carolina. It is very humbling to hear comments from both Democrats and Republicans, the elevator operators as well as those on the police force, how much they thought of him as a fair man and a good man. I really appreciate you mentioning his name.

I will tell you that my father and I both discussed my change of party affiliation. I used to be a Democrat, served 10 years in the North Carolina General Assembly. Quite frankly, as you mentioned, my father was a conservative. He said to me, he said, WALTER, I do not think that you nor myself, he was speaking, belong in the Democratic Party because they have become so liberal. They are out of touch with the people.

I think my friend from Arizona as well as my friends from Texas and yourself have mentioned that this country needs leadership. When a child is born in this country today—and I know I have said it 100 times, and each one of you, but it is so important. A child born in this country today, 1995, the time they take their first breath they owe $187,000 in taxes, $187,000 in taxes.

If they live to be 75 years of age and we do not balance the budget, then they will pay $187,000 in taxes just to pay the interest on the debt.

Our children deserve the American dream, not the American debt. That is why this new Congress, my fellow freshmen, you and the gentlemen from Texas, Arizona, and California and the gentleman from Florida that just had to leave, we know what the American people want. We are here to make those decisions.

Yes, I will tell my colleagues, they are tough decisions. But I will also share with my colleagues and those watching that, when I go home every weekend but four in 11 months, and I drive home and drive back, I see the people. The people say to me, WALTER, do not stray, stay committed, balance this budget, because where the liberals forget, they try to scare the senior citizens about Medicare.

□ 1000

Yet we are promising an increase in Medicare. We are promising choices for our senior citizens. We are giving them the choices that they deserve to have. We are giving them the security that they deserve to have. Yet, the other side keeps trying to scare the senior citizens.

I would tell the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], it is not working in my district. The people in my district have enough confidence in me and my fellow colleagues that they trust us to do what is right to preserve, protect, and strengthen Medicare.

The other point I would like to make before closing is that when you have a country where the average working family in this country today will spend more on paying taxes than that same average working family will spend on clothing, housing, or food, how can they ever realize the American dream? They cannot. That is why they turned to the Republican party last November, almost 365 days ago, because they said, ''We want a change. We want to believe that this is the greatest country in the world. We think that you, under the new Republican conservative leadership, you will give us the hope that the liberals have taken away from us through taxes and regulations.''

Yes, I am pleased to be with you tonight. I am proud to be part of the new majority that cares about America.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I thought of another familial relationship, a parental bond. You described the service of your father in this House, and how both of you made that philosophical journey. As we turned to our friend, the gentleman from California, a couple of distinctions, Mr. Speaker, that are worth being noted in the RECORD.

First of all, we heard our good friend, the gentleman from Florida, speak of Thomas Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson was indeed a man of many talents, including that of being a vintner, a winemaker. It is our privilege to have someone from the real world, from the wine country of California, a vintner, here serving with us in this freshman class; but also he draws a distinction, and it is akin, it comes back to the Sixth District of Arizona, for his mother was born an inspiration by the Inspiration Mine, in the Sixth District of North Carolina, so in a sense, I know that my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, or the Sixth District of Arizona and I would like to claim him as at least an honorary Arizonan, the vintner of the House of Representatives with a very, very sober reflection on what has transpired in these last 40 weeks.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am proud to be associated with all three of you gentlemen here today, to talk about what has happend in the last year since our eve of election about a year ago today.

I, too, spent the weekend going home and traveling in the district and making many stops. I stopped in Lemon Cove, the Sequoia Middle School, to address the 7th, 8th, and 9th graders. In particular, a lot of the message that I state, and of course, being on the Committee on the Budget we deal with budget issues, and I talk budget issues there, and I go home and I explain what we are really doing as far as reform and expanding the Medicare system and offering choices, and limiting government, decentralizing government, privatizing government, localizing government through the budget process.

They all realize, too, that we are coming to the point now where there are threats of a budget train wreck, and there is the issue about raising the debt ceiling, and a standoff between the Congress and the administration, the executive branch. By and large, people are concerned in general.

The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, and I think it can be articulated, in one of my Monday morning meetings I met with the Parcel Post Service in Fresno, which is a distribution center; I met with about 100 truck drivers and the management of this company, who presented a $25,000 check to the West Fresno Christian Academy for them to be able to fix their restroom floors. I was honored to be in the middle of this presentation. I was able to speak and give them an idea of what we were doing.

I explained to them with regard to the upcoming brinksmanship that we are in now with the budget, in that we had not too long ago, last week, four experts from Wall Street sit down and talk to our Republican conference and deliver a very strong message, and the message was that even if we have to go through short-term economic disheveling in order to get a balanced budget,

that it is worth it for the future economic health of this country to go through something short term, if we have to. It is imperative to get a legitimate balanced budget passed this year. That was the message that the Wall Street Journal experts, I think, conveyed to all of us.

I took that message home and explained to my group of employees there at United Parcel Service, and the message got applause when I said this is what Wall Street was willing to come up and say: ''If there is brinksmanship here, let all the stops go, but just make sure you get a balanced budget.'' Their message to me was ''Do not come home without a balanced budget.'' They are serious. They want government out of their face. This budget begins that process. It does that.

The response that I get from people in my district is just leave me alone, let me run my own life, do not try to be my mommy, do not try to be my daddy, do not try to be my pastor, and do not try to be my employer. That is really the message that I come back with.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, they sent me back here saying if I drop the ball, do not come back to Fresno. They are that serious about it. My commitment is that, that we pass a legitimate balanced budget, one that is scored by the Congressional Budget Office, which is the legitimate scoring agency in the House here; not by the Office of Management and Budget, like the administration wants their budget scored.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from California, I think I was in that same meeting, but I would appreciate if the gentleman would reaffirm what I thought I heard from those four economists, one statement they made: Since the Republican majority had been the majority, that the interest rates had dropped by 2 points, and if we should pass a balanced budget, because many of the markets feel that maybe it is more talk than action, but that if we did balance the budget, that it was accepted and we balanced the budget, that the rates could almost within a certain number of months drop to 5 percent. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. RADANOVICH. What I can relate is that we met with—on a number of occasions Alan Greenspan with the Federal Reserve met with the Committee on the Budget, and in that, he expressed supreme confidence in two things: No. 1, that business, health, and the economy and the country was directly related to our good intentions, and we had better prove it all out in passing a balanced budget, but the effect of that would have a minimum of a 2-percent decrease in interest rates. So that is something that comes from the chairman of the Federal Reserve, and backed, actually, by scoring in the budget that we have right before us today.

I want to make one brief comment. That is that people in America have to be really concerned about what their representatives say and what kind of numbers they quote. The best example I can give is the Congressional Budget Office is the legitimate scoring agency for budgets in town, and everybody, including the OMB, recognizes that the CBO is the more legitimate scorer. If you take the President's 10-year budget that balances to the CBO and have it scored, it still has annual deficits of $60 billion.

Mr. HAYWORTH. A very key point, and if the gentleman will yield, I think it is important before, Mr. Speaker, we end up in a type of alphabet soup when we talk about the Congressional Budget Office or OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, that we make this clear distinction. Indeed, it happened prior to us joining this institution, prior to the historic shift: The President of the United States stood at the podium here behind us at the outset of the 103d Congress and he said, with great oratorical flourish, that his administration would always use the figures provided by the Congressional Budget Office, because year in and year out, they were the most reliable numbers.

Yet, the same dichotomy and indeed the same reversal that we have seen on so many issues came with our friend at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, when somewhere along the line, camped out in the Rose Garden, was that mythical figure, Rosie Scenario. Rosie Scenario set up shop with the President's budgeteers in the Office of Management and Budget, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, Rosie Scenario and those at OMB cooked the numbers for a 10-year plan that my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], is absolutely correct in stating gives us no type of balanced budget, throws the numbers out the window that this same President said were the most reliable numbers. And, clearly, this dichotomy is behavior and rhetoric and instant revision of history calls into question just how serious the gentleman at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue is in joining with our new majority in the legislative branch to truly govern.

My friend, the gentleman from Arizona, I know we have talked about it on several occasions, this flip-flop, and I think it is incumbent upon the incumbent President to join with us and govern.

Mr. SALMON. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, I have talked to some of my Democrat friends on the other side. I think they know full well that there is going to be a lot of rhetoric, there is going to a be a lot of theatrics from the White House, and ultimately he is going to have to do the right thing because the American people are demanding it. This is a President that constantly has his wet finger in the air, testing which way the wind is blowing. He knows that the winds of change, they run hard and they are pushing us toward balancing the budget.

I would say to the gentleman from Arizona, this is not rocket science. Most folks understand that if they keep spending and spending and spending with their charge cards and their revolving debt and all those things that get us into trouble, that before too long there is a time that you have to pay the piper. When you have to pay the piper, you either decide that you are going to cut back on your spending in your family budget or you are going to find a new source of revenues.

At the Federal level that new source of revenues is the cash cow. It is the taxpayer. That is where Congress has gone in past years, taxed basically out of oblivion. Last Friday I went and spoke to two senior classes, government classes, at Tempe High School. I looked into their eyes and I asked them if they understood the implications of a budget that would not be balanced; if they understood full well that right now we have a $5 trillion debt—and your eyes kind of glaze over when you hear $1 trillion, because nobody has ever held, smelled, or touched $1 trillion—and when we explain to them that the first 33 cents out of every tax dollar that they send to Washington goes just to pay the interest on the debt, and under the current budget scenario, with $200 billion deficits, in 5 years we reach another trillion. Then before too long it is $10 trillion. Do you know what happens when we reach $10 trillion. Everything, everything that we have right now in the form of revenues is consumed just to pay the interest on the debt. Everything. We have nothing left for programs unless we go back and raise taxes.

I further went on to explain to them, those kids, most of them 17- and 18-year-old kids, when they reach my age, if we continue with the trends of yesteryear under the failed old tactics of the Democratic-controlled Congress, then they would be facing an 85- to 90-percent tax bracket. That means that $9 out of every $10 that you earn goes to Washington, DC. That is immoral. We cannot continue to do that.

No family would do that. No family would put themselves so far into debt that they would leave to their children, instead of an inheritance, all the Master Card bills and Visa card bills to pay. Nobody would do that. It is laughable. Why then would we conglomerately as a country do that to our children? It is the same exact principle.

Let me talk just for a minute about the tax cuts, too, because we hear so much from the other side that we are providing tax cuts for the rich. In my town hall meeting I asked this question: How many of you have children? Almost everybody raised their hand, I would say about 80 percent of the people in the town hall raised their hand. Then I asked, them ''Out of those of you who have children, how many of you paid at least $500 last year to the

IRS?'' I ask those of you listening on C-Span to consider the same equation: How many have children, how many have paid at least $500?

According to the liberals here in Congress, you are the rich. You are part of the problem. I think most of us understand that if you fall into those parameters, you are not a wealthy person. That is mainstream America. That is mom and pop America, who are trying so desperately to raise their children and trying to take care of their family's needs, but they are not able to because they are sucked up here in Washington. It is time we change, and it is time we realize that those people are not the wealthy, they are not the ones to be despised so we can rob the middle class to pay for failed social programs.

It is time to make a difference. We came here to make a difference, and is it so unique? Is this so historic that we finally have a body that has the integrity to keep its word? That is what this is all about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, and I think we see why I have such ample evidence of the pride I take in having such a responsible neighbor, because it is a pleasure to serve alongside him in this House, and geographically, to have our districts alongside one another.

My friend, the gentleman from Arizona, makes a very good point when it comes to personal finance and the family gathered around the kitchen table, trying to decide budget priorities. It is irresponsible to the 10th degree to imagine a family transferring its debt from Master Card to Visa in a type of credit card kiting scheme. And yet, and yet, Mr. Speaker, in common parlance here, as a Member of Congress, many of us have come to call the card that I hold here now, our voting card, in an attempt to laugh to keep from crying, we call this voting card that each of us has, the world's most expensive credit card.

There is an element of humor in the truth. Again, I think we cite it to laugh to keep from crying, so absurd has this equation gotten over the years, so overreaching has this Government come into the pockets of Mr. and Mrs. America. The reason we call our voting card the world's most expensive credit card is because when my colleagues and I received ours, each came with a debt of almost $5 trillion.

□ 2015

The gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman from Arizona would yield for just a moment, because the comments that the gentleman has made, as well as the other gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON], I wanted to share this with my colleagues, because as we talk about the debt, roughly $4.9 trillion, $5 trillion, and we talk about the debts of this Nation, I want to share this with my colleagues, that the bipartisan Concord Coalition reports that debt and deficit spending have lowered the income of American families by an average of $15,000 a year.

Very quickly, let me repeat that. The bipartisan Concord Coalition reports that debt and deficit spending by this Congress have lowered the income of American families by an average of $15,000 a year. You are absolutely right. That is why the new majority is here and I am proud to be a part with you gentlemen tonight.

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, trying to grasp $1 trillion, think about it, I am trying to grasp $1 trillion. I asked an economics individual one time, I said, how much is $1 trillion? He said $1 trillion was $1 bills laid on top of each other like this going from the Earth to the Moon and back again. That is $1 trillion. Think about that.

What kind of a legacy are we leaving? We are talking $5 trillion, five trips to the Moon and back, and yet we are so addicted to spending that we cannot stop.

Mr. Speaker, as I was running, somebody said, we had a great hurricane in 1900, in fact, the largest disaster in the United States to this day. Wiped out the whole town of Galveston, killing thousands of people. They built a seawall and on the other part of the seawall, the gentleman said, Steve, he said, we need a seawall. Can you get us Federal dollars? We know that your opponent will get us Federal dollars to build a seawall. I said, I cannot do that. I said, if you want a seawall, you maybe should vote for my opponent. Because see, if I promise you that, I am not spending your money, I am not spending your child's money or even your grandchild's money. I am spending your great-grandchild's money to buy your vote, and I, for one, cannot look in the mirror and say I bought your vote with your great-grandchild's money. That would be morally wrong. So I suggest if you want a future for your great-grandchildren, vote for me. But if you want a lousy bridge or road, vote for my opponent. I suggest to you, future is better, because we owe it to our great-grandchildren to do better and we will do better—$5 trillion.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, he makes a point so profound, and I think it demonstrates why the people of his congressional district had the great and good sense to end a long term for his predecessor and to make a change for the better in Texas, and indeed, as we see what goes on, the question remains, not the worthiness of some projects, because some projects are exceedingly worthy when viewed in a vacuum, when viewed without the reality of the budgetary constraints in which we live. And for those at home, Mr. Speaker, who may be watching saying, yes, but, yes, but, what about the role of government as charity, I would simply suggest this: Nowhere in the document of the Constitution, in the preamble especially, do you see the word charity. Indeed, it is not the province of the Federal Government to be the charity of first recourse. This Government exists, it derives its powers, from the people to serve the people, and indeed, my friend from California who serves on the Committee on the Budget has been dealing with the heavy lifting and the harsh realities of the numbers we confront. In one sense, in Washington or Orwellian Newspeak, it is an incredible, monumental task and exceedingly difficult. And yet, in real-world numbers, it is a challenge that must be met.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], what struck him most about the entire budgetary exercise on the committee and seeing this through to fruition with the reconciliation package?

Mr. RADANOVICH. If the gentleman from Arizona will yield, the point that you bring up and also the point that the gentleman from Texas brings up are very good examples of I think some of the changes that we want to see coming down in the next few years.

One thing, the biggest lesson I think that I learned being exposed to the national budget for the first time in January and the learning process that I went through is that this is a journey of 1,000 miles that begins with one step, and this budget truly is one step.

Now, you had mentioned one thing in particular, and that is the role of charity in government and how it got there, and how the one thing that we are going to have to learn when we are budgeting is if there is a need, it should not always be presented to government. I think that if you will look a little more closely in a few other books, the role of Good Samaritian was found in the Bible, not in the Constitution, and yet this is a responsibility that government is for some reason deemed necessary to pick up over the last few years, When something is not inherently someone's responsibility, that person is not going to do a very good job with that responsibility, as evidenced by what government has done with charity, via welfare, during these last 30, 40 years.

Mr. STOCKMAN. If the gentleman will yield quickly, I just wanted to point something out. Do you know that if you had one dollar and you wanted to help somebody, and as you may know in this body I was homeless, and you wanted to give it to some organization and you wanted it to be the most effective dollar you could use, you could give that dollar to the Federal Government or you could give it to Red Cross or some private charity, or your church or your synagogue, do you know that the Federal Government takes 80 cents to 90 cents to give to a bureaucrat and only gives 20 cents to the poor? It is the exact opposite in private enterprise. Is that compassion, is that true compassion to give $1 to the Federal Government seeing 89 cents of it wasting and only 10 cents or 20 cents ending up with the poor?

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield, the point that I want to make too is that not only are we starting to eliminate the deficit, but what we want to do is to begin to reduce this $5 trillion debt that we are talking about, and then after we are done with that, then we can start reducing further Federal income taxes and really shift control of the State and local levels, so that if Texas wants a sea wall, they can go to their State and local authorities and fund that and have dollars that go a lot farther to solve the problem, and we can contribute to our churches' and charities' nonprofit organizations to take care of the poor and needy and for once be effective doing it.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would just like to comment also, we hear so many times from people as we look at, not cutting programs, because I do not think we are really cutting anything. In fact, I know we are not cutting anything. The Federal budget is still rising dramatically, as we all know. When we hear of cuts to Medicare, again, I think Mr. GINGRICH probably put it best when he said it is really a problem with remedial math. The people really do not understand that when you go from $4,500 to $6,400 that that is an increase, that is not a cut. But we hear from folks, whether it is the arts or the humanities or you name it, all of these wonderful, wonderful things that the Federal Government has done, but is is a good program and it is good for society. I think back to when I was in college and I was a junior in college and I was married and we had our first child, and I remember a really high-pressure encyclopedia salesman came to our house. He made a good case and he made me feel guilty, he said how I really needed to think about my child's future and this was such a worthy program, like we hear so much in Washington, that this was something that was good. I ended up making the decision not to buy those encyclopedias. No. 1, they were very expensive, but No. 2, at that time I was working full-time, I was a full-time student, my wife was working full-time, and we were having a hard time making ends meet. We were having a hard time putting food on the table. We had priorities. Yes, it was a worthy program, but do I put food on the table for my daughter, for my family, or do I buy this worthy program? I think that is the kind of choices that we are faced with now.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I enjoyed your comments, and you made the statement that we are really not cutting programs. I want to share this with you. The total government spending over the next 7 years under the Republican plan would continue to grow an average of 3 percent per year. Social Security spending is slated to rise about 5 percent per year, and Medicare growth will average 6.4 percent. So when the liberals keep saying we are cutting, we do not care about the poor, they are so wrong, we do care about the poor and we care about every American's future.

Mr. STOCKMAN. My wife would like that kind of cuts in her own private life.

Mr. JONES. That is a personal problem.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, I think that is vitally important, and indeed we should address some of our comments, Mr. Speaker, to those who may be looking in who say to us, gee, you have not really gone far enough. And what I can say, Mr. Speaker, to those who have that idea, I would say, perhaps you are right. But it is exceedingly difficult in the span of 40 weeks to change a culture that has grown up over 40 years, not impossible, because we have taken the first steps to do so. But in this climate, within this beltway, with the Orwellian Newspeak that ignores the realities which mathematics bears out that the so-called cuts in fact are reductions in future expenditures, that have no place on any legitimate number line, but only on the squiggle that seems to meander around this district, from Federal office to Federal office, we need to have straight talk with the American public. The fact is, we are taking some steps that while they may be called momentous, history will record, perhaps as modest, but as my friend from California said, the journey of 1,000 miles begins with a single step. My journeys yesterday took me to the town of Eloy, AZ, and to the town of Casa Grande, and in Eloy I had an assembly with the entire student body of Santa Cruz High School and the question came up, Congressman, how would you rate yourself on education spending? And indeed, some of the folks who may be looking in, Mr. Speaker, are looking to the Department of Education and saying, well, there is an area, there is a project left undone. And it surprised me when I explained to the student body and to one of the questioners, I felt it was important, again, echoing the comments of the gentleman from California, I believe it is important to take the billions of dollars spent on a bureaucracy directed by a friend of mine, former Governor Riley of South Carolina, a fine and decent gentleman, but a centralized bureaucracy spending billions of dollars, I would far rather return that money to the States and counties and localities and to the school boards and ultimately to the front lines, to help children learn than to continue to perpetuate a vast bureaucracy. Indeed, as we look at the so-called Information Age, at the technological advances that we have now, what do they echo, what resounds from them in this new computer age? It is what we find in the Constitution, it is what we find in the writings of Madison, which is the power of the individual, and so that is our mission, to help empower the citizenry, to understand the value and the power of one, and to rejoice in the fact that yes, we unify on key questions and yes, even as we have differences of philosophy within this Chamber, sometimes I think exaggerated too greatly in the theater of politics, yet we have this mission to allow people to live up to their fullest potential, not due to the dictates of government, but to the dignity of their respective person. That is what this revolution encompasses, not what is radical, what is exceedingly reasonable, and much remains to be done.

I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the only thing that I would add to the comments of the gentleman from Arizona is that the hope is, too, that looking out even a little farther, is that some day that dollar, that education dollar that we send down to Casa Grande will never have to leave Casa Grande to come to Washington in the first place. So that as you well know, and I think we articulated, that dollar on its round trip to Washington and back to Arizona loses a lot on the way, and if we get to the point where we eliminate the deficit and we pay off the debt and start shifting these taxing responsibilities down to the State and local level, if Casa Grande wants its education dollars to go to the State and local government, raise your taxes and fund your own programs there.

□ 2030

Mr. JONES. If the gentleman will yield, this has been a great hour and I really have enjoyed and appreciate everybody that has joined us. I know we are getting down to the last 2 or 3 minutes, but to share with those that are watching tonight, that all the good that can come from the balanced budget, always remember that if we balance the budget, that we can create 6.1 million new jobs in the next 10 years.

We are not just talking about, as I mentioned earlier, a child born this year, we are talking about the good that can come to this country in the way of new jobs and new opportunities for our people. I thank each and every one. I know we are not quite through, but thank you for joining me and I have enjoyed being with you.

Mr. SALMON. If the gentleman will yield, I would just like to follow up on that. I think maybe that is one thing that we do not talk about enough. The gentleman mentioned that there would be 6.1 million more new jobs.

How does that occur? That occurs when you lower people's taxes. What do they do? They invest it in their businesses. And their businesses grow. When their businesses grow, there are more jobs for people. When the interest rates drop by 2 percent, once we balance the budget, they can expand their businesses, they can grow their businesses and jobs grow. And what happens when jobs grow?

Have you seen the bumper sticker that says ''The Best Kind of Welfare Is

a Job''? Truer words were never spoken, in many ways, because it helps that person preserve dignity and self-respect and feel like they are a contributing member of society.

How many of our other social programs would turn around when people felt that they had that kind of dignity and empowerment to take charge of their own lives? What is going to happen to our society is we have less reliance on social programs, on failed social programs, I might add, because there will be jobs and we will be an opportunity society as we once were.

America was great because our grandparents and our grandparents' parents that came to this land because it was the land of opportunity where you could become anything you wanted be. I think we have lost that vision but we are regaining it in this 104th Congress. That is the ball we have got to keep our eye on. That once that budget is balanced, we will be having an opportunity society again for everybody.

Mr. HAYWORTH. As I heard my colleague from Arizona, I think of our colleague from Texas who perhaps more than anyone in this institution has lived the American dream, who knows what it is like to pull up from the bootstraps. I would ask the gentleman from Texas, coming through the experiences he has, knowing the ultimate fabric and value and truth of our society, what does he see as the mission for the future?

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply touched by how after a year we still see the grassroots and I want to thank everybody who went out today. I have to tell you, I went out today and voted this morning at a little church near our home.

I did start out at night, looking up, in Fort Worth at the clock, it also had the temperature, it never dropped below 80 degrees in 1980, and I was sleeping on the concrete slab and had a lot of introspect and thought, a lot of different things.

I had to say, how did I get here and were do I want to go? But I realized one thing, that I could have easily taken food stamps. I could have easily gotten in welfare and got into the system. But that is not the road I chose. The reason I did not choose that road is because that is a dead-end road.

What Republicans are doing is opening up the road. We are not giving them the fish. We are teaching them to fish. We do not count how many people are on welfare. We count how many got off welfare and are productive members of society. That is what this revolution is about. I think tonight as the vote count is coming in, the revolution will continue.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this freshman class commit to, no matter what the media up here says, that we commit to the revolution of lower taxes and lower and less government.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I would simply conclude by thanking our good friend from North Carolina, having the foresight to schedule this special hour on an auspicious night where we rejoice in the fact that we changed things through ballots and not bullets, where we rejoice, in the freedom of our society, in the basic dignity of the American people which we hope again to empower through a revolution that is not radical but is reasonable, rational, and we will see through.

POLITICAL GAMESMANSHIP IN BASE CLOSINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] for 60 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am going to be joined by two of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on National Security, my good friend, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], as well as my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS]. We want to discuss an issue that is of great importance to our constituents.

It is also an issue that ultimately, Mr. Speaker, we view to be an issue of importance to every American, because it concerns the ability of our U.S. Air Force to protect this great Nation.

The issue is privatization in place, and it refers to a plan that has been hatched by the current administration in the White House, that makes military effectiveness and efficiency take a back seat to political gamesmanship. We will use the next hour to discuss the President's plan and offer our thoughts about the future of our military maintenance system.

Privatization in place is an issue that has come out of the White House recently because of the closing of two military bases, one in San Antonio, TX, Kelly Air Force Base, and one in California, McClellan Air Force Base. These two Air Force bases are two of the five air logistics centers that are currently operated by the U.S. Air Force.

What is the problem with the depot system? Why are we here tonight talking about the issue of privatization in place?

We are talking about that issue because of the fact that the Air Force has determined, and the Department of Defense has agreed, that we have excess capacity within the U.S. Air Force depot system from a maintenance standpoint. We have too much capacity out there to do the work that we have to do. Therefore, certain bases need to be considered from a downsizing standpoint or possibly from a closure standpoint.

The U.S. Congress has a mechanism in place called the BRAC process to deal with this specific issue. The BRAC process is not a very well thought of issue within this body. The reason is because it has a very drastic effect on areas where it is determined that bases are no longer needed and must be closed.

But the BRAC process is a nonpolitical process that was established by this body and by the U.S. Senate several years ago, and is a process that is designed to take politics out of making decisions on whether or not military bases should remain open or whether or not military bases should be closed.

As everyone knows, since the end of the cold war we have been downsizing the size of the force structure of our various militaries. We have downsized the Air Force, we have cut back on the number of people that we have in that blue uniform. We have downsized the Army, the number that we have in that green uniform; and the Navy, the Coast Guard and so forth and so on.

As we continue to downsize our military, it is necessary that we look at other areas that serve that force structure. For example, with respect to the Air Force, we now have less airplanes than we had flying 10 years ago. We have less pilots to fly those airplanes. Therefore, we have less maintenance work to be done on those airplanes. That is why we have the excess capacity that has led to this issue of privatization in place.

The BRAC process, as I say, was not a very popular item within this House, but the BRAC Commission was established several years ago to review all of the military bases all across this country from the standpoint of can we afford to operate without those military bases due to the fact that we have begun to downsize the force structure.

We do not have as many people in uniform. We need to look to see whether or not we can make savings in the amount of money that the Government spends, no only from the standpoint of paying the salary of those personnel but from the standpoint of maintaining the airplanes, of maintaining the trucks, for maintaining tanks, for maintaining ships, whatever it may be with respect to each particular branch of the service. That is why BRAC was established.

During the past 6 years, we have had three BRAC Commissions to take action with respect to military bases all across this country. Those BRAC Commissions have taken into consideration the fact that we have downsized our force structure, and they have made decisions regarding certain military bases, be they depots or be they nondepots.

Those FRAC Commissions have made decisions that are not popular decisions within this body, to close military bases, but those decisions needed to be made.

They were good judgment decisions that have been made to make certain base closures.

In this particular instance, the BRAC Commission came to consider certain bases to determine whether or not they should be closed during the 1994 year and 1995 year. They considered the Air Force depots, of which there are five,

that maintain all of the Air Force equipment that is used by the personnel in this country.

Those five bases are Hill Air Force Base, which is located in Utah, represented by my friend, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], who has joined us; Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma, represented by our friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS]; Robins Air Force Base in Warner Robins, GA; McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento, CA; and Kelly Air Force Base in San Antonio, TX.

Those were the five U.S. Air Force depots that were in existence that were under consideration by the BRAC Commission.

At this time, I am going to ask my friend, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] if he will to step in and tell us a little bit about this, and explain a chart that he has there concerning the excess capacity issue that I have alluded to, why that issue was important and what the BRAC Commission decided with respect to that excess capacity.

Mr. HANSEN. I appreciate my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, yielding to me on this very important issue that he has brought up tonight, and I thank the gentleman for coming up with an issue that I think is so very important to the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, with permission of the gentleman from Georgia, I would like to explain a little about air logistics centers, if I may. Air logistics centers are some of the largest industrial complexes in the Department of Defense. They provide the critical maintenance and logistics support to sustain our ability to meet the national military strategy.

ALC's, along with other maintenance depots, Army arsenals and Navy shipyards, provide a ready and controlled source of technical competence and repair and maintenance capability to respond to our Nation's national security needs. This core maintenance capability must include sufficient skilled personnel and capital equipment and facilities owned and operated by the Department of Defense to meet any contingency or mobilization, and must be assigned sufficient work load to ensure cost efficiency and technical proficiency in time of peace.

That is what the Under Secretary of Logistics said, why a core depot maintenance capacity is so important. Core exists to minimize operational risk and to guarantee required readiness for these weapons systems.

Those reasons, to minimize risk and guarantee readiness, are even more important in today's leaner force structure, and in fact make the armed services' new policy of two-level maintenance possible. Under two-level maintenance, a weapons system is either fixed right at the unit level or shipped back for depot level repair. Only consolidated maintenance depots under the direct control of the Department of Defense can guarantee a full service, flexible and on-time response for a predictable price in time of peace and war, without risking readiness for our troops in the field.

In the First District of Utah, I represent Hill Air Force Base which contains the Ogden Air Logistics Center. I am proud to say that Hill Air Force Base was the only installation in the Air Force to be rated in the top tier as both an operational base and a maintenance depot.

Let me just say a little about what Ogden ALC provides. Ogden is the logistics manager and depot for the world's largest aircraft fleet, the F–16, used by 21 nations around the world. Ogden is the world's largest overhaul facility for landing gear, struts, wheels and brakes, accommodating over 70 percent of DOD's work, with the capacity actually to do it all. Ogden is also the only maintenance site for the Nation's ICBM fleet, with a work force cited by the Vice President as heroes of reinvention.

These are just a few of the tremendous assets the Ogden ALC brings to the Air Force. In combination with two champion F–16 fighter wings in the vast Utah Test and Training Range, Hill Air Force Base is simply the best of the best.

In a January 1995 letter to the Secretary of Defense, the Commander of U.S. Air Force in Europe put it this way: ''The combination of Hill Air Force Base,'' and I am quoting, ''and Utah Test and Training Range is an irreplaceable national asset.'' I could not agree more.

While Hill Air Force Base represents the future fighter aircraft of the Air Force, it is Tinker Air Force Base in the great State of Oklahoma that is the future of jet engines. I have noticed, my friend from Georgia, that our friend from Oklahoma has joined us. I think that we should yield to him regarding Tinker.

□ 2045

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] that I am delighted to be a part of this tonight and have an opportunity to talk about the BRAC process and the three facilities that survived the BRAC procedures.

I want to take an opportunity at this time to share a little bit about Tinker Air Force Base, which is there in the Fourth District of Oklahoma, the district I represent, in Midwest City, OK. My colleagues owe it to themselves to come and take a look at Tinker Air Force Base sometime. It is a state of the art facility for the repair and maintenance of the world's most sophisticated aircraft engines.

The work force is a blend of military, civilian and contractor support to provide for our fighting force the fabrication of parts to keep our most sophisticated aircraft, like the B–2 bomber, in a mission ready state, or the management of missiles, such as the air launch cruise missile, the short range attack missile, the Navy's harpoon, and an advanced cruise missile.

Tinker has the responsibility of managing more than 17,000 jet engines. The Department of Defense' own depot maintenance operations indicators report states that during the period ending in the second quarter of fiscal year 1994 Tinker's average engine process days was greater than one-third, one-third better than the competition.

Additionally, Tinker's schedule indicator index for the period between April of 1993 and February of 1994 was the second best in the entire Air Force. Tinker is leading the fleet in the area of technology innovation and partnering. Tinker has formed a number of technology advancement coalitions to address a wide spectrum of environmental issues. One such venture will join all Department of Defense installations in Oklahoma as a coalition to cross feed information on compliance concerns or compliance actions and improve the partnership between the Environmental Protection Agency and other Federal agencies.

Also, Tinker has blazed a trial in alternative fuel use by adapting some 551 vehicles to run on propane, compressed natural gas, and electric battery power. Nearly 300 fleet vehicles have been converted to dual fuel clean natural gas, giving Tinker the distinction of having one of the largest dual fuel armadas in the Nation.

Tinker Air Force Base, as we went through the BRAC process, we continued to find that Tinker was well ahead of its competition and in productivity and efficiency. As a matter of fact, Tinker got out about 98 percent, or over 98 percent of its work on time.

The Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center entered into its first technology transfer agreement with private industry in November of 1994. The signing of the cooperative research and development agreement between Tinker and Savalitch Prosthetic and Research Center represents the first medical involvement for practical application between an air logistics center and a private entity.

There is a partnership between the Air Force and the Navy at Tinker Air Force Base. They share resources, some of the finest resources and skills and some of the best technology in human resources available.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I have visited several military facilities around the country, as I serve with these gentlemen on the Committee on National Security. So I have the opportunity to travel around the country and look at different Air Force facilities and ask questions. Of course, any time anyone goes into a military facility, they feel great pride knowing that they are on grounds of responsibility and commitment and sacrifice and dedication to protect our Nation's national resources or to protect our Nation's interests around the world.

I find it quite interesting to walk on the grounds of Tinker Air Force Base

and see how the general there, the commander, General Eichman, and his leadership and the management there and the civilian employees, the military employees, the contractors have created an air of expectancy, where they expect to be at the top of what they do. They expect to do things well. They expect to compete well, and they expect to come out ahead whenever they are given a task or given a challenge to do something for our Nation's forces.

I am just quite proud to be a part of Tinker and representing them in my district, and that even just makes me feel a little worse, as I understand the pride and the quality and the work that they do there, to be on the short end of this BRAC process, as the way it is being recommended by the President.

So with that, I will yield back to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman, has he commented on the strengths of Warner Robins, GA?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I have not yet, but I will take a moment to do that. As my colleagues are both deservedly proud of the work done at Tinker and the work done at Hill, I cannot tell them how proud I am to represent the Eighth District of Georgia, which is the home of Robins Air Force Base in Warner Robins, GA.

Robins Air Force Base has a $2.1 billion economic impact on the State of Georgia, and all of central Georgia sort of evolves around Robins. It is the largest industrial employer in the State of Georgia. I get filled with a sense of real pride every time I go on that military base and I see those men and women dressed in blue, knowing that not only the military but the civilian personnel at Robins Air Force Base are absolutely totally and firmly committed to ensure that they do the very best work on every job assigned to them.

At Robins Air Force Base we have worldwide management and engineering responsibility for several of the workhorses in Desert Storm, the F–15 Eagle, the C–130 Hercules, the C–141 Starlifter, home of the electronic warfare and avionic centers. We do all the maintenance work on the helicopters operated by the United States Air Force, and we do all special operations aircraft.

It was quite ironic that Robins Air Force Base competed with every other Air Force Base in the World over the last couple of years and received the award as the best Air Force Base in the whole world. It was really ironic that that announcement was made back in the spring, and the next week Robins Air Force Base was placed on the BRAC Commission list to be considered for closing.

Mr. Speaker, thank goodness we had a great experience in going through the BRAC process. As I worked with each of these gentlemen and some other gentlemen that were involved frankly in representing Kelly and McClellan, it was competition that we all participated in. Our bases participated and our bases were fortunate to come out on top. We want to talk a little bit about what happened in that process and why we are here considering the privatization in place. But let us be clear about the fact that the personnel at McClellan Air Force Base and the Kelly Air Force Base are very capable and competent, but there are just valid reasons why bases need to be closed occasionally.

We went through the BRAC process. That is part of the reason why we are here tonight to talk about the privatization in place, and I yield back to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman continuing to yield, and I appreciate we are all justly proud of these Air Force Bases we represent. People in America should realize these ALCs are some of the largest military bases in the world and the largest we have in the Air Force.

Now, the question comes down, the Navy has closed three out of their six aviation depots. If BRAC 95 goes through, as I recall, the Army will have six out of nine of theirs closed. But here of these depots are five ALCs. What is the problem? What are we talking here tonight? What is the problem the American people face?

The problem can be put into two words: Excess capacity. That is why we have this chart up here to show the people of America what we are talking about.

As everyone is aware, the Department of Defense has experienced dramatic downsizing over the last 6 years. In the wake of the victory of freedom and democracy over tyranny and communism and the end of the Cold War, our armed forces have experienced a real cut in spending of over 40 percent and a force structure reduction of over a third. Comparatively, even after full implementation of all three rounds of base closures, the department will only have closed 20 percent of its industrial capacity. In the Air Force, while we have only half the number of planes, we still have all five of the depots designed to maintain them.

As I pointed out, the Navy has closed three of six; the Army six of nine. Let us take a look at this chart.

The long black lines represent capacity, and they are fixed. Capacity in this sense measures industrial facilities and the design capability of real facilities and buildings. The only way to decrease this obvious excess capacity is to make the hard choices and close installations.

The white lines represent workload. These will continue to decline as we complete the downsizing of our armed forces.

The gray lines that we see show just how much of the current depot work loads are core and, as such, would remain in the organic depot system.

The problem displayed so clearly on this simple chart is obvious. Our depot infrastructure does not match our current or planned workload and, thus, significantly increases the cost of each and every product by spreading a massive and expensive infrastructure over a smaller and smaller workload.

I guess the question we have to face is, how can we solve this problem and eliminate the capacity?

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, under this privatization-in-place plan, I believe Tinker's capacity would be around 42 percent. So, if the objective in the BRAC process was to eliminate capacity, as the gentleman from Georgia mentioned a few minutes ago, two words, excess capacity, they want to eliminate that, under this privatization-in-place plan, Tinker Air Force Base would have 42 percent of their capacity full.

It does not take a rocket scientist to see that the privatization-in-place process is going to create even more problems for the existing facilities. I think, again, it does not take a rocket scientist to understand that. The winners in this progression become the losers because we have even more capacity in all five of the air depot facilities around the country.

We have added to that excess capacity problem rather than resolving that problem, which is what the BRAC process was all about.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, let us put this in the perspective of a business decision, which really it is. This body runs the world's largest business. Unfortunately, if every other business in this country was run the way Congress has been run for the last 25 years, there would not be many left, because we have been spending more than we make.

What we have been talking about is the fact that we have capacity at all of the five Air Force depots all across the country to do a certain amount of work. We have capacity of 100 percent of the work that each base can produce. But what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] is saying is that at his base he is producing 42 percent of what he could produce. That is an excess of 58 percent up there, and it is about the same all the way across at all of our bases.

It only made sense for the BRAC commission to say, hey, something is not right here. We are costing the American taxpayer money by having all of these bases open and all of this excess capacity out there that is costing so much just to open the gates every morning. What we have to do is, from a business standpoint, we have got to close some of those bases to narrow that capacity down and try to provide for work to be done during surge periods, such as Desert Storm or any other catastrophe that might arise or war that may break out somewhere, we have to leave capacity there for that, but we can do that and, at the same time, save the American taxpayer billions and billions of dollars. And this is

the way we do it. We consolidate the work at less depots than what we have now.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Utah said, the Navy has done it, the Army has done it, and it was time for the Air Force to do it, and that is what we have done.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to what the gentlemen have both said.

I want to talk about the base analysis of how this came about. I do not know if the people in America realize that prior to the base closing law how many bases were closed. We know the answer to that was zero. Not one. Because any Congressman worth his salt could come in here and he could just stop it one way or another because all of his buddies did not want to have his closed.

□ 2100

So they would close them all. People would come in, and they would not allow them to be closed. And they would go out to their districts and brag how well they had done.

Was it necessary to do a base closing? I think absolutely it was necessary. There is no way we could continue with the amount of money we were putting in defense, when we were facing the old evil empire, the old Soviet Union. At that point we had to pour billions and billions of dollars into defense. And because of that, we were able to bring them to their knees.

I still remember when Mr. Gorbachev gave his concession speech. A man that I knew from the Soviet Union said, you spent us under the table. Your technology was so great. We could not run with you. You are way ahead of us.

Well, we did that, but then we cannot keep it going at that level. We all know that. It could not happen. So we passed the base closing law out of that. That is Public Law 101–510. It established the independent Base Closure and Realignment Commission. And incidentally, there is not one of those for parks, in case anyone wants to bring that up. This independent commission was designed to shield the difficult issue of base closure from the political pressure of an individual congressional district and political favoritism of the President and the administration. In other words, we said, Mr. President, you do not have anything to do with it. Congressman Oklahoma, Georgia, Utah, you guys do not have anything to do with it. We are going to put this independent commission there to get this job done. Because if the political element there is, it is not going to happen.

This process has worked well. We have closed well over 100 major installations with project savings of billions and billions of dollars. The reason it works is because decisions are made on certified, objective data designed to reevaluate military value and are reviewed by an independent BRAC commission. Each community, each political leader, we are all given a shot. We all had our shot. We all realized our bases were on the base closing list. So we said, come on, you can go in there.

They came to our bases respectively. We toured them around. We made the best pitch. We got people in there from our community to put up thousands of dollars. They had bands playing and kids yelling and giving out lollipops and the whole bit to try to influence the BRAC commission. And every one was a big boy. We all knew we were taking our chances, but the main thing was not the balloons and the lollipops. The main thing was the information that they got from where? From the Pentagon.

And I happen to have here a base analysis, and this was flashed up in front of the BRAC commission, put there by the U.S. Air Force. I recalled, as you gentlemen did, on the last day when the BRAC commission decided whether or not to close some of these ALCs. The Navy has done it. The Air Force has done it.

They asked the question, is this the chart you looked at, will you stand by that chart? And the answer from the Secretary of the Air Force, General Fogleman, was yes, we stand by that chart.

As you both pointed out, we have nothing against our good friends at McClellan. We have nothing against our good friends at San Antone, but they came in last in both these instances. So it was easy for the BRAC commission to look at this. Look at the tiers. Look at how they rated them. Look at the cost to close. Look at the annual savings, the return on investment, the economic impact. It was simple to do that. It did not take a rocket scientist to look that up. This was the military. This was the Air Force's own version of what should happen.

It is not something that we came up with, even though we were doing our very best to show the best side of our bases, and we were right, our bases were excellent. But it came up from those people.

We know about the BRAC process in my home State of Utah. Utah has had a base closed every round of BRACC. From 1987 to 1993, Utah dropped from 5th to 15th in defense-related expenditures. With the closure of the second largest employer in the State, Twill Army Depot in BRACC 1993, Utah has dropped from 23d to 48th nationally in total defense dollars in the State. And we had to go through that. We cannot selfishly say, yes, hurt you, hurt them and do not hurt me. That was the reason behind BRACC.

And now the question comes up, what did the 1995 BRACC commission decide and why? Would either of my colleagues like to respond?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Well, what the BRAC commission decided was that it was time to look very closely at the five Air Force depots and make a decision as to whether or not any of them ought to be closed as opposed to the downsizing in place of all five, as was recommended by the Air Force. The Air Force wanted to keep them all five open just in case there was a major outbreak of war. And they had a plan designed where they thought they could keep operating, but the BRAC commission thought that was not the right thing to do.

The BRAC commission took the numbers that the gentleman has on the chart right there and went down the list of each of the eight criteria that the BRAC commission set forth. And they made a decision based on the consideration of all of those eight criteria that it was in the best interest of this country from a taxpayer standpoint and from a national security standpoint that two of those bases be closed, that we could handle all of the depot maintenance capacity at Hill Air Force Base, at Tinker Air Force Base and at Robins Air Force Base. Based upon their decision to do that, they made the recommendation that those two bases be closed.

And it was right interesting what evolved from that decision, which was made back July 1, I believe, is the date that that was done and the President had about 15 days to come back and either accept that recommendation along with the BRAC recommendation with respect to all other bases all across the country, or he could reject it. And then Congress had the same option of either accepting it or rejecting it. And it was interesting that the president started playing politics immediately.

There are 53 electoral votes in California. There is 40 something in Texas. Those two States are very important to any President who wants to get reelected. He knew that this would have a negative, closing of those two bases would have a negative effect on his reelection campaign in 1996. So what did he do? He began immediately playing the role of what can I do to preserve my position with respect to those two huge military facilities and hopefully be able to save the votes that are going to be necessary for me to secure the electoral votes in California and Texas.

And I have in front of me the letter that the President wrote back to the Congress when he reported back on his decision following the BRAC commission's recommendation. I would like to read just a couple of sentences out of there because we want to get both of you gentlemen to talk about what privatization in place is and why we are here tonight talking about it.

The President said as follows:

> In a July 8, 1995 letter to Deputy Secretary of Defense White, Chairman Dixon confirmed that the commission's recommendations permit the Department of Defense to privatize the work loads of the McClellan and Kelly facilities in place or elsewhere in their respective communities. The ability of the Defense Department to do this mitigates the economic impact on those communities while helping the Air Force avoid the disruption in readiness that would result from relocation

as well as preserve the important defense work forces there.

First of all, let me just say, did the gentleman from Oklahoma have any conversation with members of the BRAC commission concerning this issue of privatizing in place that the President has referred to here?

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Yes, I did. It is interesting, before I get into some of the letters I had written, I wrote all of the commissioners of BRAC and they reported back to me. I got responses back from several of them. I will read those here in just a second. But it is quite interesting to me that these commissioners had a very, very difficult job to go into these communities, every one of these communities, these five different communities, Hill, Tinker, Robins, Kelly, and McClellan, go into these communities and look in the eyes of every one of the taxpayers, every one of the people in those communities that were dependent on these jobs and finally conclude that these two have to be closed is what we are going to recommend for closure. That was a very, very difficult job.

I think it is a sad commentary on what the President has done and just kind of, in my opinion, kind of backhanding the commissioners and saying, I am going to ignore all the trials and tribulations and difficulties and burdens you went through and try to be fair and being apolitical and saying we are not going to play politics, Republican or Democrat, and we are not going to consider that one is in Oklahoma City or in Georgia, Utah, California, Texas, that is not important to us. We are after excess capacity. Went in and made some difficult decisions. They recommended two facilities be closed. And they also went on to say that over a 7-year period of time that if these recommendations were implemented or executed, that $19 billion, $19 billion would be saved over a matter of 7 years.

When you talk about the electoral votes in California and Texas, that tells me that if the President is going to ignore saving $19 billion over the next 7 years because of electoral votes, that is a pretty doggone expensive campaign, $19 billion. That is, boy, you are talking about campaign reform. We really need campaign reform from that.

As you said, my friend from Georgia shared that I have written the commissioners and got some responses back from them. I want to share with you, with my colleagues, what I got back from these commissioners, the response that I got back from several of them.

First of all, I had written a letter asking them questions about what their intentions were, did they intend to privatize in place or recommend that or encourage that. And I shared with them a letter that the President had proposed for the privatize-in-place option for McClellan and Kelly air logistics centers. However, I questioned the viability and merit of this plan. Simply put, I have thought through Dr. White's proposal and cannot make sense out of it. A few questions come to mind, and I asked them these questions.

My primary concern results from an apparent contortion of the BRAC recommendations. By any reasonable standard, the winners appear now to be the losers, and I refuse to accept that after the long and hard battle was fought and won by Tinker Air Force Base and the other two facilities, how privatization in place results in reducing excess capacity cited by the BRAC commission without reducing infrastructure at the three other air logistics centers.

I went on to ask, did the BRACC truly intend privatization in place as a viable option for McClellan and Kelly. I know it was recommended at two of the other locations, but why was it not specifically mentioned for McClellan and Kelly if it was intended as a BRACC recommendation? If privatization in place is such a good idea, why was this strategy not brought to light in hearings or at the final vote?

Why was privatization in place not mentioned as part of the Air Force's original proposal? How does privatization in place at McClellan and Kelly provide for and enhance national security position?

I believe, and I shared with the commissioners, I said, I believe in the BRACC and do not want to see a political strategy overtake a responsible and reasonable approach to downsizing our defense structure. I encouraged them to give me an apolitical answer. I shared with them a letter. I seek an apolitical answer to these questions. And these are some of the comments that I got back as I went through the responses.

One of the commissioners said:

> Moreover, not allowing the remaining ALCs, all of which ranked higher in military value, to compete for the additional workload would cause them to become increasingly less cost competitive in the future. Even beyond common sense issues of most effectively utilizing our limited defense resources, I am at a loss to understand why it would be in the Air Force's interest to protect its lowest ranking depots at the expense of its three superior installations.

He went on to say:

> As difficult as it was to vote for the closure of two facilities of this size and quality, the commission voted 6 to 2 to do so because we felt that it was in the best interest of the air force, DOD and the American taxpayers.

This is one I really found interesting:

> If any commissioner had offered a motion to privatize in place as the President proposes, I am 100 percent certain that such a motion would have been defeated handily.

That sounds like to me that this commissioner is pretty confident that this privatization in place or deal was never meant to be by any of the commissioners.

Mr. HANSEN. Is the gentleman saying, from what he has in front of him, that the commissioners said, if that motion had been made by any one of the eight commissioners to privatize in place like the President of the United States is now changing the BRACC law to do, that it would have been soundly defeated? Is that what they said?

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Soundly defeated. As a matter of fact, the words of the commissioner were, ''I am 100 percent certain that it would have been defeated unanimously.'' ''I am at a loss to understand why'' were some of the other comments that I got from the response. I am at a loss to understand why it would be in the Air Force's best interest, as I said, to protect its lowest ranking depots at the expense of its three superior installations. We had one commissioner that said, he did not provide a written response to me but I talked to him on the phone.

□ 2115

He said, ''Privatization in place would not have been approved if offered before the BRACC.'' I said one Commissioner told me they were 100 percent certain it would have been defeated unanimously. Do you stand behind that? He said, ''You bet I do. I, too, am 100 percent certain that it would have been defeated unanimously.'' There is another Commissioner who said, ''The Commission's review clearly documented significant excess capacity in the five Air Force logistics centers. Privatization in place of all of the workload of Sacramento and San Antonio air logistics centers could result in privatizing excess capacity rather than eliminating it.'' That was the objective of the BRACC, to eliminate the excess capacity, not privatize it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think this is fascinating, what the two gentlemen have brought up, absolutely damning evidence, if I may say so. First, the BRAC Commission took the response from the Air Force. We all know the Air Force said, ''Keep all five of them open.'' The BRAC Commission looked at it and said, ''We've got too much excess capacity,'' which is what we are talking about.

The General Accounting Office reviewed that and agreed completely with the BRAC Commission. There were so many. So here are the words that the BRAC Commission came up with in the final report after they had done this exhaustive study, all of this work with all these high-paid staffers. ''The Commission found that significant excess capacity and infrastructure in the Air Force depot system requires closure of McClellan Air Force Base and the San Antonio Air Logistics Center, and the Commission found the closure of the McClellan Air Force Base and San Antonio Logistics Center permits significantly improved utilization of the remaining depots and reduces DOD operating costs.''

So if we go to this next chart, we see if we close those in this capacity, here we are without BRACC, and here we are with BRACC. We are now up to 73 percent. That is about where we ought

to be, considering that contingencies come along. We do not know when it is going to play that peak and valley thing predicated upon conditions in the world, so this is principal, the ultimate place to be, 73 percent.

However, you gentlemen have both brought another factor into this. After the BRACC wisely made this decision, after they had finished their work which they had to do under public law, they then submitted it to the President of the United States. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] what were the choices the President had under the law as you understand it by your legal mind?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The President had the right to either accept the recommendations of BRACC or reject the recommendation of BRACC. There was not option one way or the other.

Mr. HANSEN. I would ask the gentleman, does he have any third alternative to this? Does the law say you could bring an additional thing to it, or does he just have those two options?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Those are the only two options he had.

Mr. HANSEN. That is the way the gentleman from Oklahoma understands it.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. That was my understanding. The President called a play that was not in the playbook. What he was doing was never an option, it was never intended by the Commissioners of BRACC. I think those charts are very telling of the dilemma that this privatization-in-place plan puts the Air Force in.

Mr. HANSEN. Those of us who were here when that law went through and those of us who argued it thought it was crystal clear. Our attorneys thought it was crystal clear. The Pentagon attorneys thought it was crystal clear. At that time the Reagan and Bush administration thought it was crystal clear, or I guess it was the Bush administration. They thought it was all crystal clear.

Now we come along and, all of a sudden we have a new play that was not in the playbook.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. If it was not crystal clear, why was not the privatization-in-place issue brought up by the White House prior to the time the BRACC decision was made?

Mr. HANSEN. A great question to bring up, is it not?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Also what if Tinker Air Force Base and/or Robbins Air Force Base and/or Hill Air Force Base had been closed? Did you gentlemen receive any indication that the President would have stepped forward and, said ''Mr. WATTS, we want to privatize in place out at Oklahoma City and keep your employees out there and continue to pay these folks?'' Was that ever mentioned to you?

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. That was never mentioned, no.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. No.

Mr. HANSEN. Possibly for this discussion tonight, we should read into the RECORD what the law really says, so people who are listening could see this for themselves. Public law 101–510 states:

> If the President approves all the recommendations of the Commission, the President shall transmit a copy of said recommendation to the Congress, and if the President disapproves the recommendation of the Commission, in whole or in part, the President shall transmit to the Commission and the Congress the reasons for the disapproval. The Commission shall transmit to the President a revised list of recommendations. The law gives the President no authority to forward the list of recommendations to the Congress with any changes or specific guidelines for its implementation.

If that is the case, what happened here? What did we get out of this after the President of the United States looked at the recommendation that the BRAC Commission worked all that time on, all that money, all that effort, all that work of the best heads in America? What did we get?

As the gentleman from Georgia brought up, no one had ever heard of this term ''privatization''. Where did this idea come from? If that is the case, there are 71 bases out there besides the ones we are talking about tonight, and I bet if we send a letter to the folks there, do you know what they would say? ''Privatize me, too. How come I am being discriminated against? Privatize me, defense depot Ogden, Tooele Army depot,'' as I mentioned, in my State, and we can mention in all the States the same thing, ''Privatize us.''

But the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Oklahoma hit upon why that is. It seems abundantly clear, and sadly, too, I may add; 52 electoral votes in one State and 47 in another State. Why would the President make those promises when he knew he would be in violation?

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think it is very clear, and I want to reiterate that again, this privatization-in-place plan was not about jobs, it was about one job, the job that allows you to occupy that big white house down there on Pennsylvania Avenue. Again, I just think it is really unfortunate that we have circumvented a very—that a very sound, apolitcal process has been circumvented. I think, too, this hurts the credibility of a system that has been used for some time, the BRACC process, and I think it obviously will hurt the credibility of the BRACC process if we ever go through this again, simply because people just will not have any confidence in it anymore, so we are not just fighting for the facilities that we represent. We are fighting for the integrity of the process, the integrity of those Commissioners that went in and faced those citizens and those taxpayers.

I remember, the day after the recommendation had been made public, seeing the Oklahoma City paper the next day and seeing the faces of some of the people down in San Antonio that had been around for 37, 38 years and had been employed there, and people were talking about what they were going to do now.

To have the Commissioners go through that torture of making some very, very difficult decisions, and any one of the three of us could have been in the same position, going into the process. We did not know who was going to be saved, we did not know who was going to make the cut. We had no idea. All I had ever asked in the process is, judge us on our merits, judge us on our quality, judge us on the standards of the leadership at Tinker and the community of Midwest City and the surrounding communities, and the employees and the contractors of Tinker. Judge us on the standard that they have created for themselves, created of expectancy, judge us on that. We can live with that.

We went through that, we won, and through this process now all three of us become the losers.

Mr. HANSEN. Do you not think that the United States of America and this Congress and the administration owes a great debt to eight very courageous people?

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. HANSEN. They did one whale of a job. The others were good. I have lived through those. I think these eight individuals did a super job. They laid politics aside and they did what they thought was the best for America, and no one moved the goalpost on them, no one came up with some new rules. They played by the rules they knew.

I guess the question we have to look at as we wind up our special order here tonight is, does the President have the right—he did not have the right, which is very clear with everybody, and I do not know anyone that disputes that, that he had the right to privatize. That was not even part of it. It was not even a consideration in the entire BRACC hearing. No one even brought it up until he did. Then the question comes up: Would he have the right to privatize under the law of the land as we know and understand the law? Is anybody above the law?

I sat on the Ethics Committee for 12 years and I went through 29 cases. In those 29 cases, from time to time we would find a Member of Congress who thought he could bend it, break it, or get away with something. I remember distinctly being in charge on the Republican side of the check-cashing area, and how many of our colleagues thought that they could bounce checks. A lot of them, they would go to jail if they were in the private sector; but no, they went ahead and did it, and did not think it would ever come home to roost.

I remember one President that we all honor and respect, FDR, who thought he could pack the Court. That blew up in his face. There is no man who is above the law. There is no woman above the law.

Now I would like to put up another chart which shows four specific parts of

the law that privatization would violate. I would like to know if someone could respond as to how anyone thinks they could get around this, or why they should, or why it even should be on the table.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. As the gentleman mentioned, this is a bipartisan issue, too. This has happened to Democratic Presidents, it has happened to Republican Presidents. When they were called and asked, ''Why are you violating the law?'' when they do not have a response to it, that they have to be dealt with accordingly.

Mr. HANSEN. I would like to point out here in this chart, if people could see, we have four specific areas of the law. We give the code number. You are welcome to look it up, debate it, talk about it, and bring it into your legal circuit. This one identifies a requirement for core organic logistic functions. This second one requires studies and reports to Congress prior to transfer of work from DOD civilian to contracted performance. The third one requires no more than 40 percent of depot-level maintenance performed by private contractors. The fourth one requires merit-based competition prior to transfer of any workload valued over $3 million per year.

I do not think any of us do not think that something should be privatized. Of course something should be. But Congress has established the rules of what can and cannot be. I do not think any of us want to turn around and say to the industrial defense complex, ''You have the whole thing. You fly the airplanes. You take care of it. You drive the tanks. You drive the submarines.'' It would not work. We would lose. We know that.

How do you say to a McDonnell Douglas, ''Pack up and go to the Persian Gulf and fight right now?'' They are private people. They do not work for the Government. We have to maintain that. Whether it is right I guess is debated, but we think that we have worked out a good compromise between core maintenance work done at our military installations, our depots, and what goes to the private sector. That is the issue that we are looking at here.

I would hope that the President of the United States, that Mr. White over at the Pentagon, that Secretary Perry in the Pentagon and all those people, and especially their legal heads, would carefully examine these four requirements that we have in front of us at this point, fully knowing the Congress will not back down from this stand, that we fully intend to carry this out to its conclusion, and if they do not like that, they should change the law.

Every one of us in our lives have been at the dinner table or at a meeting with our friends or at a public meeting of the PTA and somebody gets all excited and says, ''Doggone it, something is wrong here.'' The answer is, ''Change it, then.'' I think most of the 435 of us who are in this Chamber are here because we wanted to change the law somewhere. We wanted to see a different direction for America. We wanted to see something happen.

We do not say ''violate it'' when people come up to me and say, ''You do not have to pay your taxes.'' Do you know what is going to happen to you? You are going to be looking out the other side of the bars, because you have to pay your taxes. If you do not like that, run for Congress and get it changed. If Mr. White, Mr. Perry, and Mr. Bill Clinton do not like this, then change it, but right now this is the law of the land, and I expect the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and all of us to uphold the law. What is so wild about that?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The gentleman makes a good point on the issue of privatization. We happen to all three be Republicans. We believe in privatization. We think we need to get the Federal Government more out of our daily lives and out of our business lives than we have right now. I think all three of us are totally committed to trying to downsize the Federal Government. We think the Federal Government is doing too many things now that we ought not to be doing.

But there is one key difference in privatizing military depots and privatizing other agencies where the Federal Government is involved. That issue is exactly what the gentleman just spoke to. In times such as Desert Storm, times of Korea and times of Vietnam, and going all the way back in every war that we have fought, we have had military personnel going to the scene of the battles, going to the location where wars were fought and making sure that our tanks ran, that they started when we turned the switch, that our airplanes flew, that our ships rode high in the seas to provide the security that this country demands. If we do not have that security, then we will never remain the world's greatest military power. Thus, we will never remain the world's greatest country that we are right now.

□ 2130

I think it is absolutely ludicrous to think that we can go to the private sector and say, okay, you hire folks, train them, and tell them that if war breaks out, they have to go dodge bullets, they have to go stand on the front lines and make repairs to the vehicles and the airplanes and the ships or whatever it may be that the military is going to require, and you have to get those people on line and have them ready to go and dodge those bullets; we know that is not going to happen. We have good, qualified, trained military personnel to carry out those functions now. That is the difference in the privatization that we are talking about right now and the privatization of other agencies that we have in this country.

Mr. Speaker, a good example of privatization is Fannie Mae. Fannie Mae is something that was privatized years ago. It works well. It got the government out of that particular business of financing. The government was losing money in it. We turned it over to the private sector. It works. Let us not do something that is going to make us look back 10 years from now and say gee whiz, why in the world did we ever think that we could turn the maintaining of military equipment over to the private sector and cost the lives of our young men and women who are going to the forefront of the battle.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say, except that I think what we have tried to do is state the facts and that is what we have done. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has four different statutes there before us that all Americans can see. Anyone that would be a proponent of privatization in place can see that you can neither circumvent, nor ignore, what is on the books.

So I think we have spoken the facts this evening. I think we have shared with the American people how the President has just totally ignored the law, and I think it is important that we continue to fight this battle and continue to say to all of those that would support this effort of privatization in place that it will not work.

One more thing, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back to the gentleman from Utah, is that it is interesting how I have been contacted by, and my office has been contacted by people out at Kelly saying that we do not want to privatize in place. We would prefer that these jobs go to Tinker or Utah. We would prefer that they go there and give us the opportunity to follow these jobs.

So the employees, many of the employees at Kelly have said, we are not even supportive of the privatization in place. So again, there are a lot of statutes, a lot of law, a lot of common sense and wisdom surrounding this thing, and those who are proponents of this privatization effort, they are just totally ignoring these laws.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes an excellent point. Those people that have worked long and hard, many of those people have come into being civilian workers for the military, and have been there many, many years, and now privatization in place does not mean any sure bet for them, none whatsoever. But if their job moves, they could move with their job, and that is something that a lot of them would want, to see out their careers, to retire as Federal employees. Can anyone fault them for that? I cannot.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one point, and that is, when we stand up and debate in this hall about the authorization of the defense bill, we have people stand up constantly and say, the Cold War is over, we do not need submarines, we do not need bombers, we do not need fighters, we do not need all

of these things. Why do we have them? Let us put it in some social program.

Admittedly, some of the social programs have their genesis in very worthwhile projects, some of them probably do not. But it really amazes me that America today, most of us, the three of us here, those in this room, those people that are listening at this particular time, were able to raise our families, get our education, get to whatever professional thing we wanted to do, build our business, because we were all raised for the last 40 years with a nuclear sword over our heads. But we did that without firing the shot that everyone thought would be.

When I first came to Congress there was a survey done that said, 85 percent of the people in America felt there would be an exchange between the old Soviet Union and the United States by the turn of the century. Well, that did not happen, and it did not happen because Congress, America, basically, had the will and the wisdom to keep a strong core maintenance of people keeping this Nation free.

So a lot of us have gone on criticizing the government, doing what we do in our business, whatever we want to do, and you have done it because there has been a strong military presence in the world today.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, are there any bad guys left out there that we need this for? Well, think about it. I also sit on the Committee on Intelligence. I am not saying anything that should not be said, but we all know there is a lot of bad guys still there. They may be bad guys, but they are not dumb guys, and they know very well what they could do to this country and would very likely like to do if they had the option to do it.

When we had our trips over to the Persian Gulf, does anyone think Saddam Hussein would not mind lobbing two or more in here? Do you think Kim Il-song likes us any better? Do you think some of these other nations are our best friends? No, they are not.

You go to work every morning, you send your kids to school, you have the benefits and beauties and blessings of his country, and a lot of it is because we have fine young men and young women who have the courage to keep this Nation free. The least we can do for them is give them the right and adequate equipment, depots, airplanes, to keep this Nation free. We cannot let down on that promise. We would be betraying our oath of office if we did.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman makes an excellent point that the Cold War certainly is over. The Soviet Union is not a threat to us right now, although they may become a threat again. We do not know where it may be 10 years from now; it is in some uproar over there right now.

As Members of the Committee on National Security, we have been debating a very hot issue in our committee, and that is Bosnia. I bet if you took a vote among the three of us, I think all three of us would be voting the same way of having very grave doubts about whether or not we ought to ever send troops to Bosnia. Unfortunately, the President appears to be headed in that direction.

We have airplanes flying over there right now. We had one airplane shot down over there. That pilot I think took some resolve in the fact that he knew that his rescue team was going to be Americans flying in there in American-made equipment and American-maintained equipment. Those are the type of things that our military personnel right now rely on. They know that their equipment is maintained by the very best that America has to offer, and it always will be, as long as we maintain the depot structure in all of our military branches. But if we ever get outside of it, if we lose control of it, we will never get that control back again.

Let me just say that I thank both of you for participating in this tonight, and I think we are about to wind down, and as the gentleman from Utah said a little earlier, the three of us, and I would venture to say that most everybody in this body, intends to take this issue head-on with the Department of Defense and with the White House and we are going to win it. We are going to ensure that our depots are maintained and that our men and women that wear the uniforms in this country always have equipment that is maintained by military personnel in the best manner possible. Thank you very much.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

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

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2300

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–326) on the resolution (H. Res. 257) providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mrs. MYRICK (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WISE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TATE, for 5 minutes, on November 9.

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHRLICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, today and on November 8.

Mr. TORKILDSEN, for 5 minutes, on November 8.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each day, today and on November 8.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WISE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. PALLONE in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAYWORTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. DAVIS in two instances.

Mr. MANZULLO.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. MCCARTHY.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. ALLARD.

Mr. LATHAM.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE.

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. 1715. An act respecting, the relationship between workers' compensation benefits and the benefits available under the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act; and

H.R. 1905. An act making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 457. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to update references in the classification of children for purposes of United States immigration laws.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 8, 1995, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1614. A letter from the Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service; transmitting notification that the Defense Finance and Accounting Service is initiating a cost comparison study of the DFAS vendor pay function supporting the Defense Commissary Agency [DeCA], pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on National Security.

1615. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report on the activities and efforts relating to utilization of the private sector, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1616. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–12), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1617. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 96–2: Determination and Certification for Fiscal Year 1996 concerning Argentina's and Brazil's Ineligibility Under Section 102(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2799aa–2; to the Committee on International Relations.

1618. 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.

1619. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 96–1: Determination and Certification Concerning Brazil's Ineligibility Under Section 101 of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2799aa(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1620. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 96–3: Determination and Waiver of Argentina's and Brazil's Ineligibility Under Section 129(2)(C) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as Amended, to Receive Certain U.S. Nuclear Exports; to the Committee on International Relations.

1621. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2000 resulting from passage of S. 1254, S. 227, and S. 268, pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388–582); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1622. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's 1994 annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1623. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Federal Employee Tax Reimbursement Act of 1995''; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1624. A letter from the Executive Vice President, United States Institute of Peace, transmitting the 1994 annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1625. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on reasonably identifiable Federal and State expenditures for endangered species in fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1544; to the Committee on Resources.

1626. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting the Department's biennial report on the implementation of section 1135 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 2294 note; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1627. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Director's concerns with respect to the House-passed budget reconciliation bill containing language allowing companies to remove pension assets freely and use this money for any purpose whatsoever; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1628. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on data necessary to review and revise the Medicare Geographic practice cost index [GPCI], pursuant to Public Law 103–432, section 122(c) (108 Stat. 4409); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 994. A bill to require the periodic review and automatic termination of Federal regulations; with an amendment (Rept. 104–284, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1163. A bill to authorize the exchange of National Park Service land in the Fire Island National Seashore in the State of New York for land in the Village of Patchogue, Suffolk County, NY; with an amendment (Rept. 104–313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCINNIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 256. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 395) 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 (Rept. 104–314). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 657. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of three hydroelectric projects in the State of Arkansas (Rept. 104–315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 680. A bill to extend the time for construction of certain FERC licensed hydro

projects (Rept. 104–316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1011. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Ohio (Rept. 104–317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1014. A bill to authorize extension of time limitation for a FERC-issued hydroelectric license; with an amendment (Rept. 104–318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1051. A bill to provide for the extension of certain hydroelectric projects located in the State of West Virginia (Rept. 104–319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1290. A bill to reinstate the permit for, and extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of, a hydroelectric project in Oregon, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1335. A bill to provide for the extension of a hydroelectric project located in the State of West Virginia (Rept. 104–321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 1366. A bill to authorize the extension of time limitation for the FERC-issued hydroelectric license for the Mt. Hope waterpower project (Rept. 104–322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2366. A bill to repeal an unnecessary medical device reporting requirement (Rept. 104–323 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2366. A bill to repeal an unnecessary medical device reporting requirement (Rept. 104–323 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of bad debt reserves of savings associations which are required to convert into banks, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2586. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 257. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–326). Referred to the House Calendar.

BILLS PLACED ON THE CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

Under clause 4 of rule XIII, the Speaker filed with the Clerk a notice requesting that the following bills be placed upon the Corrections Calendar:

H.R. 2366. A bill to repeal an unnecessary medical device reporting requirement.

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. ARCHER:

H.R. 2586. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 2587. A bill to carry out the international obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions to provide criminal penalties for certain war crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 2588. A bill to nullify the 25-percent pay increase afforded to Members of Congress by the Ethics Reform Act of 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on House Oversight, Rules, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 2589. A bill to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until December 31, 1995, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

H.R. 2590. A bill to better target loans to family farmers and income-producing activities, to provide for the improved management of the portfolio of loans made under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, to assure the prompt repayment of such loans, and to consolidate Federal rural development programs into a single program of capitalization grants to States for rural development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 2591. A bill to provide for administrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2592. A bill to reduce the fiscal year 1996 budget for intelligence activities by $1 billion; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 2593. A bill to enable processors of popcorn to develop, finance, and carry out a nationally coordinated program for popcorn promotion, research, consumer information, and industry information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on House Oversight, Government Reform and Oversight, Ways and Means, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WISE:

H.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution honoring the life and legacy of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 254. Resolution making technical corrections in the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. RIVERS:

H. Res. 255. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that a Member, officer, or employee may not accept a gift or expense reimbursement from any entity which has an interest in actions taken by the Congress; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 79: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 109: Mr. METCALF, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 119: Mr. REED.

H.R. 123: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 142: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 359: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 497: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WARD, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. CHRYSLER.

H.R. 559: Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 573: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 580: Mr. MARTINI.

H.R. 783: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 835; Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 957: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 969: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 1003: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1024: Mr. CHRYSLER and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 1083: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1161: Ms. DUNN of Washington.

H.R. 1201: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1210: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 1226: Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. FUNDERBURK.

H.R. 1499: Mr. SHAW and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1619: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. MARTINI.

H.R. 1627: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 1733: Mr. EWING, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1747: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1776: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1856: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ROEMER, MR. JONES, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 1863: Mr. MCHALE, Mr. FORD, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1884: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2090: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2098: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 2190: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 2244: Mr. ENSIGN and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 2245: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 2270: Mr. WAMP, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 2306: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2323: Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 2333: Mr. CRANE, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2335: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BROWDER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 2337: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 2341: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2342: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mrs. LINCOLN.

H.R. 2400: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2429: Mr. HOUGHTON and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 2435: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2447: Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 2463: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 2468: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FOX, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 2509: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 2519: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 2525: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WELLER, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2528: Mr. COOLEY, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2550: Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 2555: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 2572: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 2579: Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.J. Res. 70: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FOX, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.J. Res. 97: Mr. SANDERS.

H.J. Res. 114: Mr. FROST, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. BORSKI.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. KIM.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEACH, Ms. FURSE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Res. 30: Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H. Res. 220: Mr. OLVER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MCKINNEY.