The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1772, 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2715, PAPERWORK ELIMINATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–532) on the resolution (H.R. 409) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2715) to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Paperwork Reduction Act, to minimize the burden of Federal paperwork demands upon small business, educational and nonprofit institutions, Federal contractors, State and local governments, and other persons through the sponsorship and use of alternative information technologies, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1675, NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–533) on the resolution (H. Res. 410) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1675) to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1800

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on all legislation passed today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA (H. DOC. NO. 104–200)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments concerning the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order No. 12978 of October 21, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

1. On October 21, 1995, I signed Executive Order No. 12978, ''Blocking Assets and Prohibiting Transactions with Significant Narcotics Traffickers'' (the ''Order'') (60 Fed. Reg. 54579, October 24, 1995). The Order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of four significant foreign narcotics traffickers who are principals in the so-called Cali drug cartel centered in Colombia. They are listed in the annex to the Order. In addition, the Order blocks the property and interests in property of foreign persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, (a) to play a significant role in international narcotics trafficking centered in Colombia or (b) to materially assist in or provide financial or technological support for, or goods or services in support of, the narcotics trafficking activities of persons designated in or pursuant to the Order. In addition the Order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, persons designated in or pursuant to the Order (collectively ''Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers'' or ''SDNTs'').

The Order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDNTs, and any transaction that evades or avoids, has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, the prohibitions contained in the Order.

Designations of foreign persons blocked pursuant to the Order are effective upon the date of determination by the Director of the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the Federal Register, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On October 24, 1995, the Department of the Treasury issued a notice containing 76 additional names of persons determined to meet the criteria set forth in Executive Order No. 12978 (60 Fed. Reg. 54582–84, October 24, 1995). A copy of the notice is attached to this report.

The Department of the Treasury issued another notice adding the names of one additional entity and three additional individuals, as well as expanded information regarding addresses and pseudonyms, to the List of SDNTs on November 29, 1995 (60 Fed. Reg. 61288–89). A copy of this notice is attached to this report.

3. On March 8, 1996, FAC published a notice in the Federal Register adding the names of 138 additional individuals and 60 entities designated pursuant to the Order, and revising information for 8 individuals on the list of blocked persons contained in the notices published on November 29, 1995, and October 24, 1995 (61 Fed. Reg. 9523–28). A copy of the notice is attached to this report. The FAC, in coordination with the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, is continuing to expand the list of Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers, including both organizations and individuals, as additional information is developed.

4. On October 22, 1995, FAC disseminated details of this program to the financial, securities, and international trade communities by both electronic and conventional media. This information was updated on November 29, 1995, and again on March 5, 1996. In addition to bulletins to banking institutions via the Federal Reserve System and the Clearing House Inter-bank Payments System (CHIPS), individual notices were provided to all State and Federal regulatory agencies, automated clearing houses, and State and independent banking associations across the country. The FAC contacted all major securities industry associations and regulators, posted electronic notices to 10 computer bulletin boards and 2 fax-on-demand services, and provided the same material to the U.S. Embassy in Bogota for distribution to U.S. companies operating in Colombia.

5. There were no funds specifically appropriated to implement this program. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 21, 1995, through April 20, 1996, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to Significant Narcotics Traffickers are estimated at approximately $500,000 from previously appropriated funds. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of Justice, and the Department of State.

6. Executive Order No. 12978 provides this Administration with a new tool for combating the actions of significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia, and the unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm that they

cause in the United States and abroad. The Order is designed to deny these traffickers the benefit of any assetts subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and to prevent United States persons from engaging in any commercial dealings with them, their front companies, and their agents. Executive Order No. 12978 demonstrates the U.S. commitment to end the scourge that such traffickers have wrought upon society in the United States and beyond.

The magnitude and the dimension of the problem in Colombia—perhaps the most pivotal country of all in terms of the world's cocaine trade—is extremely grave. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against significant foreign narcotics traffickers and their violent and corrupting activities as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 23, 1996.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from 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.]

CLOSING A PROFITABLE PLANT MAY LEAD TO A CHANGE IN THE RULES

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is a speech I was hoping I would not have to give. It is a speech I may have to repeat at greater length, and I hope I will not have to do that.

In the City of New Bedford, which I represent, there is a plant, the J.C. Rhodes Co., which has been for a very long time a successful manufacturing plant, manufacturing metal fasteners, manufacturing some basic devices, and they have been profitable. We have heard a lot about American industry not being able to compete. Well, we have a plant here with an excellent dedicated work force. This plant has been around 100 years, and it is successful and profitable.

Recently the plant was bought, not by another primary metal producer, but by a financial organization. This financial organization then decided that it would shut down this profitable plant because they could make more money by shutting the plant down and consolidating the production at a plant in a different part of the country. They did not argue that it was a problem of lack of profitability. They did not argue there was no way they could make a go of it in Massachusetts. They did not argue it was because our costs were too high.

Mr. Speaker, it was simply that because of the financial manipulations involved they now found it more profitable to shut down the plant. No one is asking them to lose money.

I have not gotten into detail about the names of individuals; I hope there will not be a need to do that, because I do not want to interfere with negotiations going on now. But it would be a failure on my part not to make clear to all concerned what the stakes are.

The stakes are these. We have a profitable plant in a part of the country where industry has, for a variety of reasons, been diminishing. Heavy industry. This plant is still profitable. It was bought. We have responsible, successful business people, themselves in the manufacturing business, working with the city government and the city of New Bedford, working with the union, the United Electrical Union, working with others, and they are ready to buy the plant at a reasonable price and keep it going. We are being told that we cannot have that, by some, not because this plant is not profitable but because, to be honest, some extremely wealthy people can add incrementally to their great wealth by throwing these people out of work.

That is why this is so important. The question that America has to confront right now is, are we at a point in our economic system, with the rules that have been set forth legally and in every other way, in which the jobs of the 100 people and of families dependent on them count for zero; in which the fact these people have been working very hard for many years profitably for their employer counts for zero; in which the great costs that would be imposed on the city of New Bedford and the surrounding area, the city of Fall River and surrounding areas where these people work, does that count for zero solely so that some people who are already quite wealthy can become a little bit wealthier?

They can increase wealth that will make no difference in their lives except when they chortle over the balance sheets.

I am not asking anyone to take a loss or to keep open a building or a plant that cannot make it. I am saying that, if we are going to be told that the rules are such that this financial conglomerate can come in and simply buy up a plant and shut it down and throw these people out of work and have no concern for the disastrous financial consequences, no concern for the tax losses, no concern for the unemployment compensation that will be paid out, for the mortgage loans that will be defaulted, the student loans that will not be paid back; if the system allows a small number of people to get a little wealthier by causing this degree of financial havoc when the plant can make it on their own and people are willing to buy it and keep it running at a price that would be a reasonable price, then the rules have to be changed.

Mr. Speaker, I have met with the owners of the plant, along with business people from my district, along with the union and people from the mayor's office working with our Senators, Senators KENNEDY and KERRY. We are trying to persuade the owners to be reasonable, not to take a loss, not to subsidize anybody, but to tell us that the lives of these working people do not count for zero, that a marginal increment in their great wealth is not going to be the only factor. If in the end their answer is that nothing else counts in the balance, that nothing but their ability to maximize their already high profits will count, that all of the serious real economic costs that will be imposed on working people and on the city and on the State of Massachusetts, that those will count for nothing, then they are helping to convince me we have to change the rules.

□ 1815

I want the free market system to work. I do not want to interfere with it. But I cannot as a Representative sit idly by and allow the system to go forward if the consequence is that extraordinarily decent hard-working people are penalized and victimized solely for the financial gain of a small number of people with no real economic improvement for society. I hope I will not have to again be at this microphone on this subject.

EDUCATION

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to address my colleagues in the House on the subject of education. Everywhere you turn, in fact I just read this recent article in U.S. News and World Report, there is criticism about United States education. This U.S. News and World Report article and cover story is entitled Dumb and Dumber. It talks about the failure of the United States education.

Part of the debate here before Congress has been the question of how much money we throw at different programs. One of the questions I have always raised is, are we paying more and getting less?

One of the criticisms of the new Republican majority is that they were cutting ''education.'' In fact, that really is not the case. If you just took a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to look at the initial budget that we proposed for the House of Representatives and