



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 5, 1997

No. 76

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 5, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROBERT W. NEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Steve Kummernuss, Zion Lutheran Church, Doylestown, OH, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, You have given us this good land as our heritage. Make us always remember Your generosity and constantly do Your will. Bless our land with honest industry, truthful education, and an honorable way of life. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance, and from every evil course of action. Make us who came from many nations with many different languages a united people. Defend our liberties and give those whom we have entrusted with the authority of government the spirit of wisdom, that there might be justice and peace in our land.

Bless those who hold office in our Government that they may do their work in a spirit of wisdom, kindness, and justice. Help them use their authority to serve faithfully and to promote the general welfare, through Your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. GIBBONS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

WELCOME TO REVEREND KUMMERNUSS

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to welcome today Reverend Kummernuss from the Zion Lutheran Church in the 16th District of Ohio, who gave the invocation, a very thoughtful one, I thought. And this is a little bit special because Reverend Kummernuss' son, Matthew, is one of our outstanding pages this session.

We are pleased that we could have Reverend Kummernuss here today to join in our opening and also to give him an opportunity to see where his son has spent his past several months. If we have any errands that we need run, just summon him. Since Reverend Kummernuss has the privileges of the floor today, he also has the privilege of asking Matt to do his errands.

We are happy that Reverend Kummernuss joined us for today's invocation.

BOY SCOUTS AND GIRL SCOUTS

(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, a California court ruled that the Boy Scouts do not have to accept girls. Scouts honor. Check this out, 13-year-old Katrina Yah sued, her attorney said the Boy Scouts of America is a business, therefore under California law, she should be allowed in. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. What is next?

Boys suing the Girl Scouts. Sons suing the Daughters of the American Revolution. Grandpas suing the Brownies. Teenagers suing the AARP? Think about it. I believe that there is really nothing wrong in America with boys being boys and girls being girls. Think about it. Yield back the Cub Scouts.

SHORTFALLS IN DEFENSE FUNDING

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on National Security will meet soon to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for military activities of the Department of Defense. When voting on the defense authorization bill in the coming weeks, we must consider our Reserve component forces and the shortfalls in their funding. What will happen to our Reserve component readiness, compatibility and equipment interoperability with the Active Force if we continue to shortchange these forces?

We must remember that as the American defense budget continues to dwindle, we will be relying more on these

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H3479

dedicated men and women who choose to serve in the Guard and Reserve.

If we continue to ask these troops to do more with less, more operations and contingencies with less equipment, less training and fewer troops, we will see significant problems with recruiting, retaining the same caliber people that we choose to serve in this All Volunteer Force. Our Armed Forces, Mr. Speaker, are more than just Active Forces. They are a total force component comprised of Active, Reserve and Guard members.

EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call on my colleagues to join me in support of educational standards of excellence for our Nation's students and parents and communities. As a former State superintendent of schools in North Carolina, I have seen firsthand how much progress can be achieved when we aim high in education and give our children and teachers the tools they need to get the job done. I call on this House to go on record in favor of this commonsense approach to improving education in America.

Last week I participated in an educational town hall meeting with the Vice President in my home area. The voice I heard from North Carolina students and citizens came through loud and clear. An America needs educational standards of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, I have drafted legislation in support of voluntary standards of educational excellence. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

BE FAIR TO OUR NATION'S POLICE AND FIREFIGHTERS

(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, today I will be introducing a bill that is aimed at benefiting our Nation's police officers and firefighters. My bill will rescind the dollar limitation on police and firefighter benefit laws allowing these employees to collect the money that they have rightfully earned by contributing to their benefit fund, to their pension fund.

Currently, under section 415 of the Tax Code, police officers and firefighters are not eligible to collect the funds that they have earned and instead are required to retire with benefits generally based on the percentage of their highest 3-year salary average. Regrettably the average in most instances does not exceed 65 or 75 percent. Thus many officers living along the east coast or in large metropolitan

and surrounding suburban areas throughout our Nation are forced to work past their general retirement age in order to afford the high cost of living in these areas.

This bill will not initiate a tax revenue loss. In fact, under my bill, we would gain Federal revenues due to the disbursement of previously uncollected funds to retirees.

I invite my colleagues to support this measure. Let us be fair to those who day in and day out place their lives on the line for our protection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop the political games. The Republican leadership's failure to pass a clean supplemental appropriations bill is denying our troops in the field the resources they need to carry out their mission. The supplemental appropriations bill provides \$2 billion to pay for our operation in Bosnia. If we do not enact this bill swiftly, their readiness will suffer.

I am holding letters from Secretary of Defense Cohen, and the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and Air Force, which describe the effects on the military of the Republicans' failure to pass a clean bill. Training is curtailed. Maintenance is delayed. Rotations are canceled. Inventories are drained. Our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen need a clean supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a time for partisan politics and there is a time to put it aside. But when Americans are hit by a natural disaster, we must act together and act quickly. When American troops need our help, we must do our job and do it today.

Let us support our troops in Bosnia and our people at home. Pass a clean supplemental.

VOTE "NO" ON CAMPBELL-GREENWOOD

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today two diametrically opposed resolutions will be on the floor, in the next order of business dealing with population control. The Campbell-Greenwood substitute, which is a substitute to a bill or amendment that I am offering along with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA], promotes abortion on demand overseas and not family planning.

The Campbell-Greenwood amendment does not add any pro-life conditions to current law. Rather, it blurs the distinction between abortion and

family planning in U.S.-supported programs overseas. It allows U.S. dollars to go to the U.N. Population Fund, the UNFPA, even though that organization continues to support China's brutally enforced one-child-per-couple policy, and to nongovernmental organizations that are engaged in a crusade for abortion on demand around the world.

My amendment does not reduce family planning by even one penny. It conditions those funds to those organizations that are all about family planning and not about abortion promotion. I urge a "no" vote on the Campbell-Greenwood, a "yes" vote on the Smith-Barcia-Hyde-Oberstar.

IN OPPOSITION TO REPUBLICAN AMENDMENTS TO DISASTER RELIEF BILL

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, there are people in the Midwest who are suffering. Their homes have been destroyed by floods and they need our help. The Democrats in Congress have an emergency spending bill that will help them put their shattered lives back together.

We want to help these victims but the Republicans will not let us.

Instead, the Republicans are attaching language to a flood relief bill that would stop an accurate count of minorities in the census. The Republicans are so afraid of an accurate count of minorities that they are willing to let flood victims suffer.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans do not mind playing politics with the American people. They already shut down the Federal Government twice. Now they are fiddling while the Midwest drowns.

THE NEED TO FUND FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS IN MIDDLE FLORIDA

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to make my colleagues aware of a crisis existing in the middle district of Florida. The current Federal case load is one of the worst in the country. The population continues to increase. If no additional judgeships are approved, by 2005 there will be only one-third of the State's Federal judges assigned to two-thirds of the State's population.

As case loads increase, current judges cannot simply shoulder the additional burden. By failing to create additional positions, we are producing a backlog of cases, increasing legal costs for citizens and undermining the Federal courts.

Lately much attention has been focused on getting tough on crime. We must remember the only path from indictment to incarceration is through the judiciary. It must receive adequate

resources, otherwise the process is brought to an absolute standstill.

Only judges can exercise judicial power. There is no substitute. I urge my colleagues to fill and fund these vacancies and provide much needed help to judges, not only in Florida but across this Nation.

FLOOD RELIEF

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Government shutdown artists are at it again. Americans watched with disgust as this House Republican leadership shut down the Government and frittered away one and a half billion dollars of taxpayers' hard-earned money. Well now, this same crowd is in control, and they propose to shut down flood relief moneys to families desperate for assistance throughout the American Midwest.

□ 1015

Even though the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense say that our troops in Bosnia cannot rotate out in order and cannot come home after placing their lives at risk for our security, they would shut down those funds.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people can see that this same shutdown fervor for partisan political advantage is wrong and they can recognize when they look at North Dakota that it is not the only disaster area in this country. One of those disasters is occurring right here, when the needs of the American people are forgotten in the race for partisan political advantage.

DOUBLE STANDARD EXISTS IN THE AIR FORCE

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, it was only 1 week ago that a junior officer in the Air Force was discharged without honor for engaging in an extramarital affair. This junior officer was a woman. Today, 1 week later, a general in the same Air Force is up for promotion to the pinnacle of military responsibility after engaging in an extramarital affair. The general was a man.

Whether this double standard is because of military rank or of gender, it is still a double standard and it is simply wrong. Secretary Cohen said today he wanted to stop the feeding frenzy surrounding allegations in the Armed Forces. I understand his goal and believe he is trying to do what he feels is the right thing; however, if he wants to promote General Gaston to the Chair of Joint Chiefs of Staff, he should invite Lt. Kelly Flinn to rejoin the Air Force as a B-52 pilot.

This morning women all over America are scratching their heads wonder-

ing what kind of double standard exists in the Air Force. The Secretary should rectify that immediately and reinstate Lieutenant Flinn.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to House Resolution 159 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1757.

□ 1017

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. NEY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 4, 1997, pending was the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] adding a new title to the bill.

Pursuant to the order of the Committee of that day, debate on that amendment and all amendments thereto will be limited to 1 hour and 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the following Members or their designees:

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for 20 minutes;

The gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] for 20 minutes;

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for 20 minutes; and

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and let me just begin this debate by saying that today one of the most important pro-life amendments will be up before this Congress.

It is the amendment that separates abortion from family planning in our overseas population control programs. It is a policy that was in effect during the Reagan-Bush years and effectively erected a fire wall between family planning and the promotion of abortion on demand around the world, where approximately 100 countries protected their unborn. And regrettably they are under siege by organizations like Planned Parenthood and others in trying to bring down these laws.

So that is what the amendment is all about. I understand there will be a substitute that, frankly, is a fake, and we will talk about that during the debate.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] the designee for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]?

Mr. BERMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

We have 25 speakers, many of whom thought this would be starting at 10:30, so many are probably on their way over at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BERMAN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Presently before us is the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. And we are operating under a unanimous-consent request with respect to the Smith amendment, a substitute amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], and time limits for debate on both of those measures; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. On the Smith amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. BERMAN. But at this point, though, Mr. Chairman, the only amendment in front of us is the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the Chair, and I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, a parliamentary inquiry. Is my understanding correct that there will be a unanimous-consent request to divide time?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unanimous-consent agreement has already been ordered. The time has been divided.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Further inquiry, Mr. Chairman, before proceeding, and that is whether the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment is to be the only amendment included during this time period?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. On the clarification, the time restriction is on the Smith amendment and any amendments thereto.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Further inquiry, Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, it is my understanding that that is the only amendment; otherwise we might want to divide the time differently.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding that presently before us is the Smith amendment, the Campbell-plus amendment will be offered as a substitute to that amendment, and the time limit is for the two amendments together, three 20-minute segments.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's clarification.

One last inquiry of a parliamentary nature, Mr. Chairman. Is it now appropriate or necessary for me to actually move the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment as a substitute for the Smith amendment?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It would be in order for the gentleman to offer an amendment at this time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMPBELL to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Page 1, strike all following the title designation and insert the following:

SEC. . POPULATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES OR OTHER POPULATION ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available to pay for the performance of abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in cases of rape or incest.

(2) The limitation contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to the treatment of injuries or illness caused by unsafe abortions.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other provision of law, none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available to lobby for or against abortion.

(2) The limitation contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

SEC. . UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND.

(a) LIMITATION.—Subject to subsections (b), (c), and (d)(2), of the amounts made available for each of the fiscal years 1998 and 1999 to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not more than \$25,000,000 shall be available for each such fiscal year for the United Nations Population Fund.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CHINA.—None of the funds made available under this section shall be made available for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(c) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—(1) Not more than one-half of the amount made available to the United Nations Population Fund under this section may be provided to the Fund before March 1 of the fiscal year for which funds are made available.

(2) Amounts made available for each of the fiscal years 1998 and 1999 under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the United Nations Populations Fund may not be made available to the Fund unless—

(A) the Fund maintains amounts made available to the Fund under this section in an account separate from accounts of the Fund for other funds; and

(B) the Fund does not commingle amounts made available to the Fund under this section with other funds.

(d) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than February 15, 1998, and February 15, 1999, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees indicating the amount of funds that the United Nations Population Fund is budgeting for the year in which the report is submitted for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(2) If a report under paragraph (1) indicates that the United Nations Population Fund plans to spend China country program funds in the People's Republic of China in the year covered by the report, then the amount of such funds that the Fund plans to spend in the People's Republic of China shall be deducted from the funds made available to the Fund after March 1 for obligation for the remainder of the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

Mr. CAMPBELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offer to the Smith amendment restores the agreement that was reached last year on U.N. family planning assistance, and its purpose is that we would have exactly the same compromise which allowed us to go ahead with necessary family planning assistance through the U.N. population fund that we had last year and that was made law last year.

Let me be explicit in noting that it does not permit the United States contributions to go for any abortion purposes; and, also, it states that there is to be no contribution at all to China. So those two issues really should be taken off the table. In the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment funds may not be used in China, even if it is for family planning in China.

So the substance of the amendment is, I repeat, what we had last year. Money is to be cut into two parts, that which is available for disbursement before March 1 and that which comes after March 1. That which comes after March 1 goes to the U.N. population fund, as the first half does as well; but, dollar for dollar, if the United Nations family planning fund gives money to China, then dollar for dollar we restrict, we take that dollar out of what the United States is contributing to the UNFPA.

So, as a result, it is simply not true that any of our taxpayers' money will go to fund abortion. It is also untrue any of our taxpayers' money will go to assist even family planning in China. What the amendment permits, however, is the continuation of successful participation in family planning, which, I suggest, is a very great benefit to the U.S. interests and to those in need throughout the world.

I draw attention to the fact that family planning is a substitute for abortion. It is just essential to recognize that if a country is attempting to bring down its birthrate, and if there is a temptation to have abortion as a means of doing that, family planning is far preferable.

The Smith amendment, by contrast, runs a tremendous risk. What it does is to say unless the President can certify

that the entire United Nations fund does not go to assist in China, or unless the President can assert that there are no coerced abortions in China, then all United Nations family planning assistance contributions by the United States must end.

Let me be very clear about that. Even if the assistance is to Bangladesh, even if the assistance is to sub-Saharan Africa—because of China, the United Nations family population assistance, the part that comes from the United States, may not go ahead. Whatever one's views happen to be about China, it is simply wrong to punish the good essential functions of international family planning in destitute areas of the world because of China, which is what the Smith amendment does.

Last, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw attention to the fact that contraception diminishes abortion. The facts are indisputable. I cite the AID studies in this area involving Russia, Kazakhstan, Hungary, where there was an increase in the use of contraception, a dramatic drop in abortions followed.

Russia, 1990 to 1997, contraceptive use went up 30 percent, abortion dropped 22 percent; Kazakhstan, 1993 to 1994, contraception went up 59 percent, abortions dropped 41 percent; Hungary, from 1968 to 1988, contraceptive use more than tripled and abortion dropped more than half.

Examples of this nature are obvious because the need for family planning removes the occasion for abortion.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify some of the information relative to the Smith-Barcia-Oberstar-Hyde amendment and mention a few of the points that the amendment attempts to address and focus the issue and the discussion back on the issue of the amendment itself as opposed to debate between of course the concept of contraception, which many of us support and certainly should support, and the actual language of the amendment.

The Mexico City policy would ensure, of course, it would certainly address the point in the policy and it would ensure that U.S. tax dollars will not be allocated to foreign nongovernmental organizations unless they agree not to violate the laws or lobby to change the laws of other countries with respect to abortion and agree not to perform abortions in those countries, except in the cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is in danger.

□ 1030

Second, it closes the loophole that allows U.S. tax dollars to subsidize organizations which perform abortions. Currently, law under the 1973 Helms amendment prohibits the direct use of U.S. foreign aid funds to pay for most abortion procedures. U.S. funds and tax dollars are being used indirectly by organizations claiming that they are

using their funds and not U.S. tax dollars to perform abortions.

Third, the amendment will prohibit any U.S. funds to the United Nations Population Fund, the UNFPA, until they cease their support for China's coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization policy. The actions of the Chinese toward their citizens are beyond description. The forced abortion of their unborn and mandatory sterilization of their people, regardless of the economic hardship in their country, is inexcusable. U.S. funds should not be used to support those actions.

This amendment does not decrease funding for population assistance. In fact, spending for population control programs increased over the time the Mexico City policy was in effect from \$318 million for fiscal year 1985 to \$448 million for fiscal year 1993. This amendment continues to fund international population assistance but limits the availability only to those organizations who do not perform abortions.

Finally, this amendment will not prevent funding for most family planning organizations. Virtually all family planning organizations agreed to the terms of the Mexico City policy.

Mr. Chairman, those are the points that I wanted to make. I know we will be hearing additional debate on these very important amendments, and I hope that those of us who are concerned about this issue will get to the floor on our side to be recognized for statements they might wish to make, recognizing of course that it is a very busy and hectic time this morning as we try to complete the session business this week. But I am delighted to join my cochair, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has done a fine job in leading the discussion and offering these amendments which I was very pleased to offer bipartisan support to.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California, the author of the substitute which we are now considering, made the essential point. It is counterproductive, it is wrong to seek language which would restrict the disbursement of contraceptive services in the name of opposition to abortion when the consequence of that very conduct will be to increase abortion. That point needs to be made over and over again.

I want to just take what little time I have yielded myself to point out the other language in the amendment of the gentleman from California. There is a clear prohibition on the use of U.S. funds to pay for abortions or for abortion counseling in any foreign country except in cases of rape, incest, or where the life of the mother is in danger. No U.S. funds will be used for these purposes.

The goal of the Campbell amendment is to free up family planning funds and

contraceptive services so that people can make their decisions about how to avoid the problem of having to have abortions. It also prohibits lobbying on the issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith language and in very strong opposition to the Campbell-Greenwood amendment. I would like to clarify the debate at hand here. This is a funding issue, what are we going to do with our U.S. taxpayer dollars. While there are prohibitions against U.S. taxpayer dollars being used for purposes like providing abortions, for lobbying to overturn pro-life laws in foreign capitals, or to go to an organization that promotes the forced abortion issue that is going on in China, United Nations funds right now are going to China and they are using it to force women who do not want to have abortions to have abortions.

Our colleagues will claim that that is OK and that they can play this numbers game, and they can use our U.S. taxpayer dollars to provide condoms or other contraceptive services and then use dollars from somewhere else for forced abortions, for providing abortions or lobbying to overturn abortion laws in foreign capitals.

The Smith amendment very clearly just says we are not going to give it to those organizations, we do not want to give U.S. taxpayer dollars that come out of the pockets of hard-working Americans, millions of whom are pro-life, millions of whom are pro-life Catholics and Protestants who have a strong religious prohibition against this.

We do not want to give our U.S. taxpayer dollars to those organizations. Why would we want to give U.S. taxpayer dollars to an organization that is going to do forced abortions in China, and then we are going to get up here on the floor of the House and smile and say, well, our dollars did not go for that purpose.

I mean, what a joke. They have got \$1 million in the account, and they get \$500,000 from the United States and \$500,000 from their private sources, and they say the \$500,000 going for abortions comes from the private sources. I say support the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and support his amendment, vote against the Campbell-Greenwood amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], the co-author of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, what is this all about? The base bill does the right thing. The base bill holds true to America's commitment to population control.

This is the history of population growth on planet Earth. We can say that in the second half of this century we headed off on an explosive growth of population worldwide, and most of that growth is in underdeveloped nations, in places like India and China and Africa.

The purpose of these funds is to simply enable families, particularly poor families, to have the number of children that they want to, as many children as they want to or as few as they want to.

My colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], has an amendment. His amendment would say that none of the funds to help control population development may go to an organization if that organization, with its own money, not with American taxpayers' dollars but with the money of the woman who seeks an abortion, provides that service as well.

My colleague stands on a moral point. I respect him for that. But there is a time in public policy where morality becomes hypocrisy and morality becomes hypocrisy, when what we are trying to achieve does far more harm and in fact goes counterproductive to what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I am not suggesting that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is hypocritical, if that is his point.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I appreciate that.

Mr. GREENWOOD. I am suggesting that public policy can make us all hypocrites. The point is that without these funds, the consequences are real. The consequences are 1,600 women dying every day because their pregnancies are too closely spaced together, because their bodies are too young, their bodies are too old to sustain that pregnancy, they die of postpartum hemorrhage.

Five hundred eighty thousand women die a year because they do not have access to good reproductive health services, and it is hypocritical for any of us to suggest that we want to, in the name of reducing the number of abortions, allow that to occur. It is wrong to allow 7 million infants a year around the world to die because they are born to women who cannot nourish them, they are born into families that cannot sustain them. That is an awful consequence to pay for a moral principle.

It is wrong and most ironic that the consequence of the Smith amendment is millions and millions of more abortions around the world, because we will not stop abortions by simply prohibiting agencies from participating in family planning funds. That defies common sense on its face. In fact, what we do have is an explosive growth of abortions in those places around the world where women do not have access to family planning.

My colleagues, please support the Campbell-Greenwood amendment. It accomplishes what we all want to accomplish. It reduces human suffering. It empowers poor families to develop their families, to grow their families as they are able, to prevent this awful toll of human suffering, and it ensures that not a penny, not a dime of taxpayer moneys goes to pay for abortion.

Let us talk about the realities of this process. We know that if the Smith amendment prevails unamended by Campbell-Greenwood, that this will not be accepted by the Senate and it will be vetoed by the President, so this will not stand. This is the time for compromise. We have found ourselves compromising on this issue year after year, session after session. Let us be realistic. Let us understand the political realities as well as the realities in human suffering and support the Campbell-Greenwood amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would just also like to comment on the Campbell-Greenwood amendment and say that it simply does nothing to end United States support for the UNFPA's continued activities in China that have already been referenced, and I think are certainly viewed in a very negative fashion by the taxpayers across this country. It also does nothing to end United States tax dollars being used to promote and perform abortion around the world.

Pro-life Americans believe that it is improper use that any tax dollars go to organizations that perform or promote abortions, even though these organizations may claim that U.S. dollars are not used for abortion-related activities. We should not support any organization that fails to adhere to our unyielding belief in the right to life.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ADERHOLT].

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

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], an amendment that would save literally countless children throughout the world, and in opposition to the alternative amendment which would only continue the status quo, dodging the real issue at hand.

I would like to commend my colleague from New Jersey for taking action to try and prevent the use of hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars for promoting abortion and funding the international abortion industry. How can we justify using our hard-earned money for the purpose of helping foreign nations take the lives of innocent children? This is not what I would call foreign aid.

I also commend my colleague for taking steps to save children from a death sentence. Just yesterday in Poland, Pope John Paul II stated that the right of life is not a question of ideology, not only a religious right, it is a human right. He also restated his belief that a nation which kills its own children is a nation without a future.

The question we will vote on today is quite simply whether you oppose taxpayer funds being used to promote abortion in foreign countries or whether you support it, pure and simple.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes on behalf of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, our world's population is growing at an alarming rate. Resources are being consumed faster than they can be renewed. This exploding population is leaving poverty, malnutrition, widespread transmission of disease, and environmental degradation in its wake. That is why, Mr. Chairman, support for reproductive health services is becoming more important every day.

□ 1045

Voluntary family planning services give mothers and families new choices and hope. They increase child survival and promote safe childhood and safe motherhood. Without our support for international family planning, women in developing nations will face more unwanted pregnancies, more poverty, more despair.

Mr. Chairman, it continues to be extremely ironic that the same people who would deny women in the developing world the choice of an abortion would also seek to eliminate support for family planning programs, programs that reduce the need for abortion in the first place. Without access to safe and affordable family planning services, there will be more abortions, not fewer, the abortions will be less safe and put more women's lives in danger.

To this end, Mr. Chairman, the very least we can do is pass the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment. We should not be playing political football with international family planning funds. Let us allow international family planning programs to do what they were designed to do, maintain sustainable levels of population, giving people in the developing world better health, greater prosperity and more hope for the future.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Smith amendment which would reinstate the so-called Mexico City policy.

Once again we have this unnecessary debate. Once again those of us who are strong supporters of international family planning have to remind Congress that we already prohibit U.S. funds for

abortion in international family planning through a 1973 Helms amendment that is part of the permanent foreign aid statute. Once again we have to remind Congress that family planning is not abortion, that family planning prevents abortion. Once again we stand here today debating an issue of women and infant mortality.

This amendment uses scare tactics to prevent nongovernmental organizations from discussing issues pertaining to reproductive rights. The Smith amendment gags foreign nongovernmental organizations from talking to their own governments with their own funds about abortion law or policy, even when it might involve discussions about making abortions safer.

The effects of the Mexico City policy are far-reaching and negative. According to UNICEF, each year 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes; 75,000 of these deaths are associated with self-induced unsafe abortion. Is this the result we want? Do we want the blood of 75,000 women on our hands year after year after year?

In addition, this amendment would terminate the entire U.S. contribution to the U.N. Population Fund unless the President certifies that the U.N. Population Fund has terminated all activities in China. This is simply not fair.

The U.N. Population Fund's country program in China ended in 1995. Currently they maintain a liaison office only in Beijing for programs in Mongolia and North Korea. This amendment seeks to use the U.N. Population Fund's past program in China and its small presence in China as a basis for withdrawing all support of the U.N. Population Fund altogether.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize that to call family planning abortion is to trivialize a critical and complex issue. Family planning is prenatal care. Family planning is child nutrition. Family planning is followup and preventive care. It is the education provided by international family planning that is often what enables children to survive the first year and what enables women to survive their pregnancies.

Do not impose this gag order. Provide the world with family planning education that works to eliminate the need for abortion. Defeat the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment and in opposition to the Campbell amendment. The Smith amendment is about abortion and it is about prohibiting the use of Federal dollars for the promotion of abortion. Do not be misled. Promoting abortion is never about family planning.

This administration would have us believe that once we give away millions of dollars to contractors or grantees in faraway countries, how these dollars are used is irrelevant as long as their money is not being used to directly perform abortions. Since when is it irrelevant that U.S. tax dollars are being used to harm innocent human life? Since when are Americans obligated to finance efforts to dismantle the laws of foreign countries who have so appropriately chosen to protect human life? And since when has this Government simply turned over tax dollars to any individual, organization or entity and simply said, "What you do with this is irrelevant," especially when lives are at stake?

Mr. Chairman, human life is relevant. Nothing is more relevant. It matters to that innocent baby that may be killed because laws that protect it are being dismantled with U.S. tax dollars. It matters to the families of these children. Quite frankly, it should matter to us. It is our obligation as elected officials to actively protect innocent human life. Abortion is a disgrace to society and to civilization. Let us not degrade ourselves and our reputation abroad any longer. Please support the Smith amendment and defeat the Campbell amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise respectfully in disagreement with the Smith amendment and support of the Greenwood-Campbell-Lowey amendment and thank them for their leadership in bringing this amendment to the floor.

It seems repetitive to say what some of my colleagues have already said on the floor on this issue, but obviously the issue needs repetition because it does not seem to be clear that this provision, the Smith amendment, is unnecessary. No United States funds can be used by UNFPA in China. Current appropriations law, and I speak as ranking member of the subcommittee on appropriations for foreign operations, so I know intimately the details of our legislation. Current appropriations law already denies foreign aid funding to any organization or program that, quotes, supports or participates in the management of a program of coerced abortion or involuntary sterilization in any country, and this is under the so-called Kemp-Kasten amendment. Further, current appropriations law also ensures that none of the United States contribution to UNFPA may be used in China, and United States funds are maintained in a segregated account and may not be commingled with other UNFPA funds.

I understand and appreciate the concern that my colleague has spoken out on in terms of China and their forced abortion program. But the United States Government should not as a matter of principle hold family plan-

ning and UNFPA hostage to a legitimate concern that my colleagues and I share about the conduct of the Chinese Government. There is a well-founded concern about China's family planning program but not UNFPA's. UNFPA is already subject to more restrictions that are more punitive than those imposed on other multilateral organizations working in countries considered to be rogue nations or guilty of human rights abuses.

We must not hold our policy hostage to the politics of the House of Representatives. We must not hold the poor families and the poor women of the world hostage to the politics of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds to respond.

This is not about politics. This is about life and death. We are talking about not reducing family planning by a dime. That is a priority issue and that is a money issue. We are talking about erecting a wall of separation between promotion and performance of abortion overseas by groups like Planned Parenthood Federation of America and their international branch and the IPPF and all these other groups who have it as their mission to promote abortion on demand globally. That is what we are talking about. This is not about politics.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I come forward today to express my strong support for the Smith amendment that would essentially restore two policies that were in effect during the Bush and Reagan Administrations. I totally support and identify with the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey. One concerns future U.S. funding of the United Nations Population Fund. The second is intended to prevent U.S. funding of nongovernmental organizations which perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, current law, known as the 1973 Helms amendment, already bans direct funding of abortions. But I have learned that Planned Parenthood Federation of America—now, this is a fact—Planned Parenthood Federation of America provides direct assistance to family planning projects through its Family Planning International Assistance Program. That is not fiction. That is fact.

In Kenya, for instance, the Family Planning International Assistance Program began supporting a project designed to remedy the serious problem of unsafe abortions. The project offers feminine cyclical regulation and post-cyclical family planning services. The other projects, in Bangladesh and Nicaragua, also provide abortion and cyclical regulation services. Altogether these projects perform nearly 10,000 abortions a year.

Mr. Chairman, this news makes me very angry, because we have to deal with the facts. We cannot be fooled by the false claims of many international population groups who state that this is not an abortion issue. It is an abortion issue.

We must be firm and stipulate that no population funds will go to foreign nongovernmental organizations that, No. 1, perform abortions, except in the case of criminal rape, incest, or when the mother's life is in imminent danger; or, two, violate the laws of any foreign country. We must respect their laws with respect to abortion. Or, three, engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country with respect to abortion.

My position on abortion is very clear and consistent. I oppose it except in the case of the imminent life of the mother being threatened, or criminal rape or criminal incest, where that has occurred.

Our system of laws, our American heritage, is based on the idea that people have certain God-given rights, and those rights are life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Those rights existed before laws were established. In fact, it is because of those rights that existed that laws were established in order to protect those rights.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have the highest respect for the gentleman from New Jersey. He has been and is one of the great leaders in this Congress in supporting human rights and the rule of law across the world. Yesterday, he stood up and ensured that Voice of America and Radio Free Asia got additional funds so that we can broadcast the message of freedom to the people of China hourly.

We have had this debate so many times. Sometime I hope that I can convince the gentleman from New Jersey that voluntary family planning, the right to plan the number and spacing of one's children by the spouses of a family, is a basic human right for all people across this planet and that the United States of America ought to be the strongest supporter of that basic human right.

□ 1100

Mr. Chairman, yes, I agree there is absolutely no question that abortion is not a legitimate family planning method. The United States has never provided \$1 for abortion as a family planning method, and we do not do so today. Unfortunately, some have seen an opportunity to address a tangential issue in the context of voluntary family planning, and in the meantime, 75,000 women a year all across this world are dying from botched abortions.

In the year 2025, the world's population is projected to be 8.2 billion people; 85 percent of this population will

live in less developed countries. Thirty-five percent of the developing world is under the age of 15, compared to 20 percent in an industrialized country. In nearly all sub-Saharan African countries close to half the population is under the age of 15. What opportunity do those people have to a life of any hope?

In 1994, the average gross national product per capita in the United States was \$25,860; in Africa, \$660. With the population rate increasing faster than an economic growth rate, people are simply assigned to the dustbin of a life of no hope, no future, and no chance.

We are talking about international family planning. The abortion issue has been brought into this debate sideways, as a tangential issue. Some day we have to realize that access to family planning is a basic human right. I would say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that, since we are both strong supporters of human rights worldwide, I hope we can find common ground to support family planning and to ensure that abortion is never considered as a legitimate option.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in strong support of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe substitute. My good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and other proponents of the Smith amendment, claim that the amendment simply cuts abortion funding. What they do not tell us is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973.

This amendment would cut abortion funding from its current level of zero to zero. Therefore, the Smith amendment must be after something more. That something is family planning.

One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent.

Let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women around the world. Complications of pregnancy, child birth, unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the third world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems; each year 250,000 women die from unsafe abortions. Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care. Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them. Most of these deaths can be prevented.

The Smith amendment would impose a gag rule on U.S.-based organizations, nongovernmental organizations, multi-lateral organizations that provide U.S. supported family planning aid overseas. The gag rule is written, in fact, so broadly that it would prohibit the publishing of factual information about maternal morbidity and mortality related to unsafe abortion.

Finally, the Smith amendment cuts funds to UNFPA, an organization that provides family planning and population assistance in over 140 countries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment and to support the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I would just like to respond to the gentlewoman from New York's comments, a Member who I have a great deal of respect for, but again we emphasize this amendment does not decrease funding for population control assistance. In fact, spending for population control programs, as I mentioned in my earlier remarks, increased over the time the Mexico City policy was in effect from some \$318 million for fiscal year 1985 to over \$448 million for fiscal year 1993. The intent of the Smith amendment is to restrict those dollars from being used through subterfuge for the performing of abortions.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my good friend and colleague that I recently came back from a trip to Egypt. This amendment would have a chilling effect on programs such as exist in Egypt which are lifesaving to women and children, helping them space their children, giving them the information. If an organization such as we find in Egypt that provides these valuable services to these women uses their own money or even provides some factual information in response to a question, they could be defunded.

So we are saying here, and I believe with all due respect to my friend and colleague, that this is not about family planning; it is because, in speaking to the health professionals, they make it very clear that this would have a tremendous impact on family planning.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT], my good friend and colleague.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support a strong wall between abortion and other health-related services. This Congress should do nothing to spend U.S. tax dollars overseas to promote abortion. We as Members of Congress should not help abortionists push abortion.

If my colleagues want to hear the type of philosophy this administration wants to fund, listen to a quote from the director of the U.N. Population Fund. China has every reason to feel proud of and pleased with its remarkable achievements made in its family planning policy and control of its population growth. Now the country could offer its experiences and its special experts to help other countries.

This is a shameful statement. The forced abortion policy in China is

wrong and immoral. This Nation should not use our hard earned tax dollars to push China's policy or this administration's abortion philosophy on other nations in the world.

Mr. Chairman, we should build a strong wall between the abortion industry and other health-related services. We should promote health-related services, but let us stand up to the most pro-abortion administration in our history. Please support the Smith amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Is the gentleman the designee for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]?

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I think there is one fact that cannot be argued here. If the Smith amendment wins, as well-intentioned as it is, there will be more abortions because every time we shut down a family planning project we end up with unwanted pregnancies, and the only alternative we are going to leave for these women are abortions. In many instances not only will the fetus die, the mother will die because they do not have the kind of conditions that a safe abortion can be performed in. So my colleagues can be on lots of sides on the issue of abortion, but they cannot argue with one central fact here:

If the Smith amendment wins, women will die, and more abortions will occur because when we take away the choice of family planning, when we reduce the leverage of the dollars we have that provide for education and family planning, contraceptives and other methods of reducing the need for abortion and reducing unwanted pregnancies, we end up with one unarguable fact, that the number of abortions worldwide will increase.

Now my colleague's intent may be another category. People's intent may be completely honest here. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who I know to be a genuine individual and cares deeply about this issue, has the best intent possible. But the results of his amendment, if it succeeds, will be to increase abortions around the world in communities that cannot afford it. They cannot afford the economic consequences, they cannot afford the loss of life of mothers who are mothering children already born, and so the policy that we will send from this Chamber will have the exact opposite result than the one the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is seeking.

We need to defeat the Smith amendment to make sure that people have an alternative to abortion around the world, that family planning, that contraception is the way that we can do that, and so I say to my colleagues,

"Don't just walk into this Chamber and think about where you normally line up on this issue, because if you really want to cut the number of abortions worldwide, vote against the Smith amendment. If you're really against abortion, if you want to see fewer abortions than we had yesterday, then oppose the Smith amendment because it is the only way to reduce the number of abortions. You can't hope it is going to do it, you can't do anything else to reduce it except to increase family planning and education."

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just briefly to respond.

First of all, we are saying in my amendment, "Divest yourself of abortion and you get family planning funds." The gentleman from Connecticut in 1984-85, when I first offered this amendment, said none of the non-governmental organizations would accept those conditions. Well, over the course of the years in the 1980's, early 1990's, virtually every family planning provider except for the International Planned Parenthood Federation in London and Planned Parenthood Federation of America accepted those conditions. They separated themselves from the killing of babies through abortion and took the money and did family planning. We want to erect that wall again in my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde-Barcia amendment.

I find it ironic that today the U.S. Congress is honoring Mother Teresa for her devotion to protecting the lives of the world's children, born and unborn, and yet the American government is contradicting itself by sending money to pay for abortions in other countries. This is an outrage. Each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for family planning organizations which in turn use the money for population control activities. These groups perform and promote abortion worldwide so in essence this American money ends up paying for abortions.

The majority of the American public is opposed to spending their tax dollars on federally funded abortions. Let us not forget that we are elected to serve the people of America. Surveys have shown time after time that the people, no matter how they feel on the abortion issue, are adamantly opposed to their tax dollars paying for abortions. It is not fair and it is wrong that the U.S. Government continues to go against the will of the taxpayer.

The fact that American tax money is spent overseas on abortion not only goes against the wishes of the taxpayer, it is anti-family. We are talking about the lives of innocent children. The allocation of this foreign aid money contradicts the ideals that this

Congress claims to support. It is wrong for the U.S. Government to set the social agenda for other countries.

I urge my colleagues to protect life. Support the Smith amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. EMERSON].

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment to prevent taxpayer dollars from promoting abortion overseas, and I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for offering this important amendment and for his unwavering support for the unborn.

As many of us know, the House has already endorsed several of the provisions of the Smith amendment in a vote earlier this year, and in passing H.R. 581 we affirm the wisdom of the Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy, which does prevent taxpayer dollars from going to international organizations which promote or perform abortions as a method of family planning. Today the House has an opportunity to again make it clear that the U.S. Government must not be in a position of encouraging abortion.

The second part of the Smith amendment, which would prohibit funding of the United Nations population fund until that body ceases activities in China or until China abandons its policy of forced abortion, is equally as important as the first. It is a terrible injustice that the UNFPA would allow China's abuses to go unchecked, but worse still that the United States taxpayer may be a partner to this crime.

□ 1115

The safeguards contained in the Smith amendment are the only way to be sure that we are not fostering the policies of the Chinese Government, or making it possible for the UNFPA to do so.

I urge the House to say no to a policy of exporting abortion and yes to support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment. I strongly support international family planning because we know it will improve women's health, it reduces poverty, and it protects our global environment.

Some people claim that our family planning efforts increase the number of abortions. This is not true. This amendment is not only harmful, it is unnecessary as well. By law and by practice, U.S. funds cannot be used today to provide abortion services, either in the United States or abroad. AID has implemented procedures that carefully monitor the spending of these funds, and independent audits confirm that not one dollar of U.S. funds is used today to perform abortions.

While I personally support a woman's right to choose strongly and I disagree with this policy, it is, nonetheless, the current policy and the current law with or without this amendment.

The real problem with this amendment is that it forces family planning clinics that receive U.S. funding abroad not to use their own resources to provide abortion counseling or to perform abortions. Clinics that accept these restrictions will be limited in the services they are able to provide, and many health clinics will not accept such restrictions on the use of their own resources and may be forced to close for lack of funding.

These closed clinics will no longer help women receive prenatal care, will no longer prevent more women from dying during childbirth, will no longer prevent unintended pregnancies, and therefore will no longer help reduce the number of abortions. The number of abortions will increase, not decrease, if this amendment were to pass.

This amendment is unnecessary, pernicious and harmful. It will simply result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women in childbirth, and more abortions. It makes no sense on any grounds, and I strongly urge a yes vote for the Lowey-Greenwood substitute and a no vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I heard the comments on that side of the aisle, and I would say to my good friend from Connecticut and the gentlewoman from New York, if we knocked on the door of the people who live in Danbury, CT, in Torrington, CT and in Hartford and we said to them, we want to tax you and take the dollars that you are paying for your automobiles and dollars you are paying for your food and we want to send them over, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] would like to do, to Egypt, we are sending them over to Egypt to a group that is involved with family planning. What do you think the people of Westchester and Armonk, New York and Torrington and Danbury and Hartford would say. Get a life. They would not say, here are my dollars, run over to Egypt and give them to a family planning organization. How ridiculous. They would say no, I want to keep my dollars here.

Then we would say, well, we are going to put in a very strict accounting mechanism that is going to say, wait a second, these dollars will not be used for abortion, they will only be used for the health and welfare of the child and the mother. They would say, well, maybe, just maybe, but by and large every one of the people in Torrington and Hartford and Armonk and Westchester County would say, you know what? I would like to keep my tax dollars here.

We are talking about taxpayers money. We are talking about people

who pay taxes. My colleagues on the other side want to send this money way over to these countries and let these people use it for anything they want. And the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] here, all he is saying is, I want to put a mechanism in place to protect the taxpayer. Good Lord. Let us support the taxpayers and support the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, since his first days in office, President Clinton has pushed for abortion on demand, both domestically and abroad. His policies undermine the laws of several foreign countries where abortion is illegal, particularly in Africa and parts of Latin America.

With his repeal of the Mexico City policy in 1993, President Clinton has granted United States funds to organizations heavily involved in promoting both the legalization and provisions of abortion in foreign nations.

Supporters of worldwide family planning legislation say that this vote has nothing to do with abortion, but everything to do with family planning.

We must understand that abortion is a central element to what many countries consider family planning. Whether or not U.S. funds pay for the actual abortions themselves, nothing is preventing pro-abortion organizations from spending more of their own money on abortion when U.S. funds are there to fill the caps.

Congress must assure that international population assistance dollars will not support organizations which perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning. Representative SMITH'S amendment assures the American taxpayers that their money will not fund any program which not only performs abortions but attempts to change abortion laws in other countries.

This amendment reinstates the Mexico City restrictions on international family planning by prohibiting United States funding to any organization that directly or indirectly performs abortions in a foreign country.

Furthermore, this amendment will prevent the United States Government from funding any aspect of China's horrific population control programs. United States policy must stand against China's brutal policies toward its women and baby girls. But we don't have a chance of succeeding until we stop pouring money into programs that force abortions and sterilizations without consent.

Thomas Jefferson once said, "The care of human life and happiness, and not their destruction, is the first and only legitimate object of good government." I share this commitment to actively support legislation that sustains the Federal Government's traditional goals in family planning.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support Representative SMITH'S amendment which will restore the program's original purpose—promoting family planning, not abortion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], my friend and colleague.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Smith-Oberstar-Hyde-Barcia amendment. I also want to make it clear, as Members who are

listening, I favor family planning, so I think one can strongly favor family planning and be for the Smith amendment.

Also, this just merely returns us back to the policies of previous Congresses. This is not something dramatic or new, it just previously goes back to where we were, and more importantly, this is the House of Representatives. This returns us to the position of the American people. The American people, if they were voting today in the Congress, would clearly support the Smith amendment.

Third, this is about China. This is about China. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I were in China together where we talked to people where we had cases of women who were literally tracked down in villages and forced to have an abortion. So this is about China, and it is about forced abortion with regard to China.

Lastly, under the Smith amendment, I believe as someone who strongly favors family planning, there will be more money for family planning, and I strongly urge Members on both sides to support the Smith amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

We have this debate almost every year here and it always makes me sad. I think those of us who are fortunate enough to live in America where we have good access to health care and information probably do not understand what it is like in a Third World country where one does not have it.

Frankly, I think the harshest kind of birth control on Earth is to live in a place where women kill themselves trying to abort. They have not been able to get the information they need to help space their families or even to plan them, and we rise to the floor year after year after year and say that we don't care.

Is there anything worse than the children who are left motherless because their mother could not face one more child, and we could have helped her, had we been able to give the family planning information that she needed?

I want to give two quotes this morning which I think are very succinct. One of them has to do with the Helms amendment, and I know everybody in the majority strongly believes that the Helms amendment is quite good. The first is no U.S. foreign aid funds are used to perform abortions. It is explicitly prohibited in the annual appropriations law and the underlying statute, which is the Helms amendment. USAID has been scrupulous in complying with the law, and even the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is my good friend, agrees that the Helms amendment stopped the direct funding of abortions.

The second is what Vice President GORE has said, and I quote,

Our administration believes that the United States Constitution guarantees every woman within our borders the right to choose. We are unalterably committed to that principle, but let us take a false issue off the table. The United States has not sought, does not seek, and will not seek to establish any international right to abortion.

He said that at a national press conference in 1994, and that has not changed.

The Smith amendment is absolutely unnecessary and it is simply again another way to punish women in other countries and to provide some sense in the House that we are helping children, which is absolutely untrue.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, this has to be emphasized. The vote today is not about whether we are pro-choice or pro-life on abortion, it is about whether life for thousands, hundreds of thousands of families who choose to plan their families will include a real chance to do so, not whether or not abortion is available to that family.

I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], yes, I think most Americans support U.S. assistance for voluntary family planning.

Since 1973 the Helms amendment has prohibited the use of U.S. dollars to perform, support, or encourage abortion overseas. That mandate has been followed in good faith by the U.S. Government. And in order to ensure its implementation and sensitive to the argument about fungibility of moneys, when I was assistant administrator of AID, we instituted in the late 1970's a rigorous system to separate out U.S. moneys from other funds spent by organizations receiving American funds, and that practice has been followed assiduously by every administration. Audits show not one dollar of American funds is being used for abortion-related activities overseas.

So this is the basic question. When the United States is fully abiding by the Helms amendment, when the Government has taken every possible step to separate American funds so no American money is being used for abortion-related activities, and when there is no real fungibility as to U.S. dollars, do we want to stop the availability of critical funds for voluntary family planning for millions of families in fast-growing developing countries?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the answer for each of these is no. I urge a vote against the Smith amendment and for Campbell-Greenwood.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge Members to support the

Smith amendment. The Campbell amendment merely creates a scheme which frees up more of the organization's own resources for the promotion of abortion overseas. In contrast, the Mexico City policy places a wall of separation between abortion and family planning.

The Smith amendment prevents U.S. funding for such things as China's deplorable population control program, which includes coercion, forced abortion, forced sterilization for Chinese men and women alike. Women all over China are victimized daily due to their ability and desire to bear children. China's so-called family planning policy includes the following methods, and it is documented in this book by the anthropologist Steven Mosher and others, entitled "The Broken Earth". This is the international family planning program the UNFPA has publicly praised.

First, arresting pregnant women and taking them to abortion clinics tied up or in handcuffs. Second, incarcerating pregnant women in barracks until they acquiesce to abortions and/or sterilization. Third, forcing pregnant women to attend study sessions away from their families until they agree to have abortions. Carrying out sterilization or abortion without the consent or knowledge of the women while rendering other medical services. Imprisoning husbands until wives submit to abortion procedures. Cutting off food, electricity, water and wages for couples who refuse to comply with the Chinese Government's barbaric policies. Confiscating furniture, livestock and even homes of families who refuse to comply. And fourth, demolishing the homes of people who refuse to comply as reported in the two Catholic villages at Hepel Province.

Mr. Chairman, this is not family planning. These are outright human rights abuses. I do not believe this is a pro-life or pro-choice issue; this is a human issue, this is a woman's issue, this is a family issue. This is an issue of blatant governmental abuse, and the United States should not be in any way a part of it through the United Nations or any other agency.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE].

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear what this amendment is about. This amendment is not about abortion. This amendment is about family planning. If we went to the door of every household in this country and said, do you think our Government should be involved in family planning efforts throughout the world so that women are not forced against their will to have countless unwanted children, children who will be subject to starvation, children who will be subject to disease, so that the women can avoid the pregnancy to begin with, so that the woman can avoid abortion, these families across America would say yes, we think that that is a high use of our taxpayer dollars. We think that America

should be working across the world to prevent unwanted pregnancies and to help increase the quality of life for citizens around the world.

□ 1130

That is a noble purpose. Let us be clear. The current U.S. policy prevents Federal funds from being used for abortions anywhere in the world. This is not going to be changed.

What this amendment will do is prevent women across the world from planning their pregnancies and avoiding unwanted pregnancies. That is not the policy the United States should pursue. That is why just last month or the month before, this Congress affirmed the right of the United States to increase its family planning efforts nationwide.

I urge Members to defeat this amendment, to keep our appropriate policy throughout the world, and prevent unwanted pregnancies to begin with.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the Smith amendment. My time is short, so let me get to the point: the U.N. funds. My parents had more than one child. Because they had the freedom to do so, I have a wonderful sister named Olga. However, parents in China do not have a similar basic right. Brothers and sisters are illegal. Until the UNFPA strongly condemns and disassociates itself from this brutal coerced abortion policy in China or any other country, no United States tax dollars should go to this misguided program.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise this Congress' and in fact our Nation's attention to this irony of our entire overseas abortion debate. Many of our colleagues who will stand here on this floor and oppose this amendment to restore the successful Mexico City policy are many of the same Members who regularly lambasted this body for not moving campaign finance reform.

If they truly believe in campaign finance reform, this is their vehicle. This is the first campaign finance reform vote of this session of Congress. Vote for the Smith amendment and Members will walk the walk of campaign finance reform. Otherwise, they are saying it is OK for U.S. foreign aid money, America's hard-earned tax dollars, to be used as soft money to lobby and change abortion laws throughout the world.

Make no mistake about it, failure to enact the Smith amendment will be interpreted by the world community that this Congress wants our tax dollars going to foreign lobbyists to change other countries' laws. I am against welfare for lobbyists for the abortion industry, and so is the vast majority of the American people. The Smith amendment will prevent this. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the

gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if it seems we just had this debate, it is because we just had this debate. On February 13, this House by a vote of 220 to 209 decided to release these international family planning funds. We did so, 44 Republicans, 175 Democrats, and one Independent to 20 in all, so we knew at the end of the day if we are going to achieve the goals that we share, that we all share, including the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that international family planning funds be available to help empower families to control the number of children that they have, that the only way to get that done is to do it without the entanglements of the Smith language, to pass language that is straightforward, that prevents these funds from being used for abortion, can be adopted by the Senate and signed by the President.

When all is said and done, if we adopt the Smith amendment, we know that one of two things will happen: Either we will come back on another day and undo it, as we have in the past, or we will kill the program. Neither of those, certainly killing the program makes no sense. It makes no sense to do this simply for rhetorical reasons today, and come back and compromise as we have done each and every year.

Let us do what is reasonable. Let us do what is sensible. Let us adopt the compromise which is embodied in the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe amendment now, get it over with, and move on to the next issue.

I want to particularly address those colleagues who equivocate on this issue to be consistent and vote today as they did in February.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank first of all the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for his dedication to this issue. While we disagree on the major issue, I think his dedication is certainly something we all commend. I value his participation in our committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Campbell amendment. As Members know, I am a strong supporter of voluntary family planning programs. It is important to note that after almost 30 years of U.S. assistance to the voluntary family planning programs, the health of millions of women and children has been improved throughout the world.

I also note that the voluntary family planning programs have led to the reduction of abortions in key countries and in newly independent States of the former Soviet Union, where abortion used to be the only method of family planning.

Mr. Chairman, family planning is good for mothers, for children, for the environment, and for economic growth. The Smith amendment would impact upon voluntary family planning programs by blocking assistance to key providers of family planning programs in the U.N. Fund for Population Activities.

Permit me to review a couple of basic facts about the family planning program. First, the Hyde amendment is part of the current U.S. law which prevents any U.S. funds from being used for abortion. Second, the U.N. Fund for Population Activities no longer has a family planning program operating in China. Accordingly, the Smith amendment is language in search of a problem that essentially does not exist. Please permit me to repeat: United States funds are not now used for abortion and the UNFPA does not have any program in China.

I would also like to bring Members up to date as to how this issue affects the rest of this important issue. The Committee on International Relations, when it met to consider this bill, rejected language offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and included language offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] on this very point. I remind our colleagues that the Committee on International Relations strongly favored the Campbell language and supports the voluntary family planning program.

Accordingly, I urge Members to support the Campbell amendment and oppose the Smith amendment.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

MR. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind Members that the U.N. Population Fund was there on the ground in 1979 when the one-child-per-couple policy was crafted. They were one of the cocrafters. Over the years they have praised this coercive population control program, given it highest praise.

Dr. Sadik, the executive director of the U.N. Population Fund, has said it is a "totally voluntary program," a total lie. It is not a voluntary program. It is a coercive program.

Let me also add that they are now in negotiations with the Beijing dictatorship to decide what kind and the scope of any new programs that they will be involved in. We send a clear, non-ambiguous message: Get out of China; do your family planning elsewhere, but do not comanage and support that program.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to congratulate the gentleman from

New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, and his associates for bringing this very important issue to the floor. We ought to stop funding the international abortion industry. Family planning and abortion are two separate things. Family planning asks the question, do you want a baby or not? Once you are pregnant, you have a baby. Abortion helps you dispose of that baby by killing it. It has been our policy and it ought to continue to be our policy not to subsidize that function on an international basis.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] ignores the concept of fungibility. If you give money and say do not spend it for this, only spend it for this, who are you kidding, because it frees up other money to be spent for the forbidden function. It does not matter whether they are using our money or their money. If we give money, we empower all of their activities, so it is a distinction without a difference.

The Mexico City policy simply says that we will continue to generously fund family planning, but we will not subsidize abortion, we will not subsidize organizations that lobby to change laws in countries that forbid abortion, and it is in keeping with, I believe, the best ideals and policy certainly under the Reagan and under the Bush administration. I regret keenly that it was changed.

I ask Members to vote "no" on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD], which is more obfuscation than clarification, which ignores the fact that money is fungible, and if you forbid it for one purpose you free up other money for the other purpose.

I hope that Members will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. CHRIS SMITH, who has been a real hero in this very difficult fight. When my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] says the United Nations is out of China, that is rather superficial. They are not out of China.

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. That is a U.N. program.

Mr. HYDE. They have an office here, and they said they are negotiating for more programs.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, let us make it very clear. The Smith-Barcia-Oberstar-Hyde amendment does not reduce by one penny the amount spent on international family planning.

It merely ensures that the money we do spend and commit to population control goes to family planning, not to abortion. American taxpayers who believe that abortion is morally wrong should have their voice expressed on this floor in support of this amendment; and likewise, those who believe abortion is acceptable, and that abortion ought to be made safe and rare, ought to have assurance that their tax dollars do not go to groups who do not share that viewpoint, who see abortion as a means of family planning.

Both sides have an interest in the outcome. I believe that our side is on the side of justice, that it is morally wrong for the United States to support with its taxpayer dollars abortion as a means of family planning control, and this amendment will assure that none of those dollars go to that purpose.

□ 1145

That is what we are trying to accomplish; that just as we have pursued the policy at home of not funding abortion with taxpayer dollars, that we should not fund it abroad with taxpayer dollars. Family planning is a legitimate objective, but it should not include abortion as a means of family planning. That is what we are asking. That is what this amendment does. I ask Members to support the Smith-Barcia amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me rise briefly to support the Smith amendment and to say that the Mexico City policy that we propagated under the Reagan administration sent a moral message to the world. As I understand it, most of the organizations that heretofore had performed abortions stopped them as an effect and impact of that policy. If we still have that moral policy, and that is my feeling that we do have that and that that is exactly what we are voting on, then we should not support abortions through middlemen. We should not support organizations that support abortion. We ought to keep that message as clear as we did under the Reagan administration, under the Mexico City policy. I would urge a strong yes for the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, let me remind Members that we do not cut family planning by a dime in this amendment. We condition it. We put on human rights, pro-family, pro-baby conditions. Abortion takes the life of a baby. We do not think that we should be giving to organizations that are promoting abortion overseas. That is the simple reality of what we are trying to do today. Any other characterization misses by a mile.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is right on point. The

facts are that the taxpayers of the United States have a right to put conditions on money that they earn with their hard work that we send to international organizations. This has been one of the important conditions that we historically have put on, and we should put it on whether the organization indirectly supports abortion or does it directly.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. NEY]. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in favor of the Campbell-Greenwood amendment because I, like my colleagues, love children and love families. I have five children of my own, my parents had seven children. Their parents had 14 children. But all those children were born into a world that is vastly different than the world that we are talking about and that would be affected by this amendment.

We in this Nation are so blessed with such prosperity and high living standards that it is often very difficult to relate to people that are born into a world of such abject poverty and desperation that parents would be willing to sell their children into a life of virtual slave labor or prostitution. How can life be so cheap? How can suffering and human degradation be so tolerated?

It is largely because people in that other world have so little control over their lives because they have so little ability to control the size and the timing of their families. Ironically, this amendment further limits that control over their lives. This amendment in effect diminishes the value of those children's lives, when we have a moral responsibility to be increasing, enhancing the value of children's lives, and that is what family planning information is all about. With proper education, those in developing countries can plan their families just as we in the United States do.

It is unconscionable as leaders of the most prosperous, blessed Nation on Earth that we would deny these vital resources to the least fortunate people on Earth. Yet that is precisely what this amendment does. This, the Mexico City policy that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] wants, restricts funding to groups who offer reproductive educational services to families in need of those services.

We decided in February that denying those funds had a negative impact on population control efforts internationally and that decreasing family planning funding increases the number of abortions. This has not changed since our vote in February.

Mr. Chairman, we need to understand that family planning in this other world can prevent about 10,000 deaths that are due to pregnancy complications, low birth weight babies born to

women who are neither ready nor desirous of having children. Defeat the Smith amendment.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would ask my pro-life colleagues in the House to oppose the Campbell substitute, which is not a compromise but in fact would continue the current policy of abortion on demand around the world. Organizations can use simple bookkeeping to create the impression that U.S. taxpayer funds are not being used for abortion while in fact they are substituting other moneys for that purpose in their respective facilities around the world. I just hope that our pro-life Members of the House today will cast a strong vote against the Campbell substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 1½ minutes. The time of gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] has expired. There was a half minute yielded to the gentleman from New Jersey by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the Smith amendment. I believe it is appropriate and right, and I want to express my strong support on behalf of the people of my district.

Mr. Chairman, 50 years ago, the Nuremberg Tribunal condemned population control policies enacted by the Nazis as "crimes against humanity," and yet today, not only does China engage in the same barbaric practices but our tax dollars support them.

Every year since 1985, we have denied funds to the U.N. Population Fund because it provides financial support for China's brutally coercive one-child policy. But, Mr. Chairman, in 1993, the administration changed the rules. They reinterpreted U.S. law in order to claim opposition to coercive population control programs, but then actually provide for their financial support.

The administration's policy prohibits our tax dollars from providing direct support for forced abortion and sterilization, but that doesn't stop our money from freeing up funds in other accounts to be used for these barbaric acts. This is an unconscionable deception which must be brought to an immediate end.

Mr. Chairman, the Smith amendment simply interprets United States law as it was originally intended—it stops all payments to the U.N. Population Fund until it withdraws its financial support for China's draconian population control programs. Mr. Chairman, as a nation deeply concerned about China's human rights record, we have no business sending such mixed signals. For these reasons I urge a yes vote on the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Many of our colleagues were shocked and angered to learn that the big name pro-abortion population control organizations like Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, Zero Population Growth and others had grossly misled Congress, the President, and the American people about partial-birth abortion. In one letter sent to every Member of Congress signed by those organizations and many others, we were solemnly assured that, and I quote: This surgical procedure is used only in rare cases, fewer than 500 per year. It is most often performed in cases, it goes on to say, of severe fetal anomalies.

Mr. Chairman, we now know that the abortion lobby's campaign to defeat the partial-birth abortion ban was and is riddled with lies and distortions. It is one thing to have an honest difference about policy. Congress after all is a marketplace of disparate opinions and ideas, but do not lie to us.

Mr. Chairman, interestingly, it was one of their own, Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, who blew the whistle on their fraudulent tactics. Members will recall Mr. Fitzsimmons came forward and said that he was lying through his teeth about the circumstances and the incidences surrounding partial-birth abortion. Having raised serious questions concerning the credibility and the reliability of Planned Parenthood and others, Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted, and I quote, that thousands of partial-birth abortions in the vast majority of cases are performed on healthy mothers with a healthy fetus.

Why is this relevant to the amendment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and I are offering this morning? Because each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars; this is not an entitlement, these are discretionary funds, hundreds of millions of dollars for population control organizations. And much of that cash will wind up in the hands of the very same abortion industry that so skillfully lied to my colleagues and me.

After lying through their teeth on the partial-birth abortion ban here in the United States, is it so unreasonable to doubt the abortion lobby's commitment to truth-telling elsewhere? Who then will expose their deceptive tactics in Warsaw or Lima or Cairo or Pretoria or San Salvador? I believe that we need to steer family planning funds to those who will pledge neutrality on abortion rather than promote abortion in foreign capitals.

Today the pro-life laws and policies of almost 100 countries that restrict abortion are under siege, and the engine driving this global pro-abortion

push are the nongovernmental organizations like Planned Parenthood funded by the U.S. Government. Let me remind Members, we provide almost 50 percent of all the money that goes into their coffers. That is why we need to make a difference with the amendment that I and my friends are offering today.

Our amendment permits the flow of funds to those organizations that pledge to provide family planning and only family planning and not abortion. This is all about abortion, Mr. Chairman. The innocent children are held harmless. Who we subsidize, not just what, but who we subsidize and who we give millions of dollars to does matter.

Some Members have argued today that U.S. funds will not be used for abortion. That is already the underlying law. An amendment simply restates current law. But money is fungible. The millions of dollars we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used, and in this case are used, for performing and aggressively promoting abortion around the world. If we give millions of dollars to those for whom abortion on demand is a way to plan family size, we put unborn babies at grave risk of death.

It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with our specific donation but the rest of its agenda as well. It is a package deal. Many groups use family planning as the Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda, which is abortion.

Let me remind Members of Vision 2000, that abortion manifesto in 1992 that was agreed to by International Planned Parenthood Federation based in London and its 140 affiliates. It said these are their marching orders that they will, quote, "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion."

Fred Sai, who used to be chairman of IPPF, a Planned Parenthood group, said, now for the first time the IPPF plan Vision 2000 outlines activities at both the secretary and the family planning association level to further their explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion. Again let me remind Members, 100 countries protect their babies. These people to whom we are giving millions of dollars want to bring down those right-to-life laws. Let me give some examples.

In Poland, the chairman of the Parliamentary Group on the Family, Stanislaw Kowolik, recently lashed out at external factions in Poland for meddling in that country and pushing for liberalized abortion. As a result of strong lobbying by family planning groups, Poland recently reversed the pro-life policies of Lech Walesa and Solidarity and put in its place the pro-abortion policy of the Communists.

Another example of backlash over United States and Planned Parenthood pressure to legalize abortion on demand is the Philippines. A headline in

the Philippine Daily Inquirer last July said Senator "Flavier Hits U.S. Pressure on Abortion." And he writes: We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using funds as subtle leverage," and then he goes on to say he strongly opposes abortion, that his constitution prohibits it. And then he said, finally, "we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than be pressured into causing the death of unborn children."

The abortion promotion by Planned Parenthood is so extreme in the Philippines that the head of their IPPF affiliate, the Planned Parenthood president, quit. He said it was because a "hidden agenda of" and that his affiliate was being used as a Trojan horse to legalize abortion. They talk family planning, the real agenda is abortion on demand.

The pro-life safeguards say: We will provide money for family planning. There is not one penny lost as a result of this amendment. But we will give it only to those groups that are committed to family planning and not abortion on demand.

Let me also say on the China provision, since 1979, the U.N. Population Fund has been there on the ground promoting the one-child-per-couple policy. We have heard testimony, Members should be fully aware by now that forced abortion is commonplace in the People's Republic of China. Yet Dr. Sadik, who is the executive director of the UNFPA, has said, and I quote: "UNFPA firmly believes, and so does the government of the People's Republic of China, that their program is a totally voluntary program. It is not. It is a totally coercive program, and the UNFPA has been whitewashing these crimes since 1979."

Let me also point out to my colleagues that the amendment, the substitute amendment, is a fake. With all due respect to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], it is cover. It does not stop abortions. It does not do anything meaningful relative to China, and it actually trivializes this crime against humanity, against women, of forced abortion because again in China there is the UNFPA doing its work day in and day out. And we understand now that they are in negotiations for new programs in the PRC. We are saying you can have your \$25 million. Just get out of China. Stop being complicit. Stop the hand and glove relationship with the dictatorship of the PRC.

Mr. Chairman, many of our colleagues were shocked and angered to learn that the big name pro-abortion/population control organizations like Planned Parenthood Federation of America and the Alan Guttmacher Institute, had grossly misled Congress, the President, and the American people about partial-birth abortion.

In one letter sent to every Member of Congress, signed by Planned Parenthood and others, we were solemnly assured that:

This surgical procedure is used only in rare cases, fewer than 500 per year. It is most often performed in the case of wanted pregnancies gone tragically wrong, when a family learns late in pregnancy of severe fetal anomalies or a medical condition that threatens the pregnant woman's life or health.

We now know the abortion lobby's campaign to defeat the partial-birth abortion ban was and is riddled with distortion and lies.

It's one thing to have honest differences about policy—Congress is, after all, a marketplace of disparate opinions and ideas.

But don't lie to us.

Interestingly, it took one of their own, Ron Fitzsimmons, Executive Director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, to blow the whistle on their fraudulent tactics. You will recall that Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted "lying through (his) teeth" in spouting the pack of lies dished out by the abortion lobby. Having raised serious questions concerning the credibility and reliability of Planned Parenthood and others, Mr. Fitzsimmons admitted that of the thousands of partial-birth abortions "in the vast majority of cases, the procedure is performed on a healthy mother with a healthy fetus * * *"

Why is this relevant to the amendment Messrs. BARCIA, OBERSTAR, HYDE, and I are offering today?

Because each year Congress authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars for population control organizations—and much of that cash will wind up in the hands of the very same abortion industry that so skillfully lied to you and me. After "lying through (their) teeth" on the partial-birth abortion ban here in the United States, is it so unreasonable to doubt the abortion lobby's commitment to truth-telling? Who then will expose their deceptive tactics in Warsaw or Lima or Cairo or Pretoria or San Salvador? We need to steer family planning funds to those who will pledge neutrality on abortion rather than the promotion of abortion in foreign capitals.

Today, the pro-life laws and policies of almost 100 countries that restrict abortion are under siege and the engine driving this global pro-abortion push are the nongovernmental organizations funded by the U.S. Government.

My amendment permits the flow of funds to those organizations that pledge to provide only family planning, not abortion. The innocent children are held harmless.

Who we subsidize—not just what—but who we give millions of dollars to, does matter. Some Members will argue today that no U.S. funds will be used for abortion. But money is fungible. The millions of dollars we give to a group immediately frees up other non-U.S. funds that can be used—and, in this case, are used—for performing and aggressively promoting abortion. If we give millions of dollars to those for whom abortion on demand is a way to plan family size, we put unborn babies at grave risk of death. It should matter greatly to each of us not just what an organization does with out specific donation, but the rest of its agenda as well. It is a package deal. Many groups use family planning as the Trojan horse to conceal their real agenda—abortion on demand.

I urge Members to carefully consider the 1992 International Planned Parenthood Federation abortion manifesto called Vision 2000, a global strategic plan that Planned Parenthood and its 140 country affiliates adopted

and have been implementing ever since to promote abortion in every corner of the world.

The Vision 2000 strategic plan says, and I quote, that family planning organizations should "bring pressure on governments and campaign for policy and legislative change to remove restrictions against abortion." Can anything be more clear? Pressure governments to nullify their pro-life policies. Campaign for abortion on demand. And we are providing many, many millions of dollars to this group.

Fred Sai, who is the former chairman of International Planned Parenthood, put it very succinctly:

Now, for the first time, the IPPF strategic plan, Vision 2000, which was unanimously adopted at the Members' Assembly in Delhi, outlines activities at both the Secretariat and FPA level to further IPPF's explicit goal of increasing the right of access to abortion.

IPPF has plans of action, as they call them, to promote abortion in Central and South America where unborn children are now legally safeguarded. They have plans to repeal the pro-life laws in Africa, the Muslim countries in the Middle East, and several Asian countries.

In Poland, the chairman of the Parliamentary Group on the Family, Stanislaw Kowalikveouk recently lashed out at external factions in Poland for meddling in that country and pushing for liberalized abortion. As a result of strong lobbying by family planning groups, Poland recently reversed the pro-life policies of Lech Walesa and Solidarity and put in its place, the pro-abortion policy of the Communists.

Only last week's action by Poland's high court stopped the new abortion law from going into effect.

Another example of backlash over United States and Planned Parenthood pressure to legalize abortion on demand is the Philippines.

A headline in the Philippine Daily Inquirer last July: "Flavier Hits U.S. Pressure on Abortion." The article quotes Senator Juan Flavier:

We had just celebrated our 50th anniversary of independence from America, but we can still see insidious methods of imperialism trying to subvert our self-determination by using [population control] funds as subtle leverage * * *. I strongly oppose abortion. It is prohibited by our laws and the Philippine Constitution. Hence, we should be prepared to lose foreign funding rather than be pressured into causing the death of unborn children.

The abortion promotion by Planned Parenthood is so extreme in the Philippines that the president of IPPF's affiliate—the Family Planning Organization of the Philippines [FPOP]—resigned over what he called International Planned Parenthood Federation's "hidden agenda" and use of his affiliate as a Trojan horse to legalize abortion.

The use of family planning as cover—the use of family planning as a Trojan horse for abortion law liberalization is now commonplace and must be stopped.

Let me remind Members that the pro-life safeguards included in my amendment are nothing new; they were in effect for almost a decade. And they worked.

The pro-life safeguards often referred to as the Mexico City Policy were in effect during the Reagan and Bush years as a principled way to fully fund family planning without promoting abortion.

Specifically, the safeguards say this: We will donate funds only to those organizations that will not perform abortions except in the cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother. Funds may go to those organizations that will not lobby for or against abortion.

We should have no part in empowering the abortion industry to succeed in its war on the unborn.

If Members want to promote abortions, be up-front and legislate that. But don't hide behind counterfeit amendments like the Campbell substitute. The Mexico City Policy makes it very clear that there ought to be a wall of separation between abortion and family planning. The Campbell amendment—with all due respect to its author, a friend of mine—is a fake and a counterfeit.

The second part of our amendment relates to forced abortion.

Every day, forced abortion and forced sterilization devastate the lives of women and families in China while the U.N. Population Fund provides political cover and sustenance to those who practice these abuses. The Government of China compels women to abort their so-called unauthorized, illegal unborn children. It starts with intense persuasion using all of the economic, social, and psychological tools a totalitarian State has at its disposal. If these methods fail, women are taken physically to abortion mills. Forced abortions are often performed very late in pregnancy, even in the ninth month. Sometimes the baby's skull is crushed with forceps as the baby emerges from the birth canal. Other times the baby gets an injection of formaldehyde or some other poison into the baby's cranium. The mass murderers, euphemistically called family planning cadres, are at it every day—killing babies, devastating women's lives.

Forced abortion was properly construed to be a crime against humanity at the Nuremberg war crimes tribunal. Today, it is employed aggressively and with chilling effectiveness and unbearable pain upon women in the People's Republic of China. Women in China are required to obtain a birth coupon before conceiving a child. Chinese women are hounded by the population control cadres and even their menstrual cycles are publicly monitored as one means of ensuring compliance.

The New York Times has pointed out in an exposé that the authorities, when they discover an unauthorized pregnancy, an illegal child, normally apply a daily dose of threats and browbeating. They wear the women down. Eventually, if the woman does not succumb to the abortion, she is physically forced to submit.

In the mid-1990's, the PRC issued a decree on eugenics which nationalizes discrimination against the handicapped. In a move that is eerily reminiscent of Nazi Germany, the Communist Chinese Government is implementing forced abortion against handicapped children simply because they suffer an anomaly like Downs Syndrome, and forced sterilization against parents who simply do not measure up in the eyes of the State. Since 1979, the U.N. Population Fund has provided funds, materiel, people on the ground and what no money could buy, the sort of shield of respectability that the PRC Program so desperately wants.

Mr. Chairman, in July 1995, victims of the Chinese forced abortion program testified to the truth. Our Subcommittee on International

Operations and Human Rights heard the testimony of three women who testified that they had been forced to have abortions.

One of those witnesses, Li Bao Yu [Lee Bough You], told us how her troubles started in earnest after she removed an IUD that the population cadres had forced her accept, but which had been making her sick. She became pregnant. The family planning program officials, who came to inspect every woman in the village several times a year—the involuntary inspections a serious violation of each woman's privacy—discovered her pregnancy and threatened that if she did not have the abortion, her first child would be denied education and health care. In her own words,

They threatened me that I do not agree to have this abortion, then my first child will forever have no chance of being a registered, normal citizen.

Mr. Chairman, this is the human cost of the shameful program that for years has been assisted, praised, coddled, and protected by the U.N. Population Fund, the UNFPA. The supporters of this amendment argue that if it were not for UNFPA, the Chinese program would be even worse. But this is an assertion without evidence. UNFPA officials including Nafis Sadiq have repeatedly praised the Chinese program. UNFPA has provided demographic capabilities—a tracking system that hunts down women bearing babies—a system that enables the Beijing population commissars to tell where they need to enforce their program more vigorously. They have trained thousands of cadres—the implementors of this egregious policy. They have provided major elements of the infrastructure that systematically oppresses the women of China and murders their babies. They are part of the problem, not part of the solution.

The Campbell amendment would delete the pro-human rights language in my amendment and insert a substitute that looks good and does next to nothing. UNFPA could spend all the money it wanted in China so long as it kept a separate set of books that showed our money going only for projects outside China. There would also be a reduction in the U.S. contribution—but past experience has shown that a reduction is not enough. The language of the amendment is almost identical to language that has been adopted in the past by the Appropriations Committee, and when this language has been adopted, UNFPA has stayed in China. Only when there was a real threat of serious action—an absolute condition that UNFPA get out of China or lose our money—did UNFPA even go through the motions of getting out. So the substitute language is simply not enough. It absolutely trivializes these crimes—it should not be enough for those of us who are pro-life, and it should not be enough for those who think of themselves as pro-choice. If there is anything UNFPA's involvement in China is not about, it is not about free choice.

This House has voted countless times to condition United States funding for UNFPA on its disengagement from the PRC forced abortion program. Last year, we gave UNFPA some flexibility. They insisted they were no longer giving grants in China. They still had an office there, which they said they were using to administer old grants. Now it turns out that they are actively negotiating with the Chinese Government for future grants and contracts. So we were misled last year: UNFPA was not

getting out of China and, unless we take decisive action, has no intention of getting out of China. Congress gave UNFPA the flexibility their supporters said they needed. This is as far as we can go. Loyalty to these women—these victims of unspeakable torture—will allow us to go no further.

□ 1200

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I address to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], one simple question. I have 1 minute, so if he could please confine his answer, if he can.

Under the gentleman's amendment, if the U.N. spends one dime to advise one person in China about contraception, would not all United States assistance to U.N. family planning throughout Africa and Latin America be terminated?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that the language in our amendment says if the President can certify that there is no more forced abortion, and if they get out of China, which is what we are advocating, because they have had this duplicitous, egregious policy, working hand in glove with the dictatorship, we are saying get out and they get their full \$25 million. And there will also probably be about \$400 million of other family planning money that is also in the bill that is conditioned by the first part of the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is the answer to my question yes?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentleman will continue to yield, unless the forced abortion is ended, sure. They have had a hand-in-glove relationship.

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

My colleagues, we have heard the fundamental problem with the Smith amendment. It is not simply Mexico City. It terminates all United States contribution to all family planning around the world, in Africa, in Latin America, in Indonesia, in desperately poor parts of this world, all of it, if the U.N. spends a dime for family planning in China. It was crafted with that intention and it is cruel and wrong.

For whatever motive we have regarding China, to punish the destitute, the poor, the needy in Africa and Latin America, compassion suggests a "no" vote on the Smith amendment and a "yes" vote on the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey amendment.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment and in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey.

I have some concerns about the fact that we are even debating this issue today; especially since most of the foreign aid sections were stripped from this legislation.

I am also disappointed that the gentleman from New Jersey has insisted on offering his

amendment. The legislation that was reported out of the International Relations Committee would have provided women and families worldwide with the maximum access to essential family planning services. At the same time, it called for a dollar-for-dollar reduction in United States funding to the UNFPA for any amount spent in China. I think we can all agree that U.S. funds should not be used to pay for "forced abortions" in that country.

The gentleman from New Jersey will attempt to equate support for family planning with support for abortion. That is simply not the case. U.S. law already prohibits the use of Government international family planning funds for promoting or providing abortion services. These programs are carefully monitored to ensure that U.S. policy is strictly followed. At the same time, studies have shown that the availability of family planning services actually reduces the incidence of abortion.

The support for international family planning is instead equivalent to the support of women and families and of sustainable economic growth worldwide.

I have long been interested in the cause and effect relationship between rapid population growth and movement and worldwide environmental degradation, dwindling natural resources, urban poverty, malnutrition, and social unrest.

This is especially disconcerting given that more than 90 percent of the annual population increase of 100 million people is in the developing world.

International family planning funds allow women and families to make responsible and informed choices about when and whether to have children. These are choices that many Americans take for granted; they are also choices that many parents in the developing world do not realize they have.

Giving people in the developing world the resources to make informed reproductive choices can help to control the population growth in those countries and decrease the strains that such growth would place on society and on natural resources.

It is in our national interest, and in the global interest, to support voluntary international family planning. Efforts to slow population growth, elevate the status of women, reduce poverty, and promote sustainable development will lead to a more stable global system.

In short, it bears repeating: in so many important ways, family planning saves lives.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey to restrict international family planning.

We should not, we cannot return to the days when the so-called Mexico City policy dictated the flow of America's family planning dollars. That policy had a chilling effect on family planning in developing countries.

There is no evidence that Mexico City restrictions reduced abortions in developing countries. On the contrary, there is strong evidence that gag rule increased abortions and decreased the quality of life for many women.

The Mexico City policy denied many women access to family planning. Without these services, women lack the help they need to protect themselves from disease and to regulate childbearing.

The Mexico City policy restricted women from learning how to reduce unintended pregnancies. And, in the developing world, 40 per-

cent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion.

Clearly, the Mexico City policy is at odds with itself. We would be wrong to restore it.

Nor should we ban aid to the U.N. population fund.

The U.N. population fund does not support abortion as a family planning method. It does not fund abortions. And it does not condone coerced abortions in any country.

But, the U.N. population fund does provide women in 140 countries with family planning services.

These services help women choose the number and spacing of their children. In doing so, the U.N. fund has saved women's and children's lives, and reduced population growth.

Population growth affects all of us through its impact on the economy, environment and national security.

Population pressures on ecologically fragile areas lead to increased environmental degradation. Unchecked population growth where job opportunity is lacking threatens the political stability of the entire planet.

The Smith amendment would undermine years of progress in battling unchecked population growth and the problems it causes.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Smith amendment. Oppose a return to the past. And vote in favor of the future.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowey substitute to the Smith amendment. This is a commonsense measure which restates current law and will protect the lives of women and children around the world.

This vote is not about supporting abortion. Under current law, not \$1 of U.S. family planning funds can be used to perform—or even counsel women to obtain—abortions anywhere in the world. The substitute would retain that prohibition. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the substitute. Vote to prevent abortion. Vote to improve the health of women and children. Vote to save lives.

U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of women. Around the world, 600,000 women die in childbirth every year. Access to family planning in the developing world would reduce unintended pregnancies by one-fifth, and could save the lives of as many as 120,000 of those women.

U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of children. Family planning allows women—and men—to choose how many children they want and when to have them. Spacing children further apart and breast feeding them can improve a child's chance of survival by up to 20 percent in most developing countries. Evidence from across the developing world shows that increased contraceptive use reduces abortion, raises families out of poverty, and increases the life expectancy of all of the children in the family. The Smith amendment, which would halt U.S. family planning aid, condemns hundreds of thousands of women to poor health and possibly death.

If we fail to pass this substitute today, family planning and health clinics across the developing world will close. For many women, these health clinics are the only source of preventative health care that can detect diseases such as cervical cancer in the early stages and save lives.

By voting "yes" to this substitute, you vote to save the lives of women. You vote to reduce unwanted pregnancies. You vote to reduce abortions across the world. You vote to

improve children's health and life expectancy. Support women's health. Support children's health. Vote "yes" on the Campbell-Greenwood-Lowe substitute, and vote "no" on the Smith amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak out against the Smith amendment which seeks to reinstate the so-called Mexico City restrictions on international family planning and to cut funding for the U.N. Fund for Population Activities [UNFPA]. This is really nothing more than a global gag rule.

First of all, no U.S. foreign aid funds are used to either promote, or perform abortions. So this amendment is really unnecessary and antifamily planning. The amendment also seeks to ban aid to UNFPA based on its past involvement in China. But UNFPA is in no way linked to reported family planning abuses in China.

UNFPA does not support abortion and has never funded an abortion. The UNFPA does work in 140 countries where people are desperately seeking assistance in preventing unintended pregnancies. Holding these funds hostage hurts women, children, and families around the world.

UNFPA programs have achieved better nutrition, better health, longer life expectancy and a reduced toll of infectious disease for people all around the world. Their programs have increased the use of family planning from about 15 to 60 percent of couples. And they ensure that young women, whether in Bangladesh or Botswana, have access to reproductive and other basic health care services.

A basic principle that has governed UNFPA's work for many years is that abortion should never be promoted as a method of family planning. Families which lack access to adequate public health services deserve our understanding and our help. Vote "no" on the Smith amendment. Vote "yes" on Campbell-Greenwood.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment and I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey for offering this important amendment to reinstate what we refer to as "The Mexico City Policy."

The wording in that policy is direct, simple, and straightforward, and from 1985 to 1993 this "Mexico City" language protected the American taxpayers from having their tax dollars spent on abortion. For 8 years, this language assured that our great Nation would not, directly or indirectly, support or promote abortion throughout the world. With all the world's great crying needs, we should not spend our scarce foreign aid dollars to subsidize and promote abortion.

The world looks to America for moral leadership. The world looks to America for justice for the weak and the disenfranchised. We should respond to this call for leadership not by promoting abortion for the children of the poorest peoples of the world, but rather by helping them develop the economic and political infrastructure that encourages development, peace, and progress.

I urge my colleagues to support the Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] to the amendment offered

by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 158, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT:

At the end of the bill add the following section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE ABDUCTION AND DETAINMENT OF DONALD HUTCHINGS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Al-Faran, a militant organization that seeks to merge Kashmir with Pakistan, has waged a war against the Government of India.

(2) During the week of July 2, 1995, Al-Faran abducted Donald Hutchings of the State of Washington, another American John Childs, and 4 Western Europeans in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. John Childs has since escaped.

(3) Al-Faran has executed one hostage and threatened to kill Donald Hutchings and the remaining Western European hostages unless the Government of India agrees to release suspected guerrillas from its jails.

(4) Several militants have been captured by the Indian Government and have given conflicting and unconfirmed reports about the hostages.

(5) Donald Hutchings and the 3 remaining Western European hostages have been held against their will by Al-Faran for nearly 2 years.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the militant organization Al-Faran should release, immediately, Donald Hutchings and 3 Western Europeans from captivity;

(2) Al-Faran and their supporters should cease and desist from all acts of hostage-taking and other violent acts within the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

(3) the State Department Rewards Program should be used to the greatest extent possible to solicit new information pertaining to hostages; and

(4) the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Norway, India, and Pakistan should share and investigate all information relating to these hostages as quickly as possible.

Mr. NETHERCUTT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I am introducing this amendment today for myself and for the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has worked with me, with the two Senators from the State of Washington, Senator GORTON and Senator MURRAY, as well as the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHALE, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, the former Congressman, Bill Richardson, who is now Ambassador Richardson, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HAMILTON, and certainly the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, the distinguished Speaker of the House, over the last 2 years to raise the awareness about a constituent of mine, Donald Hutchings from Spokane, WA, who was taken hostage nearly 2 years ago on foreign soil.

On July 2, 1995, Donald Hutchings was on a mountain climbing expedition in Kashmir with his wife and other climbers when they were abducted by a shadowy group of militants known as Al-Faran. Don's wife, Jane Schelly, was released immediately, and another American, John Childs, escaped his captors.

This group has repeatedly threatened Donald Hutchings, to kill him, and the other three remaining Western European hostages, unless the Government of India agreed to release suspected guerilla fighters from its jails. One hostage was found brutally murdered in August 1995, but the location of the other hostages is unknown. A number of militants have been captured by the Government of India, but they have given conflicting and unconfirmed reports about the hostages.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, expresses the sense of Congress that Al-Faran should immediately release all the hostages from captivity and cease all violent acts in India. It urges the use of the State Department Rewards Program, which this bill, H.R. 1757, improves by raising the cap on available funds in order that those funds can be used to solicit new information pertaining to the hostages.

The Nethercutt-Pallone amendment also urges that the Government of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Norway, India, and Pakistan continue to work together to share all investigative information relating to these hostages.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment also sends a strong message to Al-Faran that the United States believes such terrorism is reprehensible, we condemn it; and, at the same time, it encourages the flow of new information which will allow Don's courageous wife, Jane Schelly, to know where her husband is being held.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Washington that it is an excellent amendment, the committee agrees to accept the amendment, and I think the minority has also expressed a willingness to accept the amendment.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am delighted the chairman would do that. I would just conclude by saying that Jane Schelly

has been halfway around the world in order to raise the level of the interest of this amendment and in the finding of her husband.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington as well as the chairman of the committee. I totally support this amendment.

I am not going to repeat the background of what occurred there and the brutal killing of the second hostage that was mentioned by the gentleman, but I do feel that we need to send a message to the Al-Faran and I believe that this will accomplish that.

I just wanted to say that while I was in India, I talked to former Prime Minister Deve on the hostage situation, and he informed me he could not confirm nor deny the status of Donald Hutchings, but he did assure me he would continue to investigate the situation and the Indian Government would do all it can to find and release the hostages.

Before my trip to India this year, I had the opportunity to meet with Donald Hutchings' wife, Jane Schelly. Obviously, she was upset and would like the safe return of her husband, and although the safe return of her husband does not look promising, she continues to hope. In her heart she believes her husband is alive and will return back to home in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot lose hope. We need to support this amendment and we must urge the State Department to work with India, Pakistan, the United Kingdom, Germany, and Norway in securing the release of these hostages. I think the gentleman's amendment will help in that regard and thank him for sponsoring it.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I would hope we can have a recorded vote on this to make certain the whole Congress weighs in very heavily on the importance of this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] will be postponed.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to advise the House that late last night, when the Committee of the Whole was meeting, there were three Members, I believe,

three Members at most, in the Chamber. One of our colleagues introduced an amendment to the legislation that is being debated at this point which is replete more than with irony, with cynicism.

It was an amendment introduced by a gentleman from New York that says more or less the following: If the terrorist state, the Cuban terrorist state, complains about any United States citizen, makes a complaint, then the State Department, paid for by United States taxpayer funds, will have an obligation to report to Congress on the complaints of the Cuban terrorist state.

I have rarely seen examples of such advocacy directly, directly in favor of a state on the terrorist list of the State Department. That is the amendment that was introduced last night by one of our colleagues.

So I want to advise the House that I will demand a separate vote in the House at the time that the Committee of the Whole rises on this unfortunate amendment.

I think that it is important for our colleagues to know, for this House to know what was introduced into this legislation last night. It was truly unfortunate, and it was truly something that I think should be and, hopefully, will be stricken at the time that the Committee of the Whole rises and we have a separate vote in the House.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we will soon be voting on final passage and I alert my colleagues that, as my colleague from Florida has stated, we will be calling for a recorded vote on the amendment introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] last night. For various reasons, the Committee felt it was best to allow a voice vote and wait until final passage to raise the question of recorded votes.

This amendment does not even belong within the scope of a debate concerning U.S. foreign policy and the protection of U.S. national security interests. The amendment places a greater emphasis on the false and distorted allegations of a terrorist regime, a pariah state, than on safeguarding persons of the United States. It places the activities of the U.S. Government in jeopardy and potentially endangers the lives of some U.S. Government personnel who risk their lives every day in Castro's Cuba in an attempt to assist human rights dissidents and the pro democracy movement inside the island.

The Serrano amendment would essentially turn our U.S. State Department into an instrument of Castro's propaganda machine. It will waste thousands of U.S. taxpayers' dollars, forcing the U.S. Government to act based on the rumblings and idiotic attacks of officials from a regime which is desperately trying to cling to the reins of power.

Time and time again Castro officials have accused falsely the United States

Government and falsely accused United States nationals of the most ridiculous actions, such as the United States launching of biological warfare against the Cuban people. That was an actual Castro accusation. They have also said that we have launched insect warfare to destroy Cuba's agricultural sector.

This is what Fidel Castro has actually accused the U.S. Government of doing. This is absolutely ridiculous, and the Serrano amendment, introduced last night, would want us to pay attention to and would tell the State Department to monitor such attacks. So if Castro says the United States is waging a chemical war against the Cuban people, which is exactly what Castro has said, we, the taxpayers of this country, would have to foot the bill to make sure that will we monitor these criticisms.

□ 1215

I think it is the wrong action for the U.S. Congress to take and that is why we will be calling for a vote on this Serrano amendment at the proper time.

So to force the State Department, our own Government, to turn against our own people, U.S. citizens, falls dangerously close to doing the same things that Castro's apparatus intimidation does on a daily basis. For anyone to suggest that this body should violate the privacy of the American people for the purposes of granting credence to the rantings of oppressors and terrorists is ludicrous. It is shameful, it is ridiculous. It is so far beyond the stretch of the imagination that it does not even merit further discussion in any serious debate of U.S. foreign policy objectives and national security interests.

In fact, if this amendment were to pass on a recorded vote, that would mean that our own State Department would have to then report on the activities of this very body. Why do I say that? Just last week, on Friday, the president of Cuba's national assembly, a nondemocratically elected group, denounced this very bill as, quote, anti-Cuban actions and rendered an official complaint, which is the only criteria required by the Serrano amendment. So according to this amendment introduced last night, our very own State Department would have to investigate us and put us on the State Department list.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues will vote against the Serrano amendment and I reiterate our call for a recorded vote against it. I wish that the Member of Congress who proposed this amendment would instead be trying to pass legislation calling for free elections in Cuba. I wish that our colleague on the other side of the aisle would instead be denouncing the human rights violations that occur daily in Cuba. But instead he is doing Castro's work for him in this body. I think that he should rethink that decision and I know that this body will

rethink our vote on that amendment, and that is why we will be proud to call for a recorded vote at the proper time.

I ask Mr. SERRANO, shouldn't U.S. taxpayer money be put to better use? Wouldn't U.S. foreign policy objectives be better served by requesting reports on human rights abuses; on Castro's narcotics trafficking; on Castro's support for terrorism worldwide?

I know this would be a better use of funds, time, and effort for the U.S. Government and specifically the State Department.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BROWN OF FLORIDA

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. BROWN of Florida:

At the end of title XVII insert the following new section:

SEC. 1717. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING THE RIGHTS OF PRISONERS IN ANDEAN COUNTRIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Several American prisoners have spent years in Ecuadorian prisons on drug-related offenses without having received a trial.

(2) The prisoners include James Williams, a United States citizen who has been held for 9 months without any findings, and Sandra Chase, who has been held for more than 18 months and has never seen a judge.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Governments of the Andean countries of Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Columbia, and Venezuela, should respect the rights of prisoners, including United States citizens, to timely legal procedures and abide by international standards of due process.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment addresses one of the most basic issues that ties together every country in this globe. This issue is respect for human rights—including the rights of people accused of crimes. My amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the Governments of the Andean countries, including Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, Columbia, and Venezuela, should respect the rights of prisoners, including United States Citizens, for timely legal procedures and international standards of due process. This is a simple amendment—one that would be difficult to vote against because it simply asks for due process, nothing more.

On my recent trip to Ecuador, I witnessed extreme human rights violations in this nation's prisons, and in their justice system. I traveled to Ecuador to visit American prisoner James (Jim) Williams in the Guayaquil Penitentiary. Jim Williams is a businessman from Jacksonville, FL, and he has been held in this prison for the past 9 months. On my trip one factor became very apparent. Like several other South American countries, Ecuador's judicial system—including the courts and prisons—is in shambles. It is a country where poverty is the norm and typewriters are a luxury. Thousands of people linger in prisons for years without a trial.

Officials related to me that because of U.S. pressure for drug suspects to be apprehended, there is a focus by an overwhelmed local police force to bring in anyone suspected of drug use, drug trafficking, or money laundering. Local police lock up persons who associate with even suspected drug dealers. Hence, prisons are overcrowded with sus-

pected drug users, drug dealers, or money launderers. But because of the rampant, corruption and bribery, the most dangerous narcotics offenders—the traffickers—are able to buy their freedom.

Because of the rampant corruption and bribery, most people sit in jail for years without every going to trial. And some of the most dangerous drug dealers buy their way out of the system.

Within this corrupt system are Jim Williams, Sandra Chase, and 40 other Americans. They are in jails where most people have no toilets. There are only six public defenders for 10 million people. Most prisoners become hopelessly lost in a broken judicial system. Children grow up in prisons with imprisoned mothers.

The prison I visited in Guayaquil has 2,500 prisoners; only 400 have ever received a trial. Because of the extensive bribery, simply getting a trial can cost the prisoner up to \$30,000. Wealthy people simply buy their way out. But Jim Williams has insisted on proving his innocence. Unfortunately, those who plead innocent spend more time in the system battling the charges than if they had first plead guilty to the crime and served their time.

The good news is that we can make a difference. When I was in Ecuador, I met one prisoner who had been in jail for 4 years on charges that he had a single marijuana cigarette. He was 16 when he entered this prison. Last week, he and 11 other prisoners who spent years in jail without a trial, were released.

I believe this is a direct result of the publicity we brought to these prisoners, and I am even more committed that we can work with our neighbors in Latin America to ensure that all people have access to due process.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and send a message to our neighbors that the U.S. Congress will not stand by while prisoners lie suffering, waiting indefinitely for justice.

Ecuador's judicial system is in shambles. There are few typewriters, cases lie in paper heaps on office floors where there is no air conditioning and the humidity is usually at very high levels.

Poverty in Ecuador is the norm.

U.S. officials in Ecuador have an overriding role to combat drug trafficking.

Local police lock up persons who associate with even suspected drug dealers.

Because of bribery, wealthy drug offenders go free.

Forty Americans are imprisoned within this system.

Ecuador has 6 public defenders for 10 million people.

One prisoner was in jail for 4 years without a trial for having one marijuana cigarette.

The jails have no phones and no toilets.

Children grow up in prison with imprisoned mothers.

Each lingering case represents a person out of work and a family that suffers.

I visited a prison with 2,500 prisoners—only 400 had ever received a trial. A trial can cost \$30,000.

COMITE DE INTERNOS,
DEL C.R.S.V.-G.,
Guayaquil, 31 de Mayo de 1.997.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN,
Congresswoman of the U.S.A.,
Washington.

MY DEAR LADY: Thanks to your visit to this Penitentiary some changes have occurred

and we, the inmates, wish to thank you for your kind intervention and interest in our plight

First of all, we wish to inform you that the inmate Jose Ayala Gomez, after 4 years and 6 months of prison, for possessing one marijuana cigarette, was finally released. He went to the press and T.V. to publicly thank you for your help.

On the other hand, we have seen that judges have started to take depositions from the inmates and some progress seems to be underway. This all has happened after your visit to this center.

Two thousand prisoners that have been relegated and remain without sentence for years are still waiting for justice.

We wish to ask you to keep your kind interest in our suffering so that the international organization of Human Rights pressures the Ecuadorian authorities to comply with the law and cease the abuse of the civil and human rights of Ecuadorian citizens.

We are pleased to remain yours very truly.

FRANCISCO BAQUERIZO

VILLAO,

President.

ROBERT VERA,

Secretario.

Guayaquil, 31 de Mayo de 1.997.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN,
Congresswoman U.S.A., Washington.

DEAR LADY: I wish to send you by this letter, my deep feeling of gratitude for my release from prison.

After four years and six months I have managed to get out of hell, thanks to your kind help. I will always remember the beautiful lady that came here as an apparition from heaven.

Now I must seek my wife and three children that I have lost. I will also try to recover my health. Hundreds of companions that are left behind wait also for justice.

I pray so hard that you are well and that your efforts be successful.

FRANKLIN AYALA GOMEZ.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentlewoman from Florida yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support our colleague from Florida, Ms. BROWN, in offering this amendment. I have been monitoring closely the case of James Wilson who is being held in prison in Ecuador. Without prejudging the merits of any particular case, I am proud to join the gentlewoman in expressing the sense of Congress that all such persons should be afforded timely legal procedures. And by passing this amendment, we would be making a strong unequivocal statement in favor of justice and due process. I commend the gentlewoman for her amendment and I would like to note to the gentlewoman that the majority accepts the amendment.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was in my office listening to the comments by the two

Members from Florida on an amendment that was passed last night concerning the ever-present and sad Cuban issue. Let me first set the record straight.

I presented the amendment because I felt it was right. I printed it under the rules of the House. I presented it under the procedures set up by the Republican majority, the amendment was voted on by voice vote and it was passed. If they desire now to quiet me and quiet the issue by bringing up the vote, that is fine; they have a right to do that. But I think we have to understand what is going on here. This bill includes provisions that ask the administration and other agencies to report to the Congress every 3 months on how the administration is enforcing the Cuban embargo. I am an opponent of the Cuban embargo. I feel it is improper and I feel it is foolish and it has not gained any success for our country.

Therefore, in a desire to strike some balance, I have said on many occasions that there are complaints that come from the Cuban Government that deal with the behavior of some American citizens and American residents, complaints such as, on more than 10 occasions before the tragic downing of 2 airplanes flown by Florida residents, on more than 10 occasions prior to that time, the Cuban Government had officially complained to our Government that these planes and planes from the same organization were violating Cuban air space.

On that July, prior to that tragic incident, the Cuban Government had complained officially to the United States and to the rest of the world, if anybody wanted to listen, that planes from that organization had flown over Havana, dropped leaflets, dropped paint, and incited or attempted to incite a riot. Now please understand what I am talking about. If Cuban airplanes flew over the capital, each one of us would expect our Government to shoot them down immediately. And I would be the first one to say that that would be the proper action to take, but because it is Cuba and it is the desire of this country and of some people to continue to press them until they come begging forgiveness for their different form of government, nothing gets done.

So all my amendment does, the amendment that was passed properly last night, is to say every 3 months tell us what official complaints have been brought forth by the Cuban Government, complaints that deal with violation of air space, complaints that deal with American citizens or residents who enter Cuban territory, complaints that deal, official complaints with ships getting beyond international waters into Cuban territory, and recently complaints that deal with American residents or citizens that have been accused by the Cuban Government of being involved in what we would call terrorist actions.

What is it that some people want to hide that they do not want simply the

truth to come out? I am not suggesting in my amendment that we do anything about those actions. Interestingly enough, I am not suggesting in my amendment that we arrest anyone, I am not suggesting in my amendment that we stop anyone from doing these things. All I am suggesting is that we know as Members of Congress so that we can balance the Cuban issue and the Cuban approach.

Now, there are people who stand on this floor and accuse my amendment of being the worst amendment they ever saw and accuse my actions of being the worst actions any Member can take, but let me say something. I strongly believe that we are wrong in our policy toward Cuba and I will not rest until my country, this country, realizes that the best way to deal with this issue is the way we dealt with the Soviet Union, the way we are dealing with China, the way we are dealing with Vietnam, the way we are dealing with Korea.

If there are Members that do not like that, I apologize for bringing grief upon their lives. But I will not move back, nor any approach on their part will make me move back from this that I believe so strongly. What is right is to let the amendment go through. What are we afraid of? To learn the truth?

The vote will be taken today. I would hope that all Members on both sides take into consideration the fact that an amendment properly presented before this House was approved. If they want to kill it, there are other ways to do that, in conference, in the Senate, but they should let this amendment go through because I presented it properly and it was approved properly.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to engage our colleague from New York, Mr. SERRANO in a series of questions about some of the statements that he has made. For example, he said that the amendment that we passed yesterday had to deal with how the United States is monitoring Cuban embargo. That is not the case.

The amendment that we will pass deals with how the State Department is or is not administering the laws that the U.S. Congress has passed with almost 400 votes in favor in a strong bipartisan way. We would like the State Department to administer the law. The U.S. Congress approved it. We would like the State Department to approve it, to implement it.

Furthermore, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] is saying that Castro was so upset about the U.S. planes flying so close to his territory. Too bad that the facts of the case are that every international body, including the United Nations, that has looked at this incident has said that it

was an unarmed, humanitarian flight that took place in international waters and Castro killed American citizens, shot them from the sky.

But my colleague is not concerned with that. He is concerned with Castro's accusations. He is not concerned about our constituents that died, and he is not concerned about the thousands of Cubans that die every year trying to get to liberty. He wants to do Castro's work in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention, in coordination with our committee's ranking minority member, Mr. HAMILTON, to move at a subsequent time to seek an agreement to limit consideration of any further amendments to this bill, the bill that is now before us.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I was just trying to understand what the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] was saying. Would he repeat, please. I apologize, I was distracted.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to move at a subsequent time to seek an agreement to limit consideration of any further amendments to this bill.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. I commend the chairman for his statement. I think it is important that we give Members notice that we are going to cut off amendments to this bill. I think the chairman is taking the right approach on it, and I will work with him on it.

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCARBOROUGH TO TITLE XVII, FOREIGN POLICY PROVISIONS

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make a technical amendment on my amendment regarding Sudan to add the sentence: "This restriction shall not be interpreted to restrict humanitarian assistance or transactions relating to normal diplomatic activities."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] insert: "This restriction shall not be interpreted to restrict humanitarian assistance or transactions relating to normal diplomatic activities."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

□ 1230

Mr. HAMILTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I understand the amendment has been adopted. The gentleman is seeking a unanimous-consent change in the text of the amendment. I just had it handed to me. I do

not want to object to the gentleman's request, but I would request that we be given a little time to examine it. It is new to me. I would like to check it out. May I request that the gentleman withdraw his unanimous consent and let me have a couple of hours here to check it and renew it at a later point?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman for asking. This vote is going to be coming up early this afternoon, after 1:30. The objection last night was that this would somehow affect NGO's. We actually have talked to NGO's that are going into Sudan. They have said this would not have any impact on them whatsoever. But we wanted to just bend over backwards to make sure that everybody knew that humanitarian assistance was cleared.

Let me just say that after this passes, we will certainly be glad as we go to conference to do whatever it takes to make sure that the minority has no concerns regarding it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I do not have any doubt about the gentleman's intent here, but since I have only had a very few minutes to look at it, I still feel like I need some additional time to review it, so I would be constrained to object to the unanimous consent at this point. However, I would anticipate we could work this out.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman agree to possibly, if I come back to amend it before the vote, when we come back in later today, would that be all right with the gentleman?

Mr. HAMILTON. Yes. I understand there is a vote pending on the gentleman's amendment. I do not want to delay that. Let us proceed quickly here to find out about it. Then the gentleman can renew his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HAMILTON. I will be back in touch with the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. NEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-120) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 160 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 160

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 160 is the customary rule for considering a conference report on a budget resolution.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 84, the budget resolution for fiscal years 1998 through 2002, and against its consideration.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on the conference report, divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget. This 1 hour is instead of

the 5 hours called for under section 305(a) of the Budget Act. However, a review of the budget conference report rules over the last decade or so reveals that most of them provided for only 1 hour of debate, so this is customary, what we are doing here today.

Finally, the rule does not address the issue of a motion to recommit, since section 305(a)(6) of the Budget Act states that a motion to recommit the conference report is not in order under the rules of the House. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this is a customary rule for the consideration of a budget resolution conference report.

Turning to the conference report itself, it is extremely important to recognize that this is a dramatic and a very positive shift in the direction of this country. This improvement is in large part due to the steadfast leadership and the committed drive of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the bipartisan members of the Committee on the Budget. They and the other Members who worked with them deserve our commendation.

Our former colleague and leader, Bob Michel, used to say on this floor that "in political decision-making, we must never let the perfect become the enemy of the good." This sage advice I think applies here today.

Mr. Speaker, this balanced budget agreement is not perfect and it does not reflect the complete priorities of any one Member of this House. In fact, I think that I can say with certainty that every Member of the House would probably have written this differently if he or she were the only one making that decision.

I know that if I were writing this budget, I would have had deeper spending cuts, much deeper. I would have had more tax cuts, more entitlement reform to get these entitlements under control, and certainly more spending for defense, which is really why this Congress exists, is to provide for a common defense for the 50 States against those that would take away our freedoms.

However, it is important to recognize once again that the nature of a democracy rests on the art of compromise, a compromise not in principle but in approach and in process. This principled compromise is epitomized in the leadership of the Committee on the Budget in crafting a bipartisan agreement that reflects the principles of balanced budgets, lower taxes, lower spending, and a smaller Federal Government. That is what this budget is all about.

Second, on balance it is a good budget. It is built upon permanent spending savings and permanent tax cuts. These are specific changes that are being written into the law by the adoption of this budget, something radically different than the procedural spending caps and deficit targets included in previous budget agreements such as Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and my colleagues all know that that did not work at all.

This one is going to work. These principles deliver real benefits for the American people. Listen to these facts.

First, this agreement balances the budget for the first time in 30 years, and for the second time in 40 years. Government spending will be less than 20 percent of the gross domestic product for the first time since 1974. Think about that. American taxpayers will save \$600 billion over the next 5 years in entitlement spending reform, the fastest growing portion of the budget. Finally, this Congress has got the guts to stand up here and do something about it.

Most importantly of all, Mr. Speaker, nondefense discretionary spending will grow at one-half of 1 percent a year over the next 5 years, one-half of 1 percent per year over the next 5 years compared with 6 percent per year over the last 5 years. What a difference that is going to make.

Contrary to what some have asserted, this budget is also built on conservative economic assumptions that the economy will grow at 2.1 percent over the next 5 years, that unemployment will rise to 6 percent, and that the Consumer Price Index will continue to go up.

However, the economy has actually been growing stronger, reaching 5.6 percent in the last quarter alone. The unemployment rate has remained below 5 percent, I think it is 4.9 percent right now, and the CPI may actually be going down. This budget is built on sound economic assumptions as well as a strong and vibrant national economy.

Furthermore, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, has stated, and again this is very important, that balancing the budget will further improve the performance of the economy.

Why is that so? One-third of all the interest that the American people pay on their home mortgages, one-third of it, let us say that their total mortgage interest rate per year is \$6,000, \$2,000 of that is caused by the Federal deficits. If we get these deficits under control, we are putting \$2,000 back into the pockets of families with mortgages. That is nontaxable money. That is money they have already paid taxes on, so that they can go out and spend it or save it, and either way it certainly stimulates the economy.

While this conference report is good, the reconciliation and appropriation bills that follow it are perhaps the most important bills that we will pass in this Congress this year, important in the sense that they will also directly benefit every single American family.

I think we owe it to those families to pass this budget and then once that is done, Mr. Speaker, to summon the courage to vote "yes" on these enabling authorization and appropriation measures that will cut spending, that will cut taxes, and end the deficits that are bankrupting the future generations of Americans. I, for one, pledge here today, right now, that I will vote for

every one of those spending cuts that are going to bring some fiscal sanity back to this Federal Government.

This budget is a victory for America's children, and I believe something this Congress and even this President should be proud to support.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson in a letter to a friend back in 1816 gave the following charge: "To preserve people's independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

I urge my colleagues to follow Thomas Jefferson's instructions to preserve independence and to maximize liberty by supporting this rule and supporting this balanced budget here today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on May 20 when the House considered the rule providing for the consideration of the budget resolution, I said that the vote on the resolution was but the beginning of what promises to be a difficult process. I also said that even if individual Members supported the framework of the agreement to balance the Federal budget, such a vote would not obligate any Member to support the separate pieces implementing that agreement that he or she might consider unfair or ill-conceived.

Mr. Speaker, even before this conference report has been adopted, we are seeing pieces of the implementing package which might indeed be considered unfair. Many Members supported the budget agreement because it promised to right a wrong that had been part of the welfare reform legislation enacted in the last Congress. I am referring, of course, to the removal of thousands of elderly disabled legal immigrants from the SSI program.

This House agreed during the consideration of the supplemental appropriation to provide funding to keep disabled elderly legal immigrants on the rolls until the Congress had an opportunity to revisit the issue and correct what is an unjustifiable inequity. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is now offering the House what can only be called a bait-and-switch deal.

This budget agreement came about as a result of long and difficult negotiations between the administration and the Republican leadership. Democrats in the House were subsequently assured that the agreement ensured that disabled elderly legal immigrants would be protected as part of those negotiations. Mr. Speaker, how is it, then, that the Republican majority is now proposing to fulfill perhaps only a part of that agreement?

□ 1245

The Committee on Ways and Means now has pending before it a proposal which will fulfill at least that part of the agreement that might save the Re-

publican majority a major public and political embarrassment. To avoid what would surely create a public furor the Republicans have agreed that they will not kick those elderly disabled illegal immigrants who currently receive SSI off the rolls. Thus the Republicans will ensure that they will not be blamed for kicking sick old people out of their nursing home beds and onto the streets.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is only half of the deal. What about the future? Mr. Speaker, I ask this question in the context that this is the same Republican majority who left Washington for a 10-day break without addressing the urgent necessity of providing money to the flood ravaged regions of the Dakotas and the Midwest. This is the same Republican majority that is now going to send a supplemental appropriation to the President knowing full well that he will veto it because of the extraneous political issues which are designed to save them future political embarrassment are attached to a bill that was supposed to help families begin to put their lives back to order. What next Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, I will not oppose this rule providing for the consideration of this conference report, but I caution my colleagues to examine closely every bill that comes to the floor which will implement this budget agreement. Some parts may indeed be fair and equitable and deserve the support of all Members, but others, Mr. Speaker, deserve to be exposed for what they are, Republican proposals which will fill only part of an agreement and are not part of the agreement at all.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, we have debated this at length, and we have with us speakers that could speak, but I would just as soon expedite this, and if the gentleman is willing to yield back his time, I would do so right after he does.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Member from Texas is always agreeable, and because of that I also yield back the balance of our time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this measure will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD] at 1:30 p.m.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 160) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 47, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie	Bliley	Carson
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Castle
Aderholt	Blunt	Chabot
Allen	Boehlert	Chambliss
Archer	Boehner	Chenoweth
Armey	Bonilla	Christensen
Bachus	Bono	Clayton
Baesler	Boswell	Clement
Baker	Boucher	Clyburn
Baldacci	Boyd	Coble
Ballenger	Brady	Coburn
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Collins
Barr	Brown (OH)	Combest
Barrett (NE)	Bryant	Condit
Barrett (WI)	Bunning	Cook
Bartlett	Burr	Cooksey
Bass	Burton	Costello
Bateman	Buyer	Cox
Bentsen	Callahan	Coyne
Bereuter	Calvert	Cramer
Berman	Camp	Crane
Berry	Campbell	Crane
Bilbray	Canady	Cuban
Bilirakis	Cannon	Cummings
Bishop	Capps	Cunningham
Blagojevich	Cardin	Danner

Davis (FL)	John	Pryce (OH)
Davis (IL)	Johnson (WI)	Quinn
Davis (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Radanovich
Deal	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
DeGette	Jones	Redmond
DeLahunt	Kaptur	Regula
DeLauro	Kasich	Reyes
DeLay	Kelly	Riggs
Deutsch	Kennelly	Riley
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Rivers
Dickey	Kim	Rodriguez
Dicks	Kind (WI)	Roemer
Dingell	King (NY)	Rogan
Dixon	Kingston	Rogers
Doggett	Kleczka	Rohrabacher
Dooley	Klink	Ros-Lehtinen
Doolittle	Klug	Rothman
Doyle	Knollenberg	Roukema
Dreier	Kolbe	Roybal-Allard
Duncan	LaFalce	Royce
Dunn	LaHood	Ryun
Edwards	Largent	Sabo
Ehlers	Latham	Salmon
Ehrlich	LaTourette	Sanchez
Emerson	Lazio	Sandlin
Engel	Leach	Sanford
English	Levin	Sawyer
Ensign	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Eshoo	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough
Etheridge	Linder	Schaefer, Dan
Evans	Livingston	Schaffer, Bob
Everett	LoBiondo	Schumer
Ewing	Lofgren	Scott
Fattah	Lowe	Sensenbrenner
Fawell	Lucas	Serrano
Fazio	Luther	Sessions
Flake	Maloney (CT)	Shadegg
Foglietta	Maloney (NY)	Shaw
Foley	Manton	Shays
Forbes	Manzullo	Sherman
Ford	Mascara	Shimkus
Fowler	Matsui	Shuster
Fox	McCarthy (MO)	Sisisky
Frank (MA)	McCollum	Skaggs
Franks (NJ)	McCrery	Skeen
Frelinghuysen	McDade	Skelton
Frost	McGovern	Slaughter
Furse	McHale	Smith (MI)
Galeggly	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Ganske	McInnis	Smith (OR)
Gejdenson	McIntosh	Smith (TX)
Gephardt	Gekas	Smith, Adam
Gibbons	McIntyre	Smith, Linda
Gilchrest	McKeon	Snowbarger
Gillmor	McKinney	Snyder
Gilman	Meehan	Solomon
Gonzalez	Menendez	Spence
Goodlatte	Metcalfe	Spratt
Goodling	Mica	Stabenow
Gordon	Millender-	Stearns
Goss	McDonald	Stenholm
Graham	Miller (FL)	Strickland
Granger	Minge	Stump
Green	Moakley	Stupak
Green	Molinari	Sununu
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Talent
Gutknecht	Moran (KS)	Tanner
Hall (OH)	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Hall (TX)	Morella	Tauzin
Hamilton	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Hansen	Murtha	Taylor (NC)
Harman	Myrick	Thomas
Hastert	Neal	Thornberry
Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt	Thune
Hayworth	Neumann	Thurman
Hefley	Ney	Tiahrt
Hefner	Northup	Towns
Herger	Norwood	Traficant
Hill	Nussle	Upton
Hilleary	Ortiz	Vento
Hinchey	Oxley	Walsh
Hinojosa	Packard	Wamp
Hobson	Pallone	Watkins
Hoekstra	Pappas	Watts (OK)
Holden	Parker	Waxman
Hoolley	Pascrell	Weldon (FL)
Horn	Pastor	Weldon (PA)
Hostettler	Paul	Weller
Houghton	Paxon	Wexler
Hoyer	Pease	Weygand
Hulshof	Peterson (MN)	White
Hunter	Peterson (PA)	Whitfield
Hutchinson	Petri	Wicker
Hyde	Pickett	Wise
Inglis	Pitts	Wolf
Jackson (IL)	Pombo	Woolsey
Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy	Wynn
Jenkins	Porter	Young (AK)
	Portman	Young (FL)
	Poshard	
	Price (NC)	

NAYS—47

Becerra	Lampson	Pelosi
Bonior	Lewis (GA)	Rahall
Borski	Lipinski	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Markey	Rush
Clay	Martinez	Sanders
Conyers	McCarthy (NY)	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Stokes
Dellums	McNulty	Thompson
Filner	Miller (CA)	Tierney
Hastings (FL)	Mink	Torres
Hilliard	Nadler	Velazquez
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Visclosky
Kennedy (MA)	Obey	Waters
Kennedy (RI)	Olver	Watt (NC)
Kilpatrick	Owens	Yates
Kucinich	Payne	

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Istook	Pickering
Barton	Jefferson	Schiff
Farr	Johnson (CT)	Souder
Goode	Lantos	Turner
Greenwood	Meek	

□ 1351

Messrs. OLVER, RUSH, and WATT of North Carolina changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1525

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1525.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 84, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 160, I call up the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 160, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 4, 1997, at page H3358.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

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

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

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of engaging the chairman in a colloquy.

This budget resolution contains an intercity passenger rail reserve fund, which originated in the other body, whereby if there is a reduction in direct spending or an increase in revenues additional funding could be provided for intercity passenger rail on a deficit neutral basis.

Is this the chairman's understanding of the intercity passenger rail reserve fund?

Mr. KASICH. Yes, it is.

Mr. SHUSTER. The chairman is probably also aware the reserve fund in the budget resolution links additional funding for intercity passenger rail service to the enactment of authorizing legislation for Amtrak. The enactment of reforms for Amtrak is absolutely critical to the future of intercity rail in this country. Amtrak, as it is currently structured, cannot survive into the future.

My committee produced reform legislation in the last Congress that passed this House by a vote of 406 to 4. This legislation relieved Amtrak of burdensome statutory mandates, imposed caps on liability exposure, and restructured the Amtrak board of directors to make Amtrak more streamlined and able to make customer-based business decisions. Unfortunately, the other body never considered the legislation, so 2 years later Amtrak is still subject to onerous statutory requirements that prevent it from providing quality service at a reasonable cost.

In my view, it would be a grave disservice to the American taxpayers to provide additional funding for Amtrak if no legislation is enacted. That is why I want to be sure that if additional funding is provided to Amtrak through the reserve fund it will happen only if the reform legislation has been enacted.

Mr. KASICH. I agree entirely. Additional funding for Amtrak through the intercity passenger rail reserve fund established in the resolution should only be permitted if reform legislation is enacted. In my role as chairman of the House Committee on the Budget I will categorically refuse to release funds from the reserve fund for Amtrak if authorizing legislation reforming Amtrak has not been enacted into law or if the additional funds are not made contingent upon the enactment of such reforms.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for his support.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

As I read the budget resolution and the conference report, together with some additional documents that the Committee on the Budget and the ad-

ministration have issued, there are three separate items concerning Superfund. The bipartisan budget agreement establishes a reserve fund to provide \$200 million per year in mandatory spending for so-called orphan share spending for the Superfund program; is that correct?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it is my further understanding that in order to obtain the additional funding from the reserve fund, the budget resolution requires Congress to pass legislation providing for that additional mandatory spending; is that correct?

Mr. KASICH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OXLEY. Did the budget negotiators specifically contemplate that such legislation would be a comprehensive Superfund reform bill?

Mr. KASICH. Yes, section 204 of the conference report specifically states the additional funds will be available only after the authorizing committees report a Superfund reform bill.

Mr. OXLEY. I thank the gentleman. And did the negotiators also specifically contemplate a comprehensive Superfund reform bill when they wrote, in the addendum to the budget agreement, that "Superfund appropriations will be at the President's level if policies can be worked out?"

Mr. KASICH. The Superfund appropriations will be at the President's level if policies can be worked out.

Mr. OXLEY. We in the Committee on Commerce interpret that as the need for a comprehensive reform bill.

Finally, the addendum states that the Superfund tax shall not be used as a revenue offset. Does that reflect an agreement among the negotiators that the Superfund taxes will not be used to pay for tax relief?

□ 1400

Mr. KASICH. The gentleman is correct. Superfund taxes cannot be used for tax relief, as specified in section 105 of the conference report.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this budget resolution in order to balance the budget in 5 years caps discretionary spending and issues reconciliation directives to a number of House and Senate committees. These directives simply set forth targets that each committee must meet, but behind these reconciliation directives are major policy and procedural agreements.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, could we get unanimous consent to submit this entire colloquy?

Mr. SPRATT. I believe in order to be effective, it has to be read aloud.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this entire

colloquy language be put in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A colloquy is not permitted to be entered into the RECORD.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget leadership, the congressional leadership, and the White House have negotiated in earnest over the past 4 months. Our negotiations culminated in a document called the Bipartisan Budget Agreement of 1997, which is incorporated by reference in the committee report. In issuing reconciliation directives, what the resolution seeks is compliance with this agreement, and compliance is critical if we are to implement in good faith the bipartisan budget agreement of 1997.

To that end, I would like to engage the chairman of the Committee on the Budget in a colloquy to confirm his understanding of this bipartisan budget agreement and this budget resolution.

First, does the chairman remain committed to House consideration of two separate reconciliation bills, first, the spending bill, second, the bill providing for \$85 billion in net tax reduction from 1998 to 2002?

I raise this question because the House reconciliation directive allows either two bills or a single omnibus bill, and on May 19, 1997, Chairman KASICH sent me a letter to clarify that provision. In that letter the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] stated:

The procedural obstacles in the Senate may preclude the consideration of two separate reconciliation bills. For that reason, the committee reported budget resolution includes a contingency for the consideration of a single bill. I remain firmly committed to considering and presenting to the President two separate reconciliation bills, as envisioned in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement, and will work in good faith with all parties to achieve that end.

I understand that the other body has now resolved the major procedural problem by granting unanimous consent to waive the so-called Byrd rule, a provision that might otherwise have precluded consideration of a separate tax reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter just referred to.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 19, 1997.

Hon. JOHN SPRATT,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPRATT: This letter is a follow-up to my comments at last Friday's mark up on the structure of the reconciliation process.

As you know, the budget resolution, as reported, establishes a structure for the consideration of two separate reconciliation bills in the House, the first for entitlement reform due on June 12 and the second for tax relief due on June 13.

The two-bill structure is consistent with the Bipartisan Budget Agreement which noted that "It is the intention of the Leaders

that Congress shall present the revenue reconciliation bill to the President after the spending reduction reconciliation bill. This assumes a good faith effort by all parties to enable such a legislative process to succeed."

Unfortunately, procedural obstacles in the Senate may preclude the consideration of two separate reconciliation bills. For that reason, the committee-reported budget resolution includes a contingency for the consideration of a single omnibus bill.

I remain fully committed to considering and presenting to the President the two separate reconciliation bills, as envisioned in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement, and will work in good faith with all parties to achieve that end.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the bipartisan budget agreement clearly states it is the intention of the leaders that Congress shall present the revenue reconciliation bill to the President after the spending reduction reconciliation bill. This assumes a good-faith effort by all parties to enable such a legislative process to succeed. I remain committed to House consideration of two separate bills, one for spending, another for tax cuts, as I stated in a letter to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT]; however, the budget resolution does provide for the possibility of a one-bill reconciliation process and we consider this an option only if the good-faith efforts to proceed with two bills proves to be unsuccessful.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask about targets for spending and tax cuts. The budget agreement and budget resolution call for \$85 billion in net tax cuts over the 5-year period 1998 to 2002 to be enacted in the second reconciliation bill.

The first reconciliation bill includes entirely spending items, with two small exceptions, the increase in Federal employee retirement contributions, as technically a revenue increase, and the administration's proposal to tighten compliance with the earned income credit is actually scored as generating a small revenue increase as well as reduction in outlays.

Some have suggested that section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act could allow the first bill to include tax cuts offset by spending reductions that are deeper than those specified in the reconciliation directive. If so, tax cuts in the first bill, with \$85 billion of tax cuts in the second bill, could bring net tax reduction to more than the \$85 billion agreed upon in the first 5 years.

However one interprets section 310(c), I would maintain that it would breach the terms of the budget agreement to include tax cuts in the first reconciliation bill or to include tax cuts exceeding \$85 billion over 5 years in the second bill. This would also breach the revenue floor set by this resolution and trigger a point of order.

Does the chairman agree that the budget agreement calls for \$85 billion in net tax cuts over 5 years and that any greater amount would violate the agreement?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the House majority fully intends to fulfill the bipartisan budget agreement by providing \$85 billion in net tax relief for the next 5 years and 250 in net tax relief over 10 years.

I would like to point out one possible exception. The text of the bipartisan budget agreement when speaking of \$16 billion over 5 years to increase health care coverage for uninsured children says that the money could be used for Medicaid, for a program of cap mandatory grants to States or for other possibilities mutually agreeable.

Equally important, the agreement states that resources will be used in the most cost effective manner possible to expand coverage and services for low-income and uninsured children. To me, other possibilities do not exclude tax incentives or other tax provisions that assist in expanding health insurance coverage for our Nation's children.

I would further point out that the gentleman from South Carolina is correct that the \$85 billion in net tax relief over 5 years and the \$250 billion in net tax relief over 10 years does not include the revenue impact of the earned income tax credit reforms or changes in the contribution rates paid by Federal employees into their retirement programs.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, with respect to expanding health insurance coverage for uninsured children, I would like to note the following: First, the budget agreement specifies the \$16 billion provided as outlay increases and refers to it as funding. Neither term implies a tax cut.

Second, the budget resolution treats the entire \$16 billion provided as an outlay increase. And third, the phrase "mutually agreeable" refers to the parties who negotiate the agreement, the White House, the congressional leadership, the Committee on the Budget leadership.

Does the chairman understand the phrase "mutually agreeable" to mean these parties?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, to me mutually agreeable means that the leaders of the Congress and the President must agree on the construction of a children's health initiative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, there is one final issue that bears repetition even though you and I have been very clear on the matter.

The budget agreement and the budget resolution both include funds for five Presidential initiatives, \$16 billion for children's health care coverage, to which we were just referring, \$9.7 billion over 5 years to restore SSI and Medicaid benefits to legal immigrants already in the country who are or may become disabled, \$1.5 billion for food stamps, \$1.5 billion to ease the impact of increasing Medicare premiums on low-income beneficiaries, and \$3 billion for welfare to work.

In each case, amounts have been allocated to the committees of jurisdiction

and netted into the reconciliation targets for each committee. Although these committees have been given directives and targets that would allow them to spend these amounts, the agreement specifically provides additional resources solely for the stated purposes. The agreement in no way contemplates that this spending can be diverted to another program within a committee's jurisdiction or that it can be withheld to meet spending reductions that that committee is called upon to make.

This is my view. Is it also the view of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, in each of the cases, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] listed the additional resources provided for these programs are the only agreed upon purposes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, is it understood that we are evenly dividing the time between us?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining time, the total time to discuss the conference report, be equally divided between the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KASICH. So how much time do we have, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To clarify, the remaining time that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] has will be added together and split down the middle.

Mr. KASICH. Just like Solomon. How much time would that then give each side, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Each side has 24 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote in this House on a conference report that would produce an agreed upon balanced budget, the first balanced budget we have seen since 1969. It will have historic levels of mandatory savings, approaching \$700 billion over the next 10 years. It would extend the life of Medicare for 10 years, accompanied with structural changes of the program, including an adjustment of the reimbursement for managed care in Medicare that would allow rural Americans to have as much choice of the kind of health care they would like to receive as we get in urban areas.

Furthermore, it would change the payments to a prospective basis for home health care and skilled nursing facilities. It would also include in the premium the cost of the shift of home health care but, at the same time, allowing our poorest senior citizens to escape that burden.

But at the end of the day, the \$700 billion in mandatory savings has never been accomplished before in the history of this House. At the same time,

those areas of spending, called the non-defense discretionary, the programs that run the operation of the Federal Government, will grow over the next 5 years at one-half percent. They have grown by 6 percent over the last 10 years. So we have had a significant reduction in the increase of that program, with those programs only growing by one-half percent.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, of course contained in here is a tax cut that would be \$135 billion over 5 years that could be used to provide a capital gains tax cut to provide incentives for people who take risks, a lowering of the cost of the death tax, allowing people who spent a lifetime building small businesses to be able to pass on what they have earned and worked for for a lifetime to their children at a lower rate of taxation by the Government. It would also provide for family tax credits, something that we believe would help to provide incentives to keep the American family together, to help reinforce the purposes of the American family, which is to build a stronger society. In addition, there will be tax relief for moms and dads and students who have had to spend an enormous amount of money on the cost of education.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is underlaid by very conservative economics. This presumes that the economy will grow over the period of the next 5 years by a very conservative estimate of 2.1 percent. That presumes at some point the economy will grow faster. It also presumes at some point the economy will grow slower.

To put that in perspective, the Reagan program of the 1980s had a projected growth in order to get this budget under control of about 4.4 percent. This is a far more conservative foundation, only arguing that this economy would grow by 2.1 percent.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I believe this agreement has bipartisan support and, therefore, will result in bipartisan enforcement. And in case any of my colleagues question it, as we know, we had a major fight here in the House of Representatives over transportation funding. Republicans and Democrats worked together to reject that amendment that we thought would begin to unravel this agreement. We were successful in being able to defeat that amendment in the U.S. Senate.

The President of the United States actually lobbied against the proposal by Senator KENNEDY and Senator HATCH to raise cigarette taxes to expand certain programs in the Federal agreement, and that was defeated.

I think we will have a commitment on both sides to try to enforce this, and I would ask my colleague from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], to really work hard diligently with me, as I know he will, in trying to enforce this agreement. I have got news for everybody, this is not an agreement only to be enforced against the Democrats. It is an agreement to be enforced against the Republicans as well.

We have reached an agreement, honorable people have reached an agreement. We have got to do our best to keep that agreement, even at times when it is uncomfortable and even at times when particular Members of both parties might get very upset about it. I came on this floor last night and had four or five chairmen tackle me as I got into the well telling me how difficult it was and how we needed to have change.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be necessary for us to maintain the integrity of this agreement. We need to do it as much as we can on a bipartisan basis. And frankly, our job is to call them like we see them, to make sure that we keep our word, and that is very, very important.

□ 1415

I know a lot of people in the country, a lot of the American people really wonder whether we can get a balanced budget under this agreement. The fact is there have been countless politicians who have promised it in the past. I think we have got the best opportunity that we have had at least during my career, because we have the specifics that will drive the policy changes that will begin saving money in the area of entitlements from the moment we pass those permanent changes in the law that will occur this year. I also believe the American people will see these tax cuts. There will in fact be an opportunity to give power back to people by putting more money in their pockets.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it is important for the House, for Republicans and Democrats, to keep their word, to deliver a budget that the people have asked for in this country, accompanied by a return of their power and money, and influence. This is not the end of the day. Obviously we have tremendous challenges as it relates to the problems of Social Security, where in fact we are going to have to give Americans more control over their earnings and their investment opportunities. We are going to have to develop a more effective voucher program on Medicare, so in fact our seniors can have the same kind of choices that their adult children have. And clearly we are going to have to talk to the baby boomers about the concept of long-term managed care insurance and trying to move Medicaid into the area of help for the disabled and the children.

But we have got a huge challenge as baby boomers begin to retire. The Committee on the Budget is going to conduct a series of hearings about the coming wave. We will have to move forward with more creative and more innovative and more imaginative plans and programs, but this is a very big first step. If we can get this done, Mr. Speaker, then I believe we communicate to the American people that we are capable of handling a myriad of very sensitive programs in a very responsible way, gaining the support of

the American people that as we move to enact more bold initiatives affecting entitlement programs that affect their lives, they will have a higher level of confidence that we can get it right.

Furthermore, I do not believe this is the end of the day on the issue of tax cuts. I think there will be a lot more to be said about this issue, that in fact the Republicans will continue to push for more growth-oriented tax cuts, more tax cuts that enforce the American family but, bottom line, that reflect the values of rewarding people for hard work and investment and risk-taking and at the same time create the power in the pockets of the American people. We believe that is where the power ought to be.

For about 40 or 50 years Americans gave up a lot of their power, money and influence in the name of justice and progress, and frankly a lot of justice and progress was achieved in the United States. But many of us have gotten the sense, in fact the vast majority of Americans have gotten the sense over the last decade that frankly it is time to shrink the Government and let the American people have more power and more influence to heal the problems in their neighborhoods, in their States, in their communities and in their families. That is going to be the watchword, Mr. Speaker.

But I think we should celebrate today an agreement that will in fact bring about that balanced budget in a real way, with tax cuts provided, and something that represents a first step toward hope that at the end of the day the next generation, in fact, is going to have a beautiful America, consisting of the same kind of opportunities that we had as young men and young women. At the same time I believe, Mr. Speaker, this is the first step toward beginning to deal significantly with entitlement programs that really have resulted in less savings, less productivity, less wage increases, and have placed a tremendous burden on the American family.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the end of the day but it is a very, very bright start; really, frankly, more than that first glorious sunrise. The sun is above that right now. It has actually risen above the mountains, but we have got a way to go before we can ensure to everybody that the next generation of Americans are going to have the kind of security that we all pray that they will.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would simply like to say that the gentleman stated as well as possibly could be stated the spirit of this agreement. I walked us through a tedious colloquy about compliance with different fine points in the agreement and important points in the agreement, but the gentleman stated it well when he stated that we all have to work together, Democrats and Republicans alike, to

see that this agreement is fulfilled in the form that it is intended as we pass a budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the budget resolution agreement. An agreement is a compromise, a settlement, a consensus. An agreement does not necessarily provide all that we want but it does provide some things we want.

This agreement is no different from that. It does provide a balanced budget in 5 years that is good for the Nation, but it continues to have very harsh provisions that allow access to food stamps for hungry people only 3 months out of 3 years. That provision will prove to be bad for the Nation.

The agreement provides an additional \$16 billion over 5 years which will mean health insurance for 5 million children who are currently uninsured, and that is good. These additional moneys will help us, certainly, to have healthy children.

But the agreement does not extend health coverage for another 5 million children that would be left out. Mr. Speaker, and, worse, the agreement hurts hospitals in rural communities, although I know that the chairman does not think so. The agreement hurts hospitals in rural communities that face increases in their Medicaid disproportionate share hospital payments. We must work on this issue beyond this conference report.

This agreement is good for education, a national priority. The \$35 billion investment in education tax cuts, the increase of \$300 in Pell grants and the expansion of Head Start go a long way to feed the minds of our American children.

This agreement is also charitable to this Nation's hard-working families. The \$500 per child tax credit, the welfare-to-work credit, and the establishment of additional empowerment zones and enterprise communities are important. Those will go a long way to boost our economy. But the agreement is bad for those who want to work and cannot find a job.

I do look forward in the Committee on Agriculture next week to passing language governing the \$1.5 billion increase in funds to allow States to exempt up to 15 percent of their food stamp load. But those funds and the \$3 million in additional funds for welfare-to-work simply will not go far enough. Many who find themselves without work, without income, many without the ability to feed their families certainly need help. Again, we must continue to work on this issue beyond this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, indeed there are things we like about this. There are many things we do not. We will work, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that those who

are left out of this compromise be a part of the American dream.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member, for their ability to bring forward a conference report on the budget that carries out the spirit of the bipartisan agreement.

The key to our ability to balance the budget in 5 years and protect the priorities that are important to the American people is the fact that we have had Democrats and Republicans working together in a bipartisan manner in the best interests of our country. But now it is time for the committees to act. That is going to be more difficult.

Let me say on an optimistic note that yesterday the Committee on Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health met on the Medicare provisions and voted by unanimous vote on the Medicare provisions providing for \$115 billion of savings. Democrats and Republicans working together, we have a good Medicare proposal to include in the budget reconciliation. I would urge all the committees to work together in a bipartisan way.

Let me just say a word of caution. We have already seen in regards to legal immigrants that we have not had that type of working together between Democrats and Republicans on the committee of jurisdiction. I am deeply concerned that we have Democrats and Republicans working together to make sure that the revenues stay true to the agreement, that we do not have more revenue lost than the \$85 billion net over the 5-year period and \$250 billion over the 10-year period. We do not want exploding deficits. But unless we have Democrats and Republicans working on the bill that come forward in reconciliation to make sure that is the case, then I am afraid we will not enjoy the same type of bipartisan support that we see here today.

My word of caution is let us follow the example that we have seen to date and work together in a true bipartisan manner on all the ingredients of budget reconciliation. If we continue to work together as Democrats and Republicans, we will have a good budget reconciliation bill that will be in the best interests of the American people.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and in support of the bipartisan agreement to balance the Federal budget.

What a long way we have come since 1995 and 1996, to have an agreement

that got a majority of both caucuses of the House and of the other body to support it. This is a bill which strikes the right balance between fiscal responsibility and making those investments which are needed to address the challenges facing our Nation, especially in the areas of children's health care, education and environmental protection.

But this agreement is only the first step. Now we must write reconciliation and appropriation bills to implement it. Our challenge is now to remain faithful to the agreement in writing the implementing legislation and to act in the same bipartisan good faith that has brought us to this point. And, as my colleague from Maryland just spoke, we must resist any temptation to undermine the agreement with extreme provisions or to fudge the numbers.

In particular, I would like to talk briefly about the Medicaid reconciliation language. I think we need to be very cautious with respect to disproportionate share as it affects heavily impacted hospitals, including our children's hospitals, and as it relates to protecting lower income elderly with the change in home health care to part B.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a budget in the right direction. It is one where we showed that we could compromise and try and reach the goals that both parties seek. I am eager to see it come to conclusion, and hopeful that we can all support the reconciliation and appropriations bills in the same way we have this outline.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN].

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the budget resolution and the conference agreement. Like any agreement or compromise, it is imperfect, but it does provide some very essential elements. It provides that we will balance the budget by the year 2002, and as the chairman pointed out, it reaches that conclusion based on conservative economic assumptions.

I believe that a balanced budget will do more to spur business in this country than any of the business incentive proposals that may have arisen on the Republican side of the aisle, and will do more to help the poor than any of the Great Society programs that are popular on this side of the aisle.

It does not mess with the cost of living increases promised to Social Security recipients, and leaves the calculation of the CPI in the hands of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Finally, and I want to bring this to the attention of the House, this budget agreement is particularly good for the environment, particularly when it comes to the acquisition of environmentally important lands. As Tony Beilenson's successor, when I found myself on the Committee on the Budget, I wanted to focus on an issue that

was not making the biggest headlines but where I thought I could have an impact, and I wanted to focus on making funds available for parklands acquisition.

I want to thank the President for making parklands acquisition a priority. When the budget agreement came to the Committee on the Budget, I put forward an amendment that would specify that \$700 million of additional funds would be spent to acquire environmentally sensitive lands and that those funds would be spent in 1998.

□ 1430

I want to thank the chairman, who in a bipartisan fashion urged the support of that amendment, I want to thank the ranking member who prevailed in the conference, who fought to include that amendment in the conference report, and I want to urge my colleagues to support the conference agreement because it moves us forward. It quadruples the funds available, 1997 to 1998, for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands.

We need to balance the budget, and we also need to balance the use of our lands between economic activity and preservation for posterity. This budget moves in that direction.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, how many times have each of us heard from the people we represent, "Why can't you guys just get together in Washington and balance the budget?" I have heard it scores of times. Of course, there is nothing easy about getting together to balance the budget. That budget reflects innumerable spending priorities. There is wide difference of opinion between the parties in terms of some of those priorities. That budget contemplates the entire Tax Code of this country. Of course there is broad disagreement within this Chamber among Members in terms of how the Tax Code ought to be structured.

So there is nothing easy about getting together to balance the budget. But on the other hand, the facts surrounding our tackling this task this year have made it, if not now, never.

Four years ago, nearly \$300 billion deficit; this year looking at a deficit in the range of \$68 billion. We are almost there, just that final push required.

And so I salute the budget chairman in the House, budget chairman in the Senate, commitment of majority leadership in the Congress working with the President to reach this balanced budget reflecting agreements worked out between the parties, between the philosophies, on how to bridge the gap and finally get the job done.

As has been mentioned before, no agreement is perfect. I certainly would have written this differently. But on the other hand, I do think it is a reasonable balancing of interests, reasonable compromising of perspectives, and it leads us to a balanced budget.

Today is only, in a way, the ratification of the agreement, the committing of the promise for a balanced budget plan. The actual doing of the plan rests before the respective committees of jurisdiction, most particularly the Committee on Ways and Means, as this goes forward. It is in this respect the final tale of this bill will be told. Will it work, will it hold, or will it fall apart as the committees of jurisdiction simply refuse to live within the bounds of this agreement?

We are all going to have to swallow hard, both sides, members of every committee of jurisdiction, in abiding by the terms of this agreement, but failure to do so would be deeply disappointing to the people of this country. For too long they have asked us to work together to balance the budget, and we have told them no, we have not gotten the job done. Now we can get it done, and I am very pleased to urge a yes vote on this agreement.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the balanced budget agreement of 1997. With the passage of this agreement today, we can move to the task of enacting the balanced budget plan. This agreement is a good first step toward the goals of balancing our budget, providing permanent tax relief for American families and reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe today that the American families deserve a break, a tax break, and the balanced budget plan will give American families some of the tax relief they deserve. Our congressional leaders and the President have come up with a plan which will give Americans \$135 billion in tax relief over 5 years and \$250 billion over 10 years in tax relief.

The tax relief package in this budget ensures that all Americans win. With it we can provide relief for families with children with a per child tax credit, the opportunity for people to keep their family farms and businesses with death tax relief, incentives for job creation and economic growth with capital gains tax relief, incentives for savings and investment with IRA expansion and relief for families who send their kids to college.

Some on the other side say that is too much. They claim American families can actually afford to pay more to Washington. I say they cannot. I urge the liberals to join their President in supporting real permanent tax relief for the American family by supporting this balanced budget agreement.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this conference report give tax relief, it reduces the size and scope of the Federal Government. In current dollars Washington will spend less than over the next 5 years in nondefense discre-

tionary spending than it has since 1969. That is the last time Washington balanced its books.

The congressional leaders and the Presidents have worked together to create a plan which will save the taxpayers \$961 billion over the next 10 years. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this important balanced budget agreement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference resolution. I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member, for the work they have put into this resolution in setting the numbers into order for bringing about a balanced budget in 2002. That is something that certainly I and most Members of this body, both sides of the aisle, have agreed to in principle.

Two concerns I express today, and it has been gratifying to me to hear from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] as well as from the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] the importance of enforcing these numbers. It is one thing today to pass this beginning, and that is the budget agreement that we have today. The proof of the pudding will be in the eating, though, and that is whether or not we actually make it to those numbers, and only by enforcing not only discretionary spending levels, but also entitlement spending levels and the tax cut levels, because if we cut more taxes than we have agreed to in this, the deficit will go up and we will not achieve that which we have said we intend to do today.

So I am very glad to hear the spirit in which both sides of the aisle, at least on the budget committees, have agreed that we will see to it that each bill, the tax bill and the other enforcement bills, will stand to the test of whether or not they meet these numbers so that we can all celebrate in 2002 by actually getting to that promised land of a balanced budget.

Again, I close by saying I commend the chairman for his work in this endeavor, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], other Members who have been responsible for getting us to this point. I look forward to rolling up my sleeves now through a long hot summer and seeing that we actually do that which we say we are doing today.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege to rise in support of this budget agreement today and to talk about just how important it is for the future of this great country that we live in.

A lot of people forget that it was back in the late 1980's that we had Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and they promised the people that we were going to get to a balanced budget, and they went along for about a year, and then they gave up on that promise up and deficits went up, and then they made a new promise. It was Gramm-Rudman-Hollings of 1987, and they went along for about a year, and then they gave up on that promise and they missed their targets.

A lot of folks forget that we are in the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget. For 3 years now the Republican Party after the takeover in 1994 has been talking about getting to a balanced budget by 2002, and we are in the third year. First 2 years are in the bank. They are done, and we are not only on track, we are ahead of schedule, and we are now passing our third budget resolution, I am happy to say, with support from both sides of the aisle. In a bipartisan way, working together, we have come to see how good this can be for the future of the country.

Because, see, our theory was this. The theory was if the Government borrowed less money out of the private sector; that is, we controlled the growth of Government spending, the deficit came down; Government borrowed less money out of the private sector, that meant there would be more money available in the private sector. With more money available, the interest rates would stay down, and if the interest rates stayed down, we expected then that people would buy more houses and cars and other things because the interest rates were low, and when they bought houses and cars, other people would go to work building those houses and cars, and that would mean the welfare rolls would come down and those folks would start paying taxes in what worked better than anyone ever imagined. There are job opportunities, unemployment is down. The deficit, in fact, is \$100 billion below what we projected just 2 short years ago.

And under this budget resolution that we are working with today, we are on track to balance by the year 2000. Medicare is restored for a decade. The American people get to keep more of their own money, and I think this is real significant.

I talked to some friends back in Janesville, Wisconsin, and they may not understand what CBO and OMB and all of these numbers really mean, but I said to them they have got one headed off to college, would a college tax tuition credit help? They said it sure will. And there are 2 kids that are still home in their house; they get \$1,000 for those 2 kids, \$500 per child. Do they understand the meaning of the \$500 per child and the college tax credit, and they sure understood those things. To a family earning 40 or \$50,000 a year, keeping \$2,500 more in their pockets, in their home, instead of sending it out

here to Washington, they understood that real well, and that is the significance of this budget agreement. We are not only balancing the budget, but we are letting the American people keep more of their own money.

And the picture gets even brighter. In this budget resolution we may even hit a balanced budget by the year 2000, and think what that means for the future of this great Nation.

So the chairman, congratulations on the great work, and as always to the people on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kindness. He knows I rise in opposition to this budget resolution. The remarks from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] about how well we are doing economically and what path we are on, I wish someone from that side had said such kind words back in 1993 when we passed the legislation that led us onto that path.

Yes, there are some good things in this budget deal, but this budget is a bad deal for the residents of my city of San Diego, and it is a bad deal for America.

Yes, it is a balanced budget, but it is balanced on the backs of our Nation's veterans, children, the elderly, and working families. It is a bad deal that puts a deep freeze on funding for our Nation's veterans, and I speak here as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It cuts real dollars from the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, if this is such a good deal, why are so many veterans organizations opposed to it: Paralyzed Veterans of America, AmVets, Blinded Veterans Association, Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Vietnam Vets of America?

These organizations know that this deal reneges on the promise America has made to our veterans. It cuts pensions for the neediest of veterans, freezes funding for veterans hospitals for the next 5 years and permanently cuts compensation for service-connected disabled veterans.

What happened to the promise that America made with our Nation's veterans? That promise has been forgotten in this deal.

The budget agreement compromises these promises to the past, it ignores our commitments to the future. It underfunds the Nation's infrastructure needs by billions of dollars and dramatically cuts investments in our Nation's future workers. Head Start, summer jobs, and education funding overall are cut while billions of dollars in corporate welfare are kept safe and sound. It makes the transition from welfare to work more difficult, and half of the Nation's 10 million uninsured children remain uninsured in this budget while lavish tax cuts are doled out to those making over a half million a year.

Americans deserve a better deal, a real balanced budget through kept promises, shared sacrifices, and necessary investments in the future. Today's budget resolution fails that test.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER].

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, today we are taking an important step toward making the balanced budget agreement a reality. While approval of the conference agreement is just one step toward a balanced budget, this agreement is a giant step for America's future.

The last time we balanced the budget was 1969, the year my first child was born. I proudly watched that young man walk down the aisle to receive his Doctor of Jurisprudence just 3 weeks ago. That means my oldest child has not seen a balanced budget from this Federal Government since the day he was born.

□ 1445

My twins, a son and daughter, have never seen a balanced budget in their lifetimes.

Our children do not remember a balanced budget, so they do not know what difference it will make in their lives; but they are not alone, because millions of Americans have forgotten what it is like for the Federal Government to treat their money responsibly.

Today I would like to take a moment just to remind us. I have had a lot of different jobs in my life, and each position has taught me why this opportunity to finally produce a balanced budget is really important. I was the mayor of Fort Worth, TX, and as the mayor I learned that local communities need more power and less mandates from Washington. A balanced budget we will consider today will return power, money, and decisions back to families and communities.

I also founded two insurance companies, and as a small businesswoman I discovered that new jobs and opportunities can only be created with a growing economy. By forcing the Government to balance its books, a balanced budget will yield more than 4 million new jobs over 10 years and raise incomes by 16 percent. And this balanced budget includes a capital gains tax cut to unleash a rising tide of new jobs, higher incomes, and raised hopes. The capital gains tax reduction of this balanced budget will make the American dream a reality for millions of people.

I also was a public school teacher. I taught for 9 years, and I know there is nothing more important than education. By eliminating the deficit, a balanced budget will lower the cost of a student loan by nearly \$9,000. A college education will be more affordable to young men and women across the United States.

But my most important job convinced me the most critical reason why a balanced budget is so important, and that is my role as the mother of three

children. By reforming entitlements and providing a child tax credit, this balanced budget will make sure that America looks toward the future. It will make my sons and daughter, and your children, have the same kind of opportunities that people in this Congress have had.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to oversell this budget agreement. There is certainly much to criticize in the agreement. Some of the previous speakers have dwelt on these shortcomings, but I would like to begin my remarks by pointing out some of the positive qualities of this agreement.

First and foremost, it is bipartisan. There are many Democrats and there are many Republicans who will not vote for this agreement. But conversely, the majority in both Caucuses will no doubt be supporting the agreement, and it will pass by a substantial margin in this body.

That is important because we need a budget agreement that will survive the next election, whoever may be the majority in this body, and bipartisanship is critical if we are going to make some of the tough decisions and expect to make them stick for the length of time necessary to reach our goal; namely, eliminating the deficit.

Second, this budget agreement does rely on realistic economic assumptions, forecasts about what the economy will do, forecasts about the demands that will be placed upon the Federal Government for programs that are already well-established. It is critical that we have realistic assumptions, because altogether too often this country has based its so-called budget agreements on phoney assumptions, smoke and mirrors, and what we have seen is an unraveling of what was supposed to have been dramatic corrective action.

Third, this budget agreement does contain reforms and limitations on spending and on programs. This is not easy. There are many who are affected by these cutbacks in programs, and I think that we owe an explanation to these folks. Yet at the same time, we know that we cannot have long-term solvency in Federal operations without making some tough decisions. Yet, we must make these decisions in such a way that we know that in the outyears we can live with them. We will not see a future administration repudiate the agreement.

So these are positive attributes that I wish to emphasize, and at a later point I am sure we will have a chance to revisit some of the downside considerations.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I would also like to congratulate the chairman and the rank-

ing committee member for the work that they have done on this process, because I think what they have really enabled us to do is that they have taken away the debate about the size of Government, at least for the next 2 to 4 years; they have enabled us to develop a path to getting to a surplus budget.

We can start the discussion on how to pay down the debt. But they are also going to liberate all of the authorizing committees to really focus on solving the problems facing this country within the context and the framework of this budget, so that we can take a look at how more effectively and more efficiently we can address and solve the problems facing this country.

Specifically, the other committee that I serve on, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, we can now go back and take a look at the 760 education programs that we have, the 40 different agencies that are working on educating our kids, the \$100 billion that we spend each and every year and say, how can we improve education in America? In meeting with our ranking member, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], we have already agreed that we can go forward and we can eliminate the 100 programs that have not been funded over the last number of years.

We know that we can work on consolidating programs. I expect that we are going to be able to work together on focusing on how to get parents more involved in the education process of our children, how we can get more dollars to the classroom.

We can take a look at why are we losing 30 to 40 cents of every dollar we spend in education, why are we losing it in the bureaucracy, so that we can definitely have more effective plans to deliver safe schools, so that we can move control back to the local level.

We can answer the question of why a local school may only get 6 percent of their dollars from Washington, but 40 to 50 percent of their paperwork, so that we can focus on developing an emphasis on basic academics in the classroom.

Education needs a major focus. We now have the framework to get that done. I thank the ranking member and the chairman for giving us this opportunity.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would just say to my colleagues, I am amazed at this debate. I think of how far we have come. As far as the press is concerned, there is no story here, because Republicans and Democrats are not fighting like little kids. When Republicans and Democrats get together and help save this country for future generations, no story here.

Mr. Speaker, I think of this Chamber in 1989, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] introduced an amendment to start to balance our budget, get our country's financial house in order. Each year he took on that effort. It is

the culmination, since 1989, what we are seeing today with the work on a bipartisan basis, with the help of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and others. I just first want to congratulate him for what he has done over these many years, with such good nature and freshness.

We are going to get our country's financial house in order and balance the Federal budget, and I think we are going to do it in less than 5 years with this agreement. We are going to save our trust funds for not just future generations, but for present generations, because Medicare is running out of money as we speak. Our plan will save it for the next 10 years. We are going to transform this caretaking society into a caring society. We are not just ending welfare and moving mothers into work, we are ending corporate welfare, we are ending welfare for farmers as well in this budget agreement.

We are moving from a caretaking society to a caring society, and in the process we are moving the power and the money and the influence back home where it belongs.

This agreement is not everything everyone wants it to be, but it does the basic things that both sides felt were important. We want it to slow the growth of entitlements and save our trust funds and we are doing that. We wanted tax cuts, meaningful tax cuts in particular areas, and we are doing that.

The other side in particular, and the President of the United States wanted some priorities for domestic spending, education, health care, and we are doing that.

So hats off to both sides of the aisle. Congratulations, in my judgment, on a job well done. Our work is cut out for us in the next few years to make sure we all live up to it.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I will close for our side.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last lap in a long race. I came here in 1983, and we were just beginning to recognize and struggle with the long-term implications of the deficit then. There was Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, there was a budget summit in 1990, there was a Deficit Reduction Act in 1993. And in every one of those cases, which I supported deficit reduction, the best that we could say, the best that we could reach for was a partial effort. We did not even pretend in any of those cases to have a solution in the short term for the deficit we face down the road.

Today we are able to say credibly to the country and to our colleagues in the Congress, we are within reach of a balanced budget. Within the next 5 years, we can get it done, because today in truth we stand on the shoulders of those who came before us and acted before us in 1990. It cost us some of the people who supported what we did then. The results were largely

eclipsed by a recession, but it was significant. Among other things, we put on the statute book to this country two rules: the pay-go rule, which essentially says, if we want to expand or liberalize entitlements, we either have to pay for it or identify commensurate spending cuts elsewhere in another entitlement program; and the discretionary spending caps, which have worked. They have not been breached since 1991.

In 1993 we came back, because in 1990 the budget summit had not really yielded measurable significant results. We laid out a 5-year plan to cut the deficit, we hoped, by half; we barely claimed we would do that much. We extended the discretionary spending caps for 5 years, we reduced entitlement spending, and we were brazen enough, brave enough, some would say, to raise taxes.

The result was not, as some predicted, a disaster in the economy. The economy took note of what we did, the financial markets were pleased, revenues began picking up, interest rates started down, the inflation rates stabilized; and guess what? The revenues of the Federal Government began to pick up again. We restored the revenue basis of this Government.

For example, corporate income taxes have risen by \$71 billion between 1992 and 1996, up more than 70 percent, and that is part of the reason, at the end of the last fiscal year, fiscal year 1996, the deficit was \$107.8 billion, down 65 percent from the deficit predicted in 1993 when President Bush left office. That is substantial progress, and that is why I say we have come several laps, and we are not at the last lap. We are really talking about an effort today that is only partially the same size as the two previous efforts in 1990, and particularly in 1993.

Because we are within reach, and because we did this in a bipartisan way, this is as much a budget agreement as a balanced budget agreement. We have set this goal realistically and conservatively, and I think credibly before us, and I think we will achieve it if the economy does not go south on us. But at the same time, we have recognized that the country has other problems and the Government has other pressing priorities than just balancing the budget. And we do not make a lot of room for these other priorities, but we do recognize, for example, that middle income American families are struggling with the way and whether or not they can pay for their children's education. We are going to bring them more tax relief in the bill that we are authorizing in this budget resolution and anything that has been done in the last 20 to 25 years.

A couple of years ago we tried to enact universal health care, and we bit off more than we could chew. We have decided to back up and take it step by step, incrementally. We did Kennedy-Kassebaum last year. This year in this bill we set aside \$16 billion over the

next 5 years in order to implement measures so that America's children, mostly in working families who do not enjoy the benefit and security of health insurance coverage, can have health insurance coverage, another incremental step toward providing health insurance coverage by Americans who need it.

□ 1500

We went back to welfare reform. We took some of the hard and harsh edges off, particularly as they impact legal immigrants in this country. We did some things that needed to be done and could not have been done unless we did it in a bipartisan way. I am proud of the fact that these accomplishments can be accounted for by this agreement.

A lot of people, some commentators, some editorial writers, have said, can all of this be done? Can you really go after these ends and other policy goals and at the same time balance the budget? What about this \$25 billion a year in extra revenues that you added at the last minute to make this agreement possible?

In truth if we look, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] said, at the underlying economic assumptions, the economic forecast that underlies this budget, most of the premises are very basic and very conservative. For example, in no year over the next 5 years do we assume growth exceeding 2.3 percent. Compared to what is happening now, that is a very conservative assumption.

This agreement has not come easily. We have been at work at it for the last 4 months, long days, late nights, weekends, some bitter dissension. But I will say this: Throughout all of the negotiation, we have maintained a spirit of common purpose, cordiality, and civility which will serve us well now that we go into the implementation phase.

The gentleman from Ohio was correct to anticipate that there will be struggles, there will be problems as we deal with the authorizing committee and the Committee on Appropriations and try to bring them to fruition in the form it is conceived in this budget resolution. That is the big challenge before us. But if we maintain that same spirit of civility, cordiality, and common purpose, we can do it. We can put them to bed. We can carry it out as intended, and we can balance the budget in 5 fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from Senator ROTH, chairman of the Finance Committee, and the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. ARCHER], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, with respect to the tax bill.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 1997.

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR PETE AND JOHN: Our Committees will soon begin marking up tax legislation to meet the reconciliation directives of the 1998 Budget Resolution. We will meet the Resolution's instructions of reducing revenues by \$85 billion over the five year period 1998-2002 and by no more than \$20.5 billion in 2002.

Furthermore, we can assure you that, consistent with the May 15, 1997 letter from the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate to the President which stated, "It was agreed that the net tax cut shall be \$85 billion through 2002 and not more than \$250 billion through 2007," the ten year net revenue loss in the tax reconciliation bill will not exceed \$250 billion.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM V. ROTH,
Chairman, Finance
Committee.

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman, Ways and
Means Committee.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the next speaker is my dear friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DAVE HOBSON. He has been of enormous help to me through this program, really since 1993. I have personally been working on this since 1989. But the gentleman came on the committee, along with my dear friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. CHRIS SHAYS and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. BOB FRANKS, and they were all particularly special, particularly my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DAVE HOBSON, who would take my calls at 1:30 in the morning. I would wake him up, try to get his advice in certain areas. We had a lot of struggles and we have developed some very deep friendships on this committee as a result of this effort.

I want to suggest to the people here in the House and to the Speaker that what is remarkable about this debate is I thought that this was going to be like game one against Utah, where we would have to sink a basketball at the buzzer, and in that famous pose of Michael Jordan at the end, he just gave him that hand. We thought it would be a buzzer-beater to balance the budget. What we are seeing happening is a sea change in the attitude of the House of Representatives. Frankly, it is a sea change we are seeing in the Congress. It is one to embrace, it is one to be joyful about, it is one to celebrate, rather than the fighting, the dynamics of this whole debate of change to an era of less government and more power back to the people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, this is an exciting day for this Chamber and this country. This plan that we are going to approve today is one more example of our Congress keeping its promises to the people of this country. We said we would balance the budget and save Medicare, and we are. We said we would cut taxes, and we are. These are the things that this Congress came to Washington to do, and we are making good on our promises to the American people by passing this conference report today. The House and Senate worked closely on this budget, and the administration is also on board. Frankly, this is the way we should be doing legislation. This is the way people want us to do legislation, by people coming together, putting aside our partisan differences, and passing legislation that is good for the country as a whole, both today and tomorrow.

I just had my fourth grandchild, and I know a lot of times other people's grandchildren are not the most exciting things to hear about, but they are to them. But frankly, without this balanced budget plan, my grandchild will face a very tough future. Without this balanced budget, Government is going to go on spending and go on racking up more debt and mortgaging her future.

But we are going to put a stop to that right now. Like every American family and business, the Federal Government is now going to have to live within this budget, with less Government spending. We will see more job creation, more money for investment, and more private sector growth.

This budget also preserves one of our most important programs, Medicare. Millions of Americans have been spared crushing poverty because Medicare was there to share the cost of health care for seniors. But without some reform, this 30-year-old program was going to go out of date and Medicare would be doomed. This budget prevents Medicare bankruptcy and also gives seniors new health care options. As a new senior myself, I do not mind that much. As a grandfather, I am interested in making sure my grandchildren get the benefit from Medicare also when it comes their time.

The Earth is not going to shake when we pass this conference report and the heavens will not part, as nice as the weather is outside. But in 20 or 30 years we just might hear people talking in such terms when they recollect the importance, frankly, of what we are going to do here in a few minutes. It is just one more example of this Congress doing what it said it would do to make our country a better place for everyone to live in.

I urge the passage of this conference report, and I want to thank both my chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], my special friend; our staff, who has done a great job; all the members of the Committee on the

Budget; and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] and his staff.

This has been one of the few times in recent memory when we have had a true bipartisan agreement, an agreement with ourselves and the President, and frankly, one we can all be very proud of, not only now but in the future. So let us all go out and pass this conference report, and move forward so all of our children and grandchildren are going to have the future we want them to have.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, veterans health care needs are critically important to the VA Committee. We will maintain a close watch on the impact of this year's budget development on veterans health care concerns. The administration's budget was a package flawed from the beginning. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the President's proposal did not balance. The administration also predicated a substantial portion of their veterans health care budget on an untested and risky legislative proposal allowing VA to retain and use third-party receipts.

I want to make that clear—it was an administration proposal that recommended a switch from fully appropriated funding of veterans health care to the use of third-party receipts. I have always supported using third-party receipts as a supplement, not a substitute, for veterans health care funding. Our committee believed that reliance upon keeping insurance receipts as part of the budget this year was premature. However, the budget agreement ignored our concerns, so we're going to do what we can to make this proposal work.

According to an analysis which came to light after the agreement was announced, there is a \$2.2 billion difference between proposed discretionary spending, mainly in VA health care, and what had been proposed in the President's budget for veterans.

Approximately \$1.1 billion is due to use of the CBO baseline projections for discretionary veterans spending—a technical estimating difference.

The other \$1.1 billion issue to agreements made by the negotiators to protect spending for certain priorities of the President.

During budget negotiations, the administration asked that spending for certain programs—not including veterans health care—be protected from future reductions. For instance, in 1998, the President insisted that of about \$258 billion in projected spending for nondefense discretionary spending, approximately \$127 billion be protected for categories such as international affairs, natural resources and environment, transportation, and education, training, employment and social services. The Budget Agreement includes \$33.6 billion in funding over 5 years for the President's domestic initiatives such as assistance to immigrants, nutrition assistance, welfare to work, children's health, Federal land acquisition, environmental reserve, and an offset for low-income Medicare premiums.

Under the agreement, total spending for veterans benefits and services would rise very slightly over the next 5 years, from \$40.5 billion in 1998 to \$42.6 billion in 2002, a 5-percent total increase over this period—compared with almost a 13-percent increase in overall Federal spending authority over the same period.

Spending for discretionary programs, mainly veterans health care, would remain at be-

tween \$18 and \$19 billion, while spending for mandatory benefits, mainly veterans compensation and pension benefits, would increase from \$23.3 to \$24.6 billion.

Ultimately, I support the budget agreement as one that is good for the country. This is a package that at least permits the advancement of the critically important third-party receipts issue. The bottom line is that discretionary spending levels were largely dictated by the President's negotiators, who worked overtime to protect his priorities. Since this budget—unlike the President's—actually eliminates the deficit in 2002, the rest of the discretionary categories, including veterans, had to pay the price for these decisions. However, the Appropriations Committee still has the flexibility within the discretionary caps to change the VA spending levels. Thus, it is just as important as ever to work with the Appropriations Committee to see that veterans health care and other needs are met, and I intend to work to that end.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I know of no other group who loves our country more than our Nation's veterans. They have answered our country's call, proudly worn our Nation's uniform and gone into harm's way when asked to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most veterans support a balanced Federal budget which is fair and honest. This should come as no surprise to anyone. Again and again veterans have signaled their willingness to do their fair share to achieve this important goal. While veterans are clearly willing to do their fair share, our Federal budget should not be balanced on the backs of those men and women who have served our country honorably and well.

For many, their military service meant great hardship and sacrifice. Our Nation's veterans should not be asked to bear an unfair burden in balancing the budget—but that is exactly what is being asked of America's veterans today.

Earlier this year, the House Committee on Veterans Affairs considered the budget proposed for veterans. At that time, our committee expressed strong reservations about the budget proposed for veterans health care. That proposal called for a 5-year freeze in appropriations for veterans health care. To offset the devastating impact of this freeze, the Department of Veterans Affairs was to be given the opportunity to retain receipts it was able to collect from third-parties, such as insurance companies, for care which VA provided to some veterans.

After careful consideration and deliberation, our committee concluded, "in our view, there is too much uncertainty about the reliability of VA's projected third-party collections to hinge the provision of health care on these projections." Mr. Speaker, my view remains unchanged.

The budget plan before us jeopardizes the ability of VA to provide health care to veterans who have honorably served our Nation. Our Nation has a moral obligation to meet the health care needs of these veterans. Indeed, we have a special obligation to those veterans who have a service-connected disability and those veterans who otherwise would not receive the health care they need.

Many veterans' service organizations understandably have decided to oppose the budget resolution before us. I understand the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion,

Paralyzed Veterans of America, Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Disabled American Veterans are among the major veterans organizations to speak out in opposition to this budget resolution.

I believe their opposition is easily understood. Freezing appropriations for veterans health care and making VA health care delivery dependent on third-party collections clearly jeopardizes the health care benefits our veterans have earned. This policy simply asks too much of veterans who have already answered this Nation's call. Our veterans are right to oppose this budget resolution.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 84, the fiscal year 1998 budget resolution that outlines the parameters under which this Congress will balance the Federal budget and reduce the deficit to zero by the year 2002. This is a truly historic achievement that proves that when we work in a bipartisan fashion, we can achieve our goals of a smaller Government, lower spending, lower taxes, and a balanced budget that our constituents elected us to achieve. There is no such thing as a perfect agreement, but this plan is the best agreement we could develop, and is a tremendous step forward not only for the Congress, but more importantly, for the American people. This agreement demonstrates that by working in a bipartisan fashion, we have the capacity to govern and to compromise—and to listen to the voice of our constituents, which has clearly called for fiscal restraint.

Though our constituents have become increasingly cynical about Government, this agreement will help restore confidence in the institutions and processes of government, and it represents a triumph of the political system and a fulfillment of the voters' 1996 command to Congress to solve our budget problems in a bipartisan fashion. Passing the first balanced budget since man walked on the Moon, for all its faults, is a solid and constructive beginning.

We need to look no further than the States to find evidence of precedent for this balanced budget accord. In almost every State where a balanced budget requirement exists, their economies are rated "excellent" or "very good". The States have set the trend for this, and it is time the Federal Government began to operate in a similar manner and live within its means.

Our constituents will benefit unlike at any time in recent history if we truly place ourselves on a path to a balanced budget. The economic impact that the balanced budget agreement will have manifests itself to the typical family by lowering interest rates by up to 2 percent, raising investment returns, lowering credit card and car loan rates, reducing mortgage payments, lowering consumer product costs, and creating more jobs.

In March, when the budget talks seemed to be breaking down, I introduced a balanced

budget outline that showed that we could achieve a balanced budget essentially by splitting the difference between the President's 1998 budget and the 1997 Republican budget plan. I am pleased that this budget agreement reflects many of the goals and principles I outlined by using budget principles like a deficit reduction glidepath to zero with the deficit declining each year, reforming entitlement programs that preserve and protect Medicare and Medicaid, using Congressional Budget Office economic estimates, assumptions and scoring; introducing no new taxes; and forwarding tax cuts that are affordable and permanent—I forwarded a net tax cut of \$77 billion; the agreement is for a net \$85 billion tax cut.

Though we have a good starting point, we must remain steadfast in our desire to ensure that this budget agreement translates into a budget that does not inflate the deficit or tax cuts, and does not undermine the carefully crafted plan before us. I am concerned that we are including tax cuts without the assurance of a balanced budget, and am also concerned that stronger budget enforcement mechanisms were not included to ensure that the budget reaches balance by 2002. Though this legislation continues "pay-go" budget rules and discretionary spending caps, there are a number of other additional enforcement mechanisms that should have been included that would assure us that spending and revenue fulfill their estimates in the agreement so that deficit targets will be met and the budget can finally be balanced.

Congress must not rest on the initial success of this agreement, but must move forward—using the same framework used to reach this accord—to better address the long-term concerns of further entitlement and budget reform. We have some time to prepare, but we must begin that work soon. I am proud to have played a part in facilitating this agreement and to have the opportunity to see that it is properly implemented, that important Federal priorities continue to be met, and that the budget reconciliation process includes additional budget enforcement mechanisms that will place us, more firmly than ever, on a course to a balanced budget by 2002.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. Although there are other reasons to oppose this budget agreement, I did want to highlight the progress that the conferees have made in regard to the provision of funds for the acquisition of lands for our national system of parks, refuges, forests, and public lands.

In recent years the administration has failed to request, and the Congress has failed to appropriate, adequate funding for Federal and State land acquisition for conservation and recreation. Despite a growing backlog of needs and willing sellers who desire that their lands be used for public purposes, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act has not

been used as intended for conservation purposes. Oil and gas revenues from offshore leasing, which are by law dedicated to the fund, have been coming at a rate of \$900 million annually, accumulating to total of over \$12 billion in the current fiscal year. Yet the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 for the National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management was only \$179 million. The popular State Grant Program, which has been used to build recreation facilities across the country, has been zeroed out entirely.

Land acquisition is a vital part of our efforts to safeguard public health and enhance the environmental assets of the Nation. Many municipal drinking systems depend on pristine watersheds for clean water which can be protected by acquisition of forested lands. Threats to fish and wildlife species can be mitigated by acquiring prime refuge habitat. Acquisition for park enhancement can contribute to growth of the recreation industry, which already provides many more land-dependent jobs than logging, grazing, and mining. Tens of millions of fishermen and hunters depend on access to clean public waters and productive public lands.

The conference report has responded to these needs by including the President's budget requests for land acquisition, State assistance, and Everglades restoration as protected domestic discretionary priorities. The Interior Appropriations Subcommittee deserves a greater section 602(b) allocation of funds than it has received in the past, for these and other important priorities.

In addition, the budget agreement includes \$700 million over and above the President's requests for priority land acquisition. I applaud Chairman KASICH for this commitment of resources. This offers a much more sensible alternative to the complicated asset and land exchanges that have been proposed by the administration to acquire the Headwaters Redwood Forest in California and to protect Yellowstone National Park ecosystem by eliminating the threat of pollution from the New World mine. We have seen extraordinary success in Alaska with over 500,000 acres of land acquisition and conservation easements acquired by using funds provided through the *Exxon Valdez* settlement trust. The resources provided by the budget agreement can and should be used to duplicate that success across the country. This is a good step forward toward better utilization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the future.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table displaying the policy assumptions in the reconciliation instructions set forth in the conference report accompanying House Concurrent Resolution 84.

RECONCILIATION ASSUMPTIONS BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE #

(In billions of dollars)

Function	Proposal	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1998-2002
----- AGRICULTURE -----							
600	Food stamps	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	1.500
	Subtotal, Agriculture	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.300	1.500
----- BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES -----							
370	FHA single family assignment program	-0.136	-0.145	-0.147	-0.128	-0.110	-0.666
600	Assisted housing	0.000	-0.088	-0.218	-0.294	-0.324	-0.924
	Subtotal, Banking and Financial Services	-0.136	-0.233	-0.365	-0.422	-0.434	-1.590
----- COMMERCE -----							
270	Lease excess SPR capacity	0.000	-0.001	-0.002	-0.004	-0.006	-0.013
550	Medicaid	-0.237	-1.771	-2.651	-3.901	-6.565	-15.125
550	Medicare low-income assistance	0.200	0.300	0.300	0.300	0.400	1.500
550	Children's Health Initiative*	2.500	2.700	3.200	3.700	3.900	16.000
570	Medicare *	-6.500	-16.800	-22.700	-29.000	-40.000	-115.000
950	Spectrum Auctions	0.000	-3.500	-3.500	-4.500	-14.800	-26.300
	Subtotal, Commerce	-4.037	-19.072	-25.353	-33.405	-57.071	-138.938
----- EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE -----							
500	Repeal appropriations. under Smith-Hughes	-0.001	-0.007	-0.007	-0.007	-0.007	-0.029
500	Student Loans	-0.241	-0.240	-0.151	-0.081	-1.050	-1.763
600	Welfare-to-Work grants*	0.700	0.700	1.000	0.600	0.000	3.000
	Subtotal, Economic and Educational Opportunities	0.458	0.453	0.842	0.512	-1.057	1.208

RECONCILIATION ASSUMPTIONS BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE #

(In billions of dollars)

Function	Proposal	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1998-2002
----- GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT -----							
<u>Direct Spending:</u>							
370	FECA reimbursement to Postal Service	-0.035	-0.034	-0.033	-0.032	-0.031	-0.165
950	Agency contributions to CSRS	-0.597	-0.591	-0.586	-0.582	-0.577	-2.933
	Subtotal, Government Reform and Oversight	-0.632	-0.625	-0.619	-0.614	-0.608	-3.098
<u>Deficit Reduction:</u>							
	Increase employee retirement contribution	0.000	-0.214	-0.423	-0.571	-0.621	-1.829
	Subtotal, Government Reform and Oversight	0.000	-0.214	-0.423	-0.571	-0.621	-1.829
----- TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE -----							
800	Asset sales	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.540
400	Extend vessel tonnage fees	0.000	-0.049	-0.049	-0.049	-0.049	-0.196
	Subtotal, Transportation and Infrastructure	0.000	-0.049	-0.049	-0.049	-0.589	-0.736
----- VETERANS AFFAIRS -----							
700	Withholding for VA overpaid benefits*	-0.090	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.090
700	Extend VA income verification (pensions) *	0.000	-0.004	-0.008	-0.012	-0.016	-0.040
700	Extend OBRA home loan provisions	-0.011	-0.228	-0.227	-0.224	-0.219	-0.909
700	Medical care income verification *	0.000	-0.018	-0.019	-0.019	-0.020	-0.076
700	Extend medical care collections	0.000	-0.232	-0.241	-0.252	-0.262	-0.987
700	Medical care administrative cost	-0.118	-0.123	-0.128	-0.133	-0.139	-0.641
700	Extend nursing home pension provisions	0.000	-0.129	-0.203	-0.131	-0.174	-0.637
700	Loan sales enhancements	-0.005	-0.005	-0.005	-0.005	-0.005	-0.025
700	Round Down Compensation COLA	-0.023	-0.051	-0.088	-0.101	-0.128	-0.391
	Subtotal, Veterans Affairs	-0.247	-0.790	-0.919	-0.877	-0.963	-3.796

RECONCILIATION ASSUMPTIONS BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE #

(In billions of dollars)

Function	Proposal	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1998-2002
WAYS AND MEANS							
Direct Spending:							
550	Children's Health Initiative*	2.500	2.700	3.200	3.700	3.900	16.000
550	Assistance to immigrants (Medicaid portion)	0.400	0.400	0.300	0.300	0.300	1.700
570	Medicare *	-6.500	-16.800	-22.700	-29.000	-40.000	-115.000
600	Earned Income Credit (outlays)	0.000	-0.010	-0.028	-0.029	-0.030	-0.097
600	Raise unemployment ceiling	0.000	0.000	-0.200	-0.208	-0.216	-0.624
600	Assistance to immigrants	1.800	1.800	1.700	1.400	1.300	8.000
600	Welfare-to-work grants*	0.700	0.700	1.000	0.600	0.000	3.000
600	Administrative Fees on State SSI Supplements	-0.035	-0.075	-0.080	-0.090	-0.100	-0.380
700	Withholding for VA overpaid benefits*	-0.090	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.090
700	Medical care income verification *	0.000	-0.018	-0.019	-0.019	-0.020	-0.076
700	Extend VA income verification (pensions) *	0.000	-0.004	-0.008	-0.012	-0.016	-0.040
	Subtotal, Ways and Means - Direct Spending	-1.225	-11.307	-16.835	-23.358	-34.882	-87.607
Revenue:							
rev	Earned Income Credit (revenue)	0.000	-0.003	-0.008	-0.008	-0.008	-0.027
rev	Net tax relief	7.400	11.300	22.400	23.400	20.500	85.000
	Subtotal, Ways and Means - Revenue	7.400	11.297	22.392	23.392	20.492	84.973

RECONCILIATION ASSUMPTIONS BY AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE #

(In billions of dollars)

Function	Proposal	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	1998-2002
----- TOTAL -----							
<u>Direct Spending:</u>							
Total		-5.519	-31.323	-42.998	-57.913	-95.304	-233.057
Dual Assignments		-3.390	-13.422	-18.527	-24.731	-36.136	-96.206
Total less dual assignments		-2.129	-17.901	-24.471	-33.182	-59.168	-136.851
<u>Revenue:</u>							
Total		7.400	11.083	21.969	22.821	19.871	83.144
Dual Assignments		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Total less dual assignments		7.400	11.083	21.969	22.821	19.871	83.144

Items Which Are Assumed But Not Reconciled

COMMERCE							
Extend Nuclear Regulatory Commission Fees		0.000	-0.325	-0.336	-0.347	-0.359	-1.367

Items to Be Allocated When Legislation is Reported

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION							
Environmental Reserve Fund		0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	1.000

Only FY 1998, 2002, and 1998 - 2002 amounts are reconciled.

* Denotes items reconciled to more than one committee

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 327, nays 97, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—327

Abercrombie	Doyle	Kelly
Ackerman	Dreier	Kennelly
Aderholt	Duncan	Kildee
Allen	Dunn	Kim
Archer	Edwards	Kind (WI)
Armey	Ehlers	Kingston
Bachus	Ehrlich	Klecza
Baesler	Emerson	Klink
Baker	English	Knollenberg
Baldacci	Ensign	Kolbe
Ballenger	Eshoo	LaFalce
Barcia	Etheridge	LaHood
Barr	Everett	Lampson
Barrett (NE)	Ewing	Latham
Barrett (WI)	Fattah	LaTourette
Bartlett	Fawell	Lazio
Bass	Fazio	Leach
Bateman	Flake	Levin
Bentzen	Foglietta	Lewis (CA)
Bereuter	Foley	Lewis (KY)
Berman	Forbes	Linder
Berry	Ford	Livingston
Bilbray	Fowler	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Fox	Lofgren
Bishop	Franks (NJ)	Lowe
Blagojevich	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bliley	Frost	Luther
Blunt	Furse	Maloney (CT)
Boehlert	Galleghy	Maloney (NY)
Boehner	Gejdenson	Manton
Bonilla	Gekas	Manzullo
Bonior	Gibbons	Martinez
Bono	Gilchrest	Mascara
Boswell	Gillmor	Matsui
Boyd	Gilman	McCarthy (MO)
Brady	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Bryant	Goodlatte	McCreery
Bunning	Goodling	McDade
Burr	Gordon	McHale
Burton	Goss	McHugh
Buyer	Graham	McInnis
Callahan	Granger	McIntosh
Calvert	Green	McIntyre
Camp	Greenwood	McKeon
Campbell	Gutknecht	McKinney
Canady	Hall (OH)	Meehan
Cannon	Hall (TX)	Meek
Capps	Hamilton	Menendez
Cardin	Hansen	Metcalf
Carson	Harman	Mica
Castle	Hastert	Miller (FL)
Chabot	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Chambliss	Hayworth	Molinari
Christensen	Hefley	Moran (KS)
Clayton	Hefner	Moran (VA)
Clement	Hergert	Morella
Clyburn	Hilleary	Murtha
Coble	Hinojosa	Myrick
Collins	Hobson	Neal
Combest	Hoekstra	Nethercutt
Condit	Holden	Neumann
Cook	Hooley	Ney
Cooksey	Horn	Northup
Costello	Hostettler	Norwood
Cramer	Houghton	Nussle
Cummings	Hoyer	Ortiz
Cunningham	Hulshof	Oxley
Danner	Hutchinson	Packard
Davis (FL)	Inglis	Pallone
Davis (VA)	Jackson-Lee	Pappas
Deal	(TX)	Parker
DeLauro	Jenkins	Pascarell
DeLay	John	Pastor
Dickey	Johnson (CT)	Paxon
Dicks	Johnson (WI)	Pease
Dingell	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Doggett	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)
Dooley	Jones	Petri
Doolittle	Kasich	Pickett

Pitts	Schaffer, Bob	Tanner
Pomeroy	Schumer	Tauscher
Porter	Sensenbrenner	Tauzin
Portman	Sessions	Taylor (MS)
Poshard	Shaw	Taylor (NC)
Price (NC)	Shays	Thomas
Pryce (OH)	Sherman	Thornberry
Quinn	Shimkus	Thune
Radanovich	Sisisky	Thurman
Ramstad	Skaggs	Tiahrt
Redmond	Skeen	Upton
Regula	Skelton	Vento
Reyes	Smith (MI)	Visclosky
Riggs	Smith (NJ)	Walsh
Riley	Smith (OR)	Wamp
Rivers	Smith (TX)	Watkins
Rodriguez	Smith, Adam	Watts (OK)
Roemer	Smith, Linda	Weldon (PA)
Rogan	Snowbarger	Weller
Rogers	Snyder	Wexler
Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	White
Rothman	Souder	Whitfield
Roukema	Spence	Wicker
Royce	Spratt	Wise
Ryun	Stabenow	Wolf
Sabo	Stenholm	Woolsey
Sanchez	Strickland	Wynn
Sandlin	Stump	Young (AK)
Sawyer	Stupak	Young (FL)
Saxton	Sununu	
Schaefer, Dan	Talent	

NAYS—97

Barton	Hinchey	Payne
Becerra	Hunter	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Hyde	Pombo
Borski	Istook	Rahall
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Brown (CA)	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Chenoweth	Kennedy (RI)	Salmon
Clay	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Coburn	King (NY)	Sanford
Conyers	Klug	Scarborough
Cox	Kucinich	Scott
Coyne	Largent	Serrano
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Shadegg
Crapo	Lipinski	Shuster
Cubin	Markey	Slaughter
Davis (IL)	McCollum	Stark
DeFazio	McDermott	Stearns
DeGette	McGovern	Stokes
Delahunt	McNulty	Thompson
Dellums	Millender	Tierney
Dixon	McDonald	Torres
Engel	Miller (CA)	Towns
Evans	Mink	Traficant
Filner	Moakley	Velazquez
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Waters
Ganske	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Gephardt	Oberstar	Waxman
Gutierrez	Obey	Weldon (FL)
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Weygand
Hill	Owens	Yates
Hilliard	Paul	

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews	Goode	Schiff
Deutsch	Jefferson	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Lantos	
Farr	Pickering	

□ 1529

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. Turner for, with Mr. Jefferson against. Messrs. CRAPO, MOAKLEY, and COYNE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. STUMP, MARTINEZ, and SKELTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 166, House Concurrent Resolution 84—conference report on the budget—I was ab-

sent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

□ 1530

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 84.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). Pursuant to House Resolution 159 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1757.

□ 1530

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] had been disposed of.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 159, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]; and a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], if requested.

Proceedings on the other postponed amendments will resume at a later time.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 218, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

AYES—200

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Neal
Ackerman	Gibbons	Obey
Allen	Gilchrest	Olver
Baesler	Gilman	Owens
Baldacci	Gonzalez	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Gordon	Pascrell
Bass	Green	Pastor
Becerra	Greenwood	Payne
Bentsen	Gutierrez	Pelosi
Berman	Hamilton	Pickett
Berry	Harman	Pomeroy
Billbray	Hastings (FL)	Porter
Bishop	Hefner	Price (NC)
Blagojevich	Hilliard	Pryce (OH)
Blumenauer	Hinchev	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hinojosa	Rangel
Boswell	Hobson	Regula
Boucher	Hooley	Reyes
Boyd	Horn	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Houghton	Rodriguez
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Rotman
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Roukema
Campbell	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Capps	(TX)	Rush
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Sabo
Carson	Johnson (WI)	Sanchez
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Sanders
Clay	Kelly	Sandlin
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Schumer
Clyburn	Kennelly	Scott
Condit	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Shaw
Cramer	Klecza	Shays
Cummings	Klug	Sherman
Danner	Kolbe	Sisisky
Davis (VA)	Lampson	Skaggs
DeFazio	Lazio	Slaughter
DeGette	Leach	Smith, Adam
Delahunt	Levin	Snyder
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Dellums	Lofgren	Stabenow
Dicks	Lowe	Stark
Dingell	Luther	Stokes
Dixon	Maloney (CT)	Strickland
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
Dooley	Markey	Tauscher
Edwards	Matsui	Thomas
Ehrlich	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Thurman
Eshoo	McDermott	Tierney
Etheridge	McGovern	Torres
Evans	McHale	Towns
Fattah	McKinney	Upton
Fawell	McNulty	Velazquez
Fazio	Meehan	Vento
Filner	Meek	Visclosky
Flake	Menendez	Waters
Foglietta	Millender-	Watt (NC)
Foley	McDonald	Waxman
Ford	Miller (CA)	Wexler
Fowler	Minge	White
Frank (MA)	Mink	Wise
Franks (NJ)	Moakley	Woolsey
Frelinghuysen	Molinari	Wynn
Frost	Moran (VA)	Yates
Furse	Morella	
Gejdenson	Nadler	

NOES—218

Aderholt	Bateman	Bryant
Archer	Bereuter	Bunning
Armey	Bilirakis	Burr
Bachus	Bilely	Buyer
Baker	Blunt	Callahan
Ballenger	Boehner	Calvert
Barcia	Bonilla	Camp
Barr	Bonior	Canady
Barrett (NE)	Bono	Cannon
Bartlett	Borski	Chabot
Barton	Brady	Chambliss

Chenoweth	John	Poshard
Christensen	Johnson, Sam	Quinn
Coble	Jones	Radanovich
Coburn	Kanjorski	Rahall
Collins	Kaptur	Redmond
Combest	Kasich	Riggs
Conyers	Kildee	Riley
Cook	Kim	Roemer
Cooksey	King (NY)	Rogan
Costello	Kingston	Rogers
Cox	Klink	Rohrabacher
Crane	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Crapo	Kucinich	Royce
Cubin	LaFalce	Ryun
Cunningham	LaHood	Salmon
Davis (IL)	Largent	Sanford
Deal	Latham	Saxton
DeLay	LaTourette	Scarborough
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer, Dan
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Schaffer, Bob
Doyle	Linder	Sensenbrenner
Dreier	Lipinski	Sessions
Duncan	Livingston	Shadegg
Dunn	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Ehlers	Lucas	Shuster
Emerson	Manton	Skeen
English	Manzullo	Skelton
Ensign	Martinez	Smith (NJ)
Everett	Mascara	Smith (OR)
Ewing	McCollum	Smith (TX)
Forbes	McCrery	Smith, Linda
Fox	McDade	Snowbarger
Gallegly	McHugh	Solomon
Ganske	McInnis	Souder
Gekas	McIntyre	Spence
Gillmor	McKeon	Stearns
Goodlatte	Metcalf	Stenholm
Goodling	Mica	Stump
Goss	Miller (FL)	Stupak
Graham	Mollohan	Sununu
Granger	Moran (KS)	Talent
Gutknecht	Murtha	Tauzin
Hall (OH)	Myrick	Taylor (MS)
Hall (TX)	Nethercutt	Taylor (NC)
Hansen	Ney	Thornberry
Hastert	Northup	Thune
Hastings (WA)	Norwood	Tiahrt
Hayworth	Oberstar	Traficant
Hefley	Ortiz	Walsh
Herger	Oxley	Wamp
Hill	Packard	Watkins
Hilleary	Pappas	Watts (OK)
Hoekstra	Parker	Weldon (FL)
Holden	Paul	Weldon (PA)
Hostettler	Paxon	Weller
Hulshof	Pease	Weygand
Hunter	Peterson (MN)	Whitfield
Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)	Wicker
Hyde	Petri	Wolf
Inglis	Pitts	Young (AK)
Istook	Pombo	Young (FL)
Jenkins	Portman	

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1548

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DAVIS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 167, I tried to record "yes" on this vote but the system did not register my vote. Please let the RECORD reflect I intended to vote "yes" on this amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 167, I was seconds late to cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 167, the Campbell amendment to H.R. 1757, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No 168]

AYES—232

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Neumann
Archer	Goodling	Ney
Armey	Goss	Northup
Bachus	Graham	Norwood
Baker	Granger	Nussle
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Oberstar
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Obey
Barr	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Barrett (NE)	Hamilton	Oxley
Bartlett	Hansen	Packard
Barton	Hastert	Pappas
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Parker
Bereuter	Hayworth	Paul
Berry	Hefley	Paxon
Bilirakis	Herger	Pease
Bliley	Hill	Peterson (MN)
Blunt	Hilleary	Petri
Boehner	Hoekstra	Pitts
Bonilla	Holden	Pombo
Bonior	Hostettler	Portman
Bono	Hulshof	Poshard
Borski	Hunter	Quinn
Brady	Hutchinson	Radanovich
Bryant	Hyde	Rahall
Bunning	Inglis	Redmond
Burr	Istook	Regula
Burton	Jenkins	Riggs
Buyer	John	Riley
Callahan	Johnson, Sam	Roemer
Calvert	Jones	Rogan
Camp	Kanjorski	Rogers
Canady	Kaptur	Rohrabacher
Cannon	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Kildee	Royce
Chambliss	Kim	Ryun
Chenoweth	King (NY)	Salmon
Christensen	Kingston	Sanford
Coble	Klecza	Saxton
Coburn	Klink	Scarborough
Collins	Knollenberg	Schaefer, Dan
Combest	Kucinich	Schaffer, Bob
Cook	LaFalce	Sensenbrenner
Cooksey	LaHood	Sessions
Costello	Largent	Shadegg
Cox	Latham	Shaw
Cramer	LaTourette	Shimkus
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Crapo	Lewis (KY)	Skeen
Cubin	Linder	Skelton
Cunningham	Lipinski	Smith (MI)
Danner	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
Deal	LoBiondo	Smith (OR)
DeLay	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Dickey	Manton	Smith, Linda
Doolittle	Manzullo	Snowbarger
Doyle	Mascara	Solomon
Dreier	McCollum	Souder
Duncan	McCrery	Spence
Dunn	McDade	Stearns
Ehlers	McHugh	Stenholm
Emerson	McInnis	Stump
English	McIntosh	Stupak
Ensign	McIntyre	Sununu
Everett	McKeon	Talent
Ewing	Metcalf	Tauzin
Foley	Mica	Taylor (MS)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Taylor (NC)
Fowler	Moakley	Thornberry
Fox	Molinari	Thune
Gallegly	Mollohan	Tiahrt
Ganske	Moran (KS)	Traficant
Gekas	Murtha	Walsh
Gibbons	Myrick	Wamp
Gillmor	Nethercutt	Watkins

Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cummins
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost

Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoolley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klug
Kolbe
Lampson
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowe
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moran (VA)
Morella

Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Kelly
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Farr
Goode

Jefferson
Lantos
Matsui
Peterson (PA)
Pickering

Schiff
Turner
White

□ 1558

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

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 168, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote by seconds. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 168, the Smith of New Jersey amendment

to H.R. 1757, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to raise an issue in regard to the Foreign Relations Authorization Act.

Sudan is located south of Egypt with its eastern boundary facing the Red Sea. It is one of the largest countries in Africa in terms of geographical area, approximately the size of one quarter of the United States with a population of some 29 million people.

Almost from the very time of independence from Britain and Egypt in 1956 the country has been divided by ethnic and religious differences. The largely Arabic Muslim North against the Sub-Sahara African Christian and Animist South.

Guerrilla warfare in the south has persisted for at least 32 years of their 41 years of independence. But, not until 1983 when the Sudan People's Liberation Army [SPLA] was created were substantial gains made in capturing towns from the control of the Khartoum Northern Government. The SPLA is under the leadership of Col. John Garang, a military officer, trained in the United States.

Following the 1989 coup, the relative free press was put under strict censorship.

I say all of this because the geostrategic importance of the Sudan is vital to our national interest. And Sudan's stability is vital to the region's stability. I too support sanctions which our administration already has put on them. Economic sanctions, military sanctions, visa restrictions on the government and its forces should be enforced; however, this places restrictions on humanitarian assistance that affects the poor and the innocent.

I went to southern Sudan in January of this year and meet with John Garang, the leader of the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Movement in the south and they seem to be conquering much of the northern territory.

As much as I believe that the Sudanese Government should not operate with immunity, we can not at this time in good faith cancel all the assistance to the men, women, and children that so badly need this. I agree that we should use sticks with the Sudan in that they have exhausted all of their carrot options. Yet this is not a stick, this hurts. It hurts the wrong people.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to stand beside Mr. PALLONE in offering this important amendment to H.R. 1757, the Foreign Affairs Authorization Act.

As with everything we do in this House, expenditures for foreign aid must be evaluated to ensure fiscal discipline. H.R. 1757 makes great strides toward reducing wasteful spending, and proposes to make a vital shift in how the United States meets its foreign policy challenges.

One of the significant shifts will be to improve the operations of the State Department by consolidating into its structure two Federal agencies—the U.S. Information Agency and the Arms Control Disarmament Agency. As we proceed with these long overdue changes in the U.S. foreign affairs establishment, we must not lose sight of our Nation's ability to affect change abroad. The United States must remain engaged and sensitive to our strategic interests in ambitious but fragile democracies like Armenia.

Armenia finds itself at a crossroads. The young republic is in a delicate rebuilding proc-

ess and struggles to reconstruct itself after having its growth impeded by harmful policies of the former Soviet Union. Armenia is striving to establish the type of government and free-market economy which will enable it to more easily integrate itself into the region. Regional integration in the Caucasus is of vital importance of U.S. foreign policy. Integration will yield additional economic stability for the region and help it to become a more attractive sector for U.S. investment. We must take action which facilitates the process.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am, with Congressman PALLONE, offering this reasonable amendment which encourages the President to seek cooperation from the governments of Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkey, as well as private companies with an interest in developing Azerbaijan's Caspian Sea petroleum reserves.

This amendment serves to encourage the construction of a pipeline route from Azerbaijan through Armenia. This pipeline would likely extend to Turkey and Mediterranean sea ports. No doubt, such an effort will improve relations between the neighboring countries by spreading the seeds of cooperation. The venture will serve the overall objectives the United States has for peace and prosperity in this region.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, as the House of Representatives debates the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, I wish to raise several issues that I believe deserve our close attention.

We must not neglect foreign affairs. As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I have seen first hand the tremendous need of people in other countries for basic assistance, and the enormous value of even our most modest assistance programs overseas. Unfortunately, our foreign assistance budget has suffered severely in our efforts to balance the budget. Development aid, disaster assistance, hunger and malnutrition programs, educational assistance, conflict resolution, and medical aid have all been cut drastically over the past several years, with serious consequences for the poorest and neediest people of the world.

I especially urge that we maintain our support of the United Nations. Although our country's many complaints about the United Nations receive the most attention, we rarely hear of the United Nation's tremendous good work: peacekeeping, assistance to children, conflict resolution, nuclear non-proliferation, and development assistance are just a few. Part of our support must include repaying our enormous debt to the United Nations, and I urge my colleagues to work to meet our unpaid U.N. obligations.

I also urge that we keep our focus on Latin America. Although the area has made great progress in democratization and free elections, less attention has been paid to the increasing problem of human rights abuses. Colombia and southern Mexico are just two areas where increasing militarization has led to greater violence and has put serious political and social pressure on local governments. We should give close examination to this problem and determine ways that the United States can help these countries demilitarize and reduce the level of violence.

Unfortunately, as in past years, this year's bill has become a battle over a woman's right

to choose. I must express my strong opposition to any amendments to this bill that would restrict the reproductive rights of women or, in an attempt to do so, limit or end all funding for international family planning. Earlier this year, a majority of the House recognized the importance of family planning to the health and welfare of our planet and voted to maintain U.S. family planning programs. Let us not go back on our own commitment to these important programs.

I thank my colleagues in the House and look forward to working with them to address these important issues.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1600

ESTABLISHING TIME LIMITATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1757, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 1757 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 159, that each further amendment to the bill, and all amendments thereto, shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, except for the following amendments:

Amendments en bloc offered by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to this unanimous consent agreement; the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY] regarding Indonesia; the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] regarding Cuba; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] regarding Egypt; the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] regarding Palestinian land transactions; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NEY] regarding Libya; the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] regarding authorization levels; the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] regarding arms transfer code of conduct; the gentleman from California [Mr. CAPPS] regarding Tibet; the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] regarding counternarcotics authorities; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on

International Relations or a designee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of that committee or a designee, to offer amendments en bloc. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this unanimous-consent agreement shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and may amend portions of the bill previously read for amendment. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object but I would like to ask a question or two about the unanimous-consent request. As I understand the unanimous-consent request, amendments that are not specifically listed will be allowed only 10 minutes of debate, 5 on each side?

Mr. GILMAN. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAMILTON. And the amendments that are listed which the gentleman has read would have unlimited debate?

Mr. GILMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HAMILTON. With respect to the votes pending, I think there are three, does the gentleman expect to have a vote on those today?

Mr. GILMAN. We are awaiting instructions from the majority leader.

Mr. HAMILTON. Can the gentleman tell us anything about the rest of the schedule with respect to the bill?

Mr. GILMAN. We anticipate taking up the rest of the bill next week.

Mr. HAMILTON. Will we also take up the European security bill next week?

Mr. GILMAN. We anticipate taking up the European security bill next week.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a question I think that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] mentioned. I think there were three of us that have amendments from last night. We have been sitting on pins and needles hoping that we could vote on these. We thought these three amendments would be voted on before the Campbell amendment and the Smith amendment. Now they have not. At this point we still are not clear when our three amendments would be voted on.

I would just like to urge on behalf of my colleagues that we vote on them today. If we do not vote on them and adjourn for next week, then the debate

is lost for all the time we spent yesterday evening when we were here until 8:30 talking about this. I will not object, but I would like the chairman, if he could, just to clarify again for me and for the other Members, when will we expect a vote on those 3 amendments?

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

Mr. STEARNS. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have not had full clarification yet from the majority leader, but anticipate we will probably vote next week on the remaining amendments.

Mr. STEARNS. I will not object but I do protest that, that we are delaying them that much.

Second, it is very difficult for the Members that have these amendments to sit around their office and try and find out what is going on and then if they do not come down, the way we structured this, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, is that if we do not show up these amendments will not even be voted on. Could the Speaker clarify that for me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It occurs to the Chair that a recorded vote has been requested in each instance.

Mr. STEARNS. But even though it has been requested, if the Member who has the amendment, if he or she is not here on the floor at the rostrum, as I understand, that amendment will not be voted on because it was presented in a manner that it has to be presented by the Member again. Could the Chair clarify that? I was not clear on that last night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A sufficient number of Members would have to stand at that appropriate time.

Mr. STEARNS. What this means is that we would have to stand and say there is a quorum not present, Mr. Speaker, and pending that, a quorum not being present, we request a quorum before we get a recorded vote, and then pending the quorum, then we would go ahead with the procedure asking for a recorded vote? Is that what we would have to do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee would proceed under the way it normally disposes of requests for recorded votes.

Mr. STEARNS. The difficulty with that is last night we were here, we asked for a recorded vote, the assumption we had is we would get a recorded vote. Now the Chair is saying we will not get a recorded vote unless we are here.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to assure the gentleman that our staff will do everything possible to alert the gentleman if and when there is a vote so that the gentleman will be prepared to come to the floor to be present during that vote.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, with that assurance from the chairman, that is as good as gold.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1714

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time today to consider a conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, and that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived, and that the conference report be considered as read when called up.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters and overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, June 4, 1997, at page H3442.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

□ 1715

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again come to the House with the conference report on the fiscal year 1997 emergency supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 1469.

As Members of the House may recall, on April 24 of this year, the Committee on Appropriations reported out the bill, and roughly 2 weeks ago we had the bill on the floor. Unfortunately, we were unable to complete the conference quickly, and we had to adjourn over the Memorial Day recess prior to the completion of this very, very important bill that will provide disaster relief to the citizens of some 35 States.

Today we hope to remedy that situation because, after several weeks of negotiating with the Senate on the differences between the House and the Senate versions of this legislation, we have concluded conference yesterday and are able to bring this conference agreement to the House so that the process of providing that very necessary recovery for the vast number of natural disasters that have occurred around the country this year can be maintained.

This conference agreement includes \$8.9 billion in new spending authority for fiscal year 1997, of which the discretionary portion is fully offset by the rescission of previously appropriated funds and by including other offsets.

I might stress, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report, as promised when we debated this issue on the floor 2 weeks ago, is fully, and I repeat fully, offset in budget authority.

The major reasons for the increase over the House reported bill are an increase for veterans compensation and pensions and SSI, Supplemental Security Income, benefits for legal aliens. These were deemed by the administration to be necessary to provide for those benefit programs through the end of the fiscal year, and the conference

agreed that the benefits, if not paid for, might leave some individuals without compensation before October 1, 1997. It is intended that these sums, these additional sums, be included in this bill so that those people might be provided for.

A summary of the total conference report on the supplemental includes the following major categories: Nearly \$5.6 billion for disaster recovery, as I said earlier, for 35 States; another \$268 million for other appropriations; \$240 million for SSI benefits for legal aliens. All of that is offset in the domestic category of the budget by \$6.092 billion in rescissions. That leaves a deficit, or an extra amount of offset by about \$21 million.

In the peacekeeping provisions or the defense side of the bill we have some \$1.929 billion allocated to repay the Defense Department for what has already been outlaid in Bosnia and elsewhere in other operations around the world, and that is offset with moneys provided from the Defense Department of exactly that same amount of money.

Likewise, there are mandatory appropriations in the conference agreement, mostly for VA, of \$937 million. And, as I indicated, the entire discretionary amount is offset in budget authority.

There is \$3.3 billion of disaster relief bill going directly to FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, so that they can assist those people who have been devastated by floods, tornados, and other natural disasters.

There is \$500 million in this bill going to Community Development Block Grants. The people in Minnesota and the Dakotas have indicated that they are concerned that the traditional assistance of FEMA has not been direct enough, has not been flexible enough to go to the people who have lost their businesses, lost their homes, and who are virtually thrown out of their entire towns. And in order to get those folks back and their cities working, they feel that the Community Development Block Grants will be more effective in solving these problems. Hopefully, that will be the case.

There is \$650 million to be applied to transportation facility repair; \$585 million for flood control and navigation facility repair; \$166 million for watershed and flood prevention; \$197 million for the national park repairs; \$928 million for veterans compensation and pensions, as I mentioned earlier; and \$240 million for continued SSI benefits for legal aliens; \$1.26 billion for peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and \$510 million for peacekeeping efforts in southwest Asia.

I would like to remind all my colleagues again that at the beginning of the 104th Congress; that is, the Congress preceding this one, we in the majority, the Republicans, began a policy of paying for all supplemental appropriations, saying to the country that no longer will we opt for the tradition that has been established in the past of

simply adding supplemental appropriations to what had previously been appropriated and not worrying about where the money comes from.

We adopted the policy of offsetting any additional or supplemental appropriations which had not been encompassed in the traditional appropriations process, which occurs in the fall, with rescissions of previously appropriated funds; that is, taking money out of other programs that we have already paid for and applying it to these supplemental needs so that there is no net cost to the taxpayer.

We have been successful. Every time we have come up with an additional or supplemental appropriation bill, we have offset it, since January 3, 1995, and I am pleased to say that we have done so again today. We have offset it with budget authority from other programs and other agencies. So I am proud to say again that this conference report complies with this policy, and that it is totally offset in budget authority.

The bill we brought to the House complied with this policy as does in this conference report. Mr. Speaker, the President has indicated, however, that because of two items, that do not have much to do with disaster relief, that he is going to veto the bill. I regret that. I hope that he does not do that.

Included in this conference agreement are matters that are very, very important to the majority of the Members of Congress and, admittedly, while they are not appropriation matters, I believe that the portions of this bill dealing with appropriations are not only acceptable but endorsed by the vast majority of the House, and I am proud of that.

But I believe also that the best thing to do is to go ahead and proceed with these extra issues because they are not consequential enough to deny aid to victims of natural disasters. One involves simply directing the Census Bureau not to sample, not to provide estimates of numbers of people in conducting the census every 10 years, as required by the Constitution, but to actually numerically count each and every person. Every person. No matter what background, no matter what ethnic identity, race, sex, or any other religious affiliation, count each and every person in America. And if the Census Bureau will do that, we will pay the bill for it, but we think that that is what the Constitution envisioned.

We hope that, in fact, the President would not veto this vital bill by saying, oh, well, let us just sample whoever is in America and not worry about counting them. We think that would be a terrible mistake, and so we have a provision in the conference agreement directing an actual count, and we have to do it this early because, otherwise, the Census Bureau will go ahead and make their plans. If we do it later on, they will say we were too late. So we have to address that issue now, and we just hope that that would not prompt the President to veto this very important bill.

Likewise, there is much concern from Members on both sides of the aisle about the fact that 2 years ago the Government closed down after the President did not sign four appropriations bills. A lot of people believe that that was unfortunate and that we should have avoided that mishap, and that we can avoid it by including in this bill what is known as a continuing resolution which says that if all of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1998

are not passed, that full funding at 1997 levels will continue until such appropriations bills are passed.

That continuing resolution is included in this bill. All it says, or all it is, is an expression by the majority that says, Mr. President, we do not want to close down the Government. Just sign this bill with this continuing resolution and Government will stay open. If the President chooses to veto the bill because of that provision, I guess, in effect, he is saying that, well, he does not mind closing down the Government and he does not want to have a fail-safe that will keep the Government operating.

Be that as it may, he has given strong signals that he is prepared to veto the bill and I regret that, as I have said. I hope that he does not, but we will just have to confront it.

I believe the best thing to do at this point is for the Congress to express its views on the conference report and then let the President express his views. This will move the process forward. Should he veto it, we will re-address this bill. And it would be my expectation that we will still have a supplemental appropriations bill that provides disaster relief to the people that need it within a very few days under any circumstance.

But we are prepared to move this bill forward now. We hope that it will gain a majority of votes so that we can send it to the President for his signature, and we hope that he will sign it, and then we will be done with this and go on to the regular fiscal year 1998 appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker at this point I would like to insert a table reflecting the conference agreement into the RECORD.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469)

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
CHAPTER 1						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
Military Personnel						
.....	Military personnel, Army (emergency appropriations).....	306,800,000	306,800,000	306,800,000
.....	Military personnel, Navy (emergency appropriations).....	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000
.....	Military personnel, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations).....	300,000	300,000	300,000
.....	Military personnel, Air Force (emergency appropriations).....	29,100,000	29,100,000	29,100,000
	Total, Military personnel.....	344,100,000	344,100,000	344,100,000
Operation and Maintenance						
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (by transfer) (sec. 101).....						
		(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)
104-3	Overseas contingency operations transfer fund (emergency appropriations).....	2,006,214,000	1,566,300,000	1,312,900,000	-136,200,000	+117,200,000
104-3	OPLAN 34A/35 P.O.W. payments.....	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
	Total, Operation and maintenance.....	2,026,214,000	1,586,300,000	1,332,900,000	-136,200,000	+117,200,000
Revolving and Management Funds						
104-3	Reserve mobilization income insurance fund (emergency appropriations).....	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000
General Provisions						
.....	Defense health program (sec. 102).....	21,000,000	21,000,000	+21,000,000
.....	Force protection initiatives (sec. 103).....	10,000,000	10,000,000	+10,000,000
.....	Additional transfer authority.....	(100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
.....	Red Cross reimbursement (sec. 104).....	50,000,000	25,800,000	+25,800,000	-24,200,000
.....	Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps (sec. 106).....	6,480,000	6,480,000	6,480,000
	Total, general provisions.....	37,480,000	56,480,000	63,280,000	+25,800,000	+6,800,000
Total, Chapter 1:						
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,098,214,000	2,039,880,000	1,805,480,000	-110,400,000	+124,000,000
	Appropriations.....	(20,000,000)	(57,480,000)	(76,480,000)	(+25,800,000)	(+6,800,000)
	Emergency appropriations.....	(2,078,214,000)	(1,982,400,000)	(1,729,000,000)	(-136,200,000)	(+117,200,000)
	(Additional transfer authority).....	(100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
	(By transfer).....	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)
CHAPTER 2						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
Military Personnel						
.....	Military personnel, Army (rescission).....	-46,000,000	-57,000,000	-57,000,000	-11,000,000
.....	Military personnel, Navy (rescission).....	-11,000,000	-18,000,000	-18,000,000	-7,000,000
.....	Military personnel, Marine Corps (rescission).....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
.....	Military personnel, Air Force (rescission).....	-15,000,000	-23,000,000	-23,000,000	-8,000,000
	Total, Military personnel.....	-77,000,000	-103,000,000	-103,000,000	-26,000,000
Operation and Maintenance						
.....	Operation and maintenance, Army (rescission).....	-174,000,000	-196,000,000	-196,000,000	-22,000,000
.....	Operation and maintenance, Navy (rescission).....	-51,000,000	-51,000,000	-51,000,000
.....	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (rescission).....	-17,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	+14,000,000
.....	Operation and maintenance, Air Force (rescission).....	-117,000,000	-117,000,000	-117,000,000
104-44	Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (rescission).....	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-15,000,000
.....	Environmental restoration, Army (rescission).....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
.....	Environmental restoration, Navy (rescission).....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
.....	Environmental restoration, Air Force (rescission).....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
.....	Environmental restoration, Defense-wide (rescission).....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
.....	Environmental restoration, Formerly used defense sites (rescission).....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
.....	Former Soviet Union threat reduction (rescission).....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
	Total, Operation and maintenance.....	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-387,000,000	-395,250,000	-8,250,000
Procurement						
.....	Aircraft procurement, Army (rescission).....	-9,085,000	-19,085,000	-19,085,000	-10,000,000
.....	Missile procurement, Army (rescission).....	-73,707,000	-26,707,000	-26,707,000	+47,000,000
.....	Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army, (rescission).....	-7,296,000	-22,696,000	-22,696,000	-15,400,000
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Army (rescission).....	-28,236,000	-32,236,000	-32,236,000	-4,000,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Other procurement, Army (rescission).....		-23,502,000	-23,502,000	-23,502,000
.....	Aircraft procurement, Navy (rescission).....		-62,000,000	-86,000,000	-86,000,000	-24,000,000
.....	Weapons procurement, Navy (rescission).....		-22,000,000	-22,000,000	-22,000,000
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (rescission).....		-4,812,000	-812,000	-812,000	+ 4,000,000
.....	Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy (rescission).....		-43,000,000	-61,700,000	-61,700,000	-18,700,000
.....	Other procurement, Navy (rescission).....		-15,237,000	-15,237,000	-15,237,000
.....	Procurement, Marine Corps (rescission).....		-5,207,000	-1,207,000	-1,207,000	+ 4,000,000
.....	Aircraft procurement, Air Force (rescission).....		-114,650,000	-130,376,000	-130,376,000	-15,726,000
.....	Missile procurement, Air Force (rescission).....		-193,195,000	-179,020,000	-179,020,000	+ 14,175,000
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Air Force (rescission).....			-7,700,000	-7,700,000	-7,700,000
.....	Other procurement, Air Force (rescission).....		-20,659,000	-33,659,000	-33,659,000	-13,000,000
.....	Procurement, Defense-wide (rescission).....		-9,860,000	-29,973,000	-29,973,000	-20,113,000
104-44	National Guard and Reserve equipment (rescission)....	-62,000,000	-5,029,000	-13,029,000	-13,029,000	-8,000,000
	Total, Procurement.....	-62,000,000	-637,475,000	-704,939,000	-704,939,000	-67,464,000
	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation					
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Army (rescission).....		-14,366,000	-22,366,000	-22,366,000	-8,000,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Navy (rescission).....		-35,978,000	-26,478,000	-26,478,000	+ 9,500,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force (rescission).....		-150,396,000	-196,245,000	-196,245,000	-45,849,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide (rescission).....		-176,090,000	-182,714,000	-182,714,000	-6,624,000
.....	Developmental test and evaluation, Defense (rescission).....		-890,000	-6,692,000	-6,692,000	-5,802,000
.....	Operational test and evaluation, Defense (rescission).....		-160,000	-160,000	-160,000
	Total, Research, development, test and evaluation.....		-377,880,000	-434,655,000	-434,655,000	-56,775,000
	Revolving and Management Fund					
.....	National Defense Sealift Fund (rescission).....		-35,000,000	-25,200,000	-25,200,000	+ 9,800,000
	Other Department of Defense Programs					
.....	Defense health program (rescission).....			-21,000,000	-21,000,000	-21,000,000
.....	Chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense (rescission).....		-48,108,000	-48,108,000	-48,108,000
.....	Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, Defense (rescission).....		-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
	Total, Other Department of Defense programs.....		-50,108,000	-71,108,000	-71,108,000	-21,000,000
	General Provisions					
104-3	DOD-wide savings proposals (offset).....	-4,800,000,000				
.....	Dual-use applications program (rescission).....		-100,000,000			+ 100,000,000
.....	Revised economic adjustments, FY 1997 (rescission).....		-307,000,000			+ 307,000,000
.....	Foreign currency savings, FY 1997 (rescission).....		-308,000,000			+ 308,000,000
.....	Prior year unobligated balances (rescission).....		-246,367,000			+ 246,367,000
.....	Prior year rescissions.....		-982,500,000			+ 982,500,000
.....	Military construction, rescissions (sec. 201).....		-180,000,000	-235,000,000	-189,000,000	+ 46,000,000
.....	Military construction, Navy (rescission) (sec. 202).....		-6,480,000	-6,480,000		
	Total, general provisions.....	-4,800,000,000	-2,030,347,000	-341,480,000	-195,480,000	+ 146,000,000
	Total, Chapter 2:					
.....	New budget (obligational) authority.....	-4,872,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	-1,929,632,000	+ 110,715,000
.....	Rescissions.....	(-72,000,000)	(-2,040,347,000)	(-1,905,943,000)	(-1,929,632,000)	(+ 110,715,000)
.....	Offsets.....	(-4,800,000,000)				
	Total, title I:					
.....	Discretionary budget authority (net).....	-2,773,786,000	-467,000	-100,463,000	-152,000	+ 315,000
.....	Appropriations.....	(20,000,000)	(57,480,000)	(76,480,000)	(83,280,000)	(+ 25,800,000)
.....	Rescissions.....	-72,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	-1,929,632,000	+ 110,715,000
.....	Offsets.....	(-4,800,000,000)				
.....	Emergency appropriations.....	(2,078,214,000)	(1,982,400,000)	(1,729,000,000)	(1,846,200,000)	(-136,200,000)
.....	(By transfer).....		(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)		

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
TITLE II - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS						
CHAPTER 1						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Farm Service Agency						
	Emergency conservation program (emergency appropriations)					
104-58	20,000,000					
104-58	17,000,000	65,000,000	77,000,000	70,000,000	+5,000,000	-7,000,000
	Tree assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations)					
		9,000,000	9,500,000	9,000,000		-500,000
	<u>Total, Farm Service Agency</u>	<u>37,000,000</u>	<u>74,000,000</u>	<u>86,500,000</u>	<u>+5,000,000</u>	<u>-7,500,000</u>
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account						
Loan subsidies:						
Farm operating loans:						
	Direct					
			12,600,000	6,300,000	+6,300,000	-6,300,000
	Guaranteed subsidized (contingent emergency appropriations)					
			10,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000	-5,000,000
	<u>Subtotal</u>		<u>22,600,000</u>	<u>11,300,000</u>	<u>+11,300,000</u>	<u>-11,300,000</u>
	Emergency disaster loans (contingent emergency appropriations)					
			18,000,000	18,000,000	+18,000,000	
	<u>Total, loan subsidies</u>		<u>40,600,000</u>	<u>29,300,000</u>	<u>+29,300,000</u>	<u>-11,300,000</u>
Loan authorizations:						
Farm operating loans:						
	Direct					
			(100,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
	Guaranteed subsidized					
			(110,000,000)	(55,000,000)	(+55,000,000)	(-55,000,000)
	<u>Subtotal</u>		<u>(210,000,000)</u>	<u>(105,000,000)</u>	<u>(+105,000,000)</u>	<u>(-105,000,000)</u>
	Emergency disaster loans					
			(59,000,000)	(59,000,000)	(+59,000,000)	
	<u>Total, loan authorizations</u>		<u>(269,000,000)</u>	<u>(164,000,000)</u>	<u>(+164,000,000)</u>	<u>(-105,000,000)</u>
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund						
Disaster reserve assistance program:						
	Livestock indemnity program					
				(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
Natural Resources Conservation Service						
Watershed and flood prevention operations						
104-58	66,100,000					
104-58	18,000,000	150,700,000	171,000,000	166,000,000	+15,300,000	-5,000,000
	<u>Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service</u>	<u>84,100,000</u>	<u>150,700,000</u>	<u>171,000,000</u>	<u>+15,300,000</u>	<u>-5,000,000</u>
Rural Housing Service						
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program:						
Rental housing (sec. 515):						
104-58	250,000		250,000			-250,000
104-58	(488,000)		(488,000)			(-488,000)
Rural housing assistance program (emergency appropriations)						
104-58	750,000					
			4,000,000			-4,000,000
	<u>Total, Rural Housing Service</u>	<u>1,000,000</u>	<u>4,250,000</u>			<u>-4,250,000</u>
Rural Utilities Service						
Rural utilities assistance program (emergency appropriations)						
104-58	1,000,000					
			6,500,000	4,000,000	+4,000,000	-2,500,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Housing Programs						
.....		3,500,000	3,500,000	+3,500,000
104-3	Preserving existing housing investment					
	Drug elimination grants for low-income housing (by transfer)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(-30,200,000)
Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing						
.....	National community development initiative (by transfer)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(+30,200,000)
Community Planning and Development						
104-71	Community development block grants fund (emergency appropriations)	100,000,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000	-250,000,000
.....	Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998	250,000,000	+250,000,000
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development						
		<u>100,000,000</u>	<u>503,500,000</u>	<u>500,000,000</u>	<u>503,500,000</u>	<u>+3,500,000</u>
INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
104-58	Disaster relief (emergency appropriations)	541,000,000	3,067,677,000	3,100,000,000	3,300,000,000	+232,323,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	438,000,000
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
Community disaster loans (by transfer)						
.....	(contingent emergency appropriations)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
.....	Salaries and expenses	5,000,000	-5,000,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency						
		<u>979,000,000</u>	<u>3,072,677,000</u>	<u>3,100,000,000</u>	<u>3,300,000,000</u>	<u>+227,323,000</u>
Total, Chapter 10:						
New budget (obligational) authority						
	Appropriations	1,832,000,000	4,329,177,000	4,353,000,000	4,731,500,000	+402,323,000
	Emergency appropriations	(753,000,000)	(761,500,000)	(753,000,000)	(931,500,000)	(+170,000,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(641,000,000)	(3,567,677,000)	(3,600,000,000)	(3,550,000,000)	(-17,677,000)
	Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998	(438,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
	(By transfer)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
CHAPTER 11						
OFFSETS AND RESCISSIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Office of the Secretary						
.....	Fund For Rural America (offset)	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
Natural Resources Conservation Service						
.....	Wetlands reserve program (offset)	-19,000,000	+19,000,000
Food and Consumer Service						
104-3	The emergency food assistance program (offset)	-6,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
Foreign Agricultural Service						
.....	Export credit (offset)	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	+16,000,000
.....	Export enhancement program (offset)	-23,000,000	-13,000,000	+23,000,000
Total, Foreign Agricultural Service						
		<u>-39,000,000</u>	<u>-29,000,000</u>	<u>+39,000,000</u>	<u>+29,000,000</u>
Public Law 480 Program Account:						
Title I - Credit sales:						
104-44	Ocean freight differential (rescission)	-3,500,000
104-44	Loan subsidies (rescission)	-46,500,000
Total, Public Law 480 program account						
		<u>-50,000,000</u>
Total, Department of Agriculture						
		<u>-56,000,000</u>	<u>-98,000,000</u>	<u>-49,000,000</u>	<u>-40,000,000</u>	<u>+9,000,000</u>
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
104-44	Working capital fund (rescission)	-6,400,000	-6,400,000	-6,400,000	-6,400,000
Legal Activities						
.....	Assets forfeiture fund (rescission)	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Food and Consumer Service							
104-3	Child nutrition programs	6,250,000					
104-3	Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	100,000,000	76,000,000	58,000,000	76,000,000		+ 18,000,000
	Total, Food and Consumer Service	106,250,000	76,000,000	58,000,000	76,000,000		+ 18,000,000
Total, Chapter 1:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	229,350,000	300,700,000	366,850,000	354,300,000	+ 53,600,000	-12,550,000
	Appropriations	(106,250,000)	(76,000,000)	(70,600,000)	(82,300,000)	(+ 6,300,000)	(+ 11,700,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(88,100,000)		(250,000)			(-250,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(35,000,000)	(224,700,000)	(296,000,000)	(272,000,000)	(+ 47,300,000)	(-24,000,000)
	(Loan authorization)	(488,000)		(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+ 164,000,000)	(-105,488,000)
CHAPTER 2							
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE							
Economic Development Administration							
	Economic development assistance programs (emergency appropriations)			54,700,000	50,200,000	+ 50,200,000	-4,500,000
	Contingent emergency appropriations		47,700,000			-47,700,000	
104-58	(By transfer)	(1,200,000)					
	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)				2,000,000	+ 2,000,000	+ 2,000,000
	Contingent emergency appropriations		2,000,000			-2,000,000	
	Total, Economic Development Administration		49,700,000	54,700,000	52,200,000	+ 2,500,000	-2,500,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration							
104-58	Operations, research and facilities (emergency appropriations)	12,000,000					
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations)	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000		
	Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	22,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000		
	Total, Department of Commerce	22,800,000	60,500,000	65,500,000	63,000,000	+ 2,500,000	-2,500,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE							
International Organizations and Conferences							
	Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment			100,000,000			-100,000,000
104-3	Arreage payments (advance appropriation, FY 1999)	921,000,000					
RELATED AGENCY							
Commission on the Advancement of Federal Law Enforcement							
	Salaries and expenses		2,000,000		2,000,000		+ 2,000,000
Total, Chapter 2:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	943,800,000	62,500,000	165,500,000	65,000,000	+ 2,500,000	-100,500,000
	Appropriations	(106,250,000)	(2,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(2,000,000)		(-98,000,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(22,800,000)	(10,800,000)	(65,500,000)	(63,000,000)	(+ 52,200,000)	(-2,500,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations		(49,700,000)			(-49,700,000)	
	Advance appropriation, FY 1999	(921,000,000)					
	(By transfer)	(1,200,000)					
CHAPTER 2A							
FEDERAL FUNDS							
	Federal payment to the District of Columbia			31,150,000			-31,150,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS							
	Public safety and justice			(8,800,000)			(-8,800,000)
	Capital outlay			(22,350,000)			(-22,350,000)
	Total, District of Columbia funds			(31,150,000)			(-31,150,000)
CHAPTER 3							
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
Corps of Engineers - Civil							
	Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee (emergency appropriations)		20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000		

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
104-58	Operation and maintenance, general (emergency appropriations)	39,000,000	150,000,000	137,000,000	150,000,000	+13,000,000
104-58	Flood control and coastal emergencies (emergency appropriations)	201,700,000	415,000,000	390,000,000	415,000,000	+25,000,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	50,000,000				
104-58	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	30,500,000				
	Total, Department of Defense - Civil	321,200,000	585,000,000	547,000,000	585,000,000	+38,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Reclamation						
104-58	Operation and maintenance (emergency appropriations)	4,500,000	7,355,000	7,355,000	7,355,000	
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
104-78	Energy supply, research and development activities (by transfer)	(19,700,000)				
Total, Chapter 3:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	325,700,000	592,355,000	554,355,000	592,355,000	+38,000,000
	Emergency appropriations	(245,200,000)	(592,355,000)	(554,355,000)	(592,355,000)	(+38,000,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(50,000,000)				
	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	(30,500,000)				
	(By transfer)	(19,700,000)				
CHAPTER 5						
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations)		1,793,000	393,000	393,000	-1,400,000
104-58	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)
	Total, Bureau of Land Management		1,793,000	393,000	393,000	-1,400,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
104-58	Resource management (emergency appropriations)	2,000,000	2,250,000	8,350,000	5,300,000	+3,050,000
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations)	32,000,000	81,000,000	91,000,000	88,000,000	+7,000,000
104-58	Land acquisition (emergency appropriations)	15,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	-5,000,000
	Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	49,000,000	98,250,000	104,350,000	103,300,000	+5,050,000
National Park Service						
104-58	Construction	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	
104-58	Emergency appropriations	147,779,000	156,912,000	157,321,000	157,321,000	+409,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	
	Total, National Park Service	187,779,000	196,912,000	197,321,000	197,321,000	+409,000
United States Geological Survey						
104-58	Surveys, investigations, and research (emergency appropriations)	1,300,000	4,290,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	+360,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
104-58	Operation of Indian programs (emergency appropriations)	5,800,000	11,100,000	14,317,000	14,317,000	+3,217,000
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations)	5,000,000	5,554,000	6,249,000	6,249,000	+695,000
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	10,800,000	16,654,000	20,566,000	20,566,000	+3,912,000
	Total, Department of the Interior	248,879,000	317,899,000	327,280,000	326,230,000	+8,331,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
104-58	National forest system (emergency appropriations)	25,000,000	37,107,000	39,677,000	39,677,000	+2,570,000
104-58	Reconstruction and construction (emergency appropriations)	13,000,000	32,334,000	27,685,000	27,685,000	-4,649,000
	Total, Forest Service	38,000,000	69,441,000	67,362,000	67,362,000	-2,079,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
.....	Indian health services (emergency appropriations)	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		
.....	Indian health facilities (emergency appropriations)	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		
	Total, Indian Health Service	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000		
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Recreation fees (sec. 5001)	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000		
	Total, Chapter 5:					
	New budget (obligational) authority	286,879,000	397,340,000	404,642,000	403,592,000	+6,252,000
	Appropriations	(10,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)	
	Emergency appropriations	(246,879,000)	(350,340,000)	(357,642,000)	(356,592,000)	(+6,252,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)
CHAPTER 6						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Health Resources and Services Administration						
.....	Health education assistance loans program		499,000	499,000	+499,000	
Office of the Secretary						
.....	Public health and social services emergency fund			15,000,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000
.....	Emergency appropriations		15,000,000			-15,000,000
	Total, Department of Health and Human Services		15,499,000	15,499,000	+15,499,000	
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Education for the disadvantaged		585,000,000	101,133,000	+101,133,000	-483,867,000
.....	Advance appropriation, FY 1998		-386,824,000			+386,824,000
	Total, Department of Education		198,176,000	101,133,000	+101,133,000	-87,043,000
RELATED AGENCY						
National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education						
.....	Salaries and expenses	650,000		650,000		+650,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Child care and development block grant (sec. 6004)		1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	
.....	Supplemental security income program (sec. 6005)	240,000,000	240,000,000	240,000,000		
	Total, Chapter 6:					
	New budget (obligational) authority	240,650,000	454,675,000	358,282,000	+117,632,000	-96,393,000
	Appropriations	(240,650,000)	(826,499,000)	(358,282,000)	(+117,632,000)	(-468,217,000)
	Emergency appropriations		(15,000,000)			(-15,000,000)
	Advance appropriation, FY 1998		(-386,824,000)			(+386,824,000)
CHAPTER 7						
CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
SENATE						
Contingent Expenses of the Senate						
.....	Secretary of the Senate (by transfer)		(5,000,000)	(5,010,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
.....	Gratuities, deceased Members			133,600	+133,600	+133,600
OTHER AGENCY						
BOTANIC GARDEN						
.....	Salaries and expenses			33,500,000	+33,500,000	+33,500,000
	Total, Chapter 7:					
	New budget (obligational) authority			33,633,600	+33,633,600	+33,633,600
	(By transfer)		(5,000,000)	(5,010,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
CHAPTER 8						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Coast Guard						
.....	Operating expenses.....	6,473,000	1,600,000	+ 1,600,000	-4,873,000
104-3	Retired pay.....	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	+ 5,000,000	+ 5,000,000
	Total, Coast Guard.....	4,200,000	4,200,000	10,673,000	+ 6,600,000	+ 127,000
Federal Aviation Administration						
.....	Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	40,000,000	-40,000,000
.....	Grants-in-aid for airports.....	15,520,000	-15,520,000
Federal Highway Administration						
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):						
.....	Emergency relief program (emergency appropriations).....	276,000,000	276,000,000	276,000,000	+ 374,000,000	+ 374,000,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	15,000,000	374,000,000	374,000,000	-374,000,000	-374,000,000
104-3	(Limitation on obligations).....	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(+ 376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
	Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	291,000,000	650,000,000	650,000,000	650,000,000
Federal Railroad Administration						
.....	Emergency railroad rehabilitation and repair (emergency appropriations).....	18,900,000	+ 18,900,000	+ 18,900,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	10,000,000	24,000,000	-10,000,000	-24,000,000
	Total, Department of Transportation.....	295,200,000	704,200,000	700,193,000	-24,500,000	-20,493,000
RELATED AGENCY						
National Transportation Safety Board						
104-3	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations).....	20,200,000	14,100,000	+ 29,859,000	+ 15,759,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	23,300,000	-23,300,000
GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):						
.....	Alcohol-impaired driving prevention incentive grants (sec. 8003).....	500,000	500,000
.....	National Driver Register (sec. 8004).....	2,500,000	2,500,000	+ 2,500,000
	Total, Chapter 8:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	315,400,000	730,500,000	714,793,000	-17,941,000	-2,234,000
	Appropriations.....	(4,200,000)	(47,200,000)	(26,693,000)	(13,800,000)	(-33,400,000)
	Emergency appropriations.....	(296,200,000)	(276,000,000)	(290,100,000)	(+ 422,759,000)	(+ 408,659,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(15,000,000)	(407,300,000)	(398,000,000)	(-407,300,000)	(-398,000,000)
	(Limitation on obligations).....	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(+ 376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
CHAPTER 9						
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Departmental Offices						
.....	Salaries and expenses.....	1,950,000	+ 1,950,000
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE						
104-3	Payment to the Postal Service Fund.....	5,383,000	5,300,000	5,383,000	+ 83,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
104-71	Unanticipated needs for natural disasters (emergency appropriations).....	200,000,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
104-61	Federal Election Commission.....	1,709,000
	Total, Chapter 9:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	207,092,000	5,300,000	7,333,000	+ 2,033,000
	Appropriations.....	(7,092,000)	(5,300,000)	(7,333,000)	(+ 2,033,000)
	Emergency appropriations.....	(200,000,000)
CHAPTER 10						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Veterans Benefits Administration						
104-3	Compensation and pensions.....	753,000,000	753,000,000	753,000,000	+ 175,000,000	+ 175,000,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
.....	Construction (rescission)	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
	Total, Department of Justice	-6,400,000	-10,400,000	-6,400,000	-10,400,000	-4,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
.....	Industrial technology services (rescission)	-7,000,000	-7,000,000	-7,000,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
.....	Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion (rescission)	-2,000,000	+2,000,000
	Total, Department of Commerce	-9,000,000	-7,000,000	+2,000,000	-7,000,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
Federal Communications Commission						
.....	Salaries and expenses (rescission)	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Ounce of Prevention Council						
.....	Direct appropriation (rescission)	-1,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
	Total, related agencies	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
Corps of Engineers - Civil						
104-3	Construction, general (offset)	-50,000,000	-30,000,000	+30,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
.....	Energy supply, research and development activities (rescission)	-22,532,000	-11,180,000	+11,352,000	-11,180,000
Power Marketing Administrations						
104-44	Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration (rescission)	-2,111,000	-11,352,000	-11,352,000	-11,352,000
	Total, Department of Energy	-2,111,000	-22,532,000	-22,532,000	-22,532,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
104-57	Clean coal technology (rescission)	-10,000,000	-17,000,000	-17,000,000
104-44	Strategic petroleum reserve (rescission)	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000
	Total, Department of Energy	-21,000,000	-28,000,000	-28,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Administration for Children and Families						
.....	Job opportunities and basic skills (JOBS) (offset)	-700,000,000	-700,000,000	-700,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Federal family education loan program account (rescission)	-849,000	+849,000
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Federal Aviation Administration						
.....	Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	-778,000,000	-750,000,000	-750,000,000	+28,000,000
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
.....	Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	-10,600,000	-13,000,000	-13,000,000	-2,400,000
Federal Transit Administration						
.....	Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	-271,000,000	-271,000,000	-271,000,000
.....	Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	-588,000,000	-588,000,000	-588,000,000
	Total, Federal Transit Administration	-859,000,000	-859,000,000	-859,000,000
	Total, Department of Transportation	-1,647,600,000	-1,622,000,000	-1,622,000,000	+25,600,000

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
General Services Administration						
Federal Buildings Fund:						
.....		-1,400,000	+1,400,000
104-44	Repairs and alterations (rescission).....					
.....	Expenses, presidential transition (rescission).....	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000
.....	Total, General Services Administration.....	-5,600,000	-7,000,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	+1,400,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Housing Programs						
104-44	Annual contributions for assisted housing (rescission).	-250,000,000	-3,823,440,000	-3,850,000,000	-3,850,000,000	+173,440,000
Federal Housing Administration						
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
.....	Rescission.....			-85,000,000	+85,000,000
.....	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	-250,000,000	-3,823,440,000	-3,735,000,000	-3,650,000,000	+173,440,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
.....	Salaries and expenses (emergency rescission).....			-5,000,000	+5,000,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
.....	National aeronautics facilities (rescission of advance appropriation, FY 1998).....		-38,000,000	-365,000,000	-365,000,000	-327,000,000
Funds Appropriated to the President						
.....	Unanticipated needs (emergency rescission).....			-4,200,000	-4,200,000	-4,200,000
Total, Chapter 11:						
.....	New budget (obligational) authority.....	-391,111,000	-4,739,221,000	-6,575,800,000	-6,456,732,000	-1,717,511,000
.....	Rescissions.....	(-335,111,000)	(-3,903,221,000)	(-3,775,000,000)	(-3,725,532,000)	(+177,689,000)
.....	Rescission of contract authorization.....			(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)
.....	Rescission of advance appropriation.....		(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)
.....	Offsets.....	(-58,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)
.....	Emergency rescissions.....			(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)
Total, title II:						
.....	Discretionary budget authority (net).....	2,991,910,000	1,162,101,000	-280,702,000	-135,511,000	-1,297,612,000
.....	Appropriations.....	(123,342,000)	(392,450,000)	(1,075,075,000)	(508,515,000)	(+116,065,000)
.....	Rescissions.....	(-335,111,000)	(-3,903,221,000)	(-3,775,000,000)	(-3,725,532,000)	(+177,689,000)
.....	Rescission of contract authorization.....			(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)
.....	Offsets.....	(-58,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)
.....	Emergency appropriations.....	(1,740,179,000)	(4,797,172,000)	(4,882,847,000)	(5,260,706,000)	(+463,534,000)
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations.....	(568,000,000)	(711,700,000)	(724,000,000)	(302,000,000)	(-409,700,000)
.....	Emergency rescissions.....			(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)
.....	Advance appropriation, FY 1998.....	(30,500,000)		(-386,824,000)		
.....	Advance appropriation, FY 1999.....	(921,000,000)				
.....	Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998.....				(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
.....	Rescission of advance appropriation.....		(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)
.....	(Limitation on obligations).....	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+376,733,491)
.....	(Loan authorization).....	(488,000)		(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+164,000,000)
.....	(By transfer).....	(51,100,000)	(30,200,000)	(35,200,000)	(35,210,000)	(+5,010,000)
.....	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations).....	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)
.....	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations).....			(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
.....	Mandatory budget authority.....	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued**

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Grand total, all titles:						
Discretionary budget authority (net)	218,124,000	1,161,634,000	-381,165,000	-135,663,000	-1,297,297,000	+245,502,000
Appropriations	(143,342,000)	(449,930,000)	(1,151,555,000)	(591,795,000)	(+141,865,000)	(-559,760,000)
Rescissions	(-407,111,000)	(-5,943,568,000)	(-5,680,943,000)	(-5,655,164,000)	(+288,404,000)	(+25,779,000)
Rescission of contract authorization			(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(+25,600,000)
Offsets	(-4,856,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
Emergency appropriations	(3,818,393,000)	(6,779,572,000)	(6,811,847,000)	(7,106,906,000)	(+327,334,000)	(+495,059,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(568,000,000)	(711,700,000)	(724,000,000)	(302,000,000)	(-409,700,000)	(-422,000,000)
Emergency rescissions			(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(+5,000,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1998	(30,500,000)		(-386,824,000)			(+386,824,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1999	(921,000,000)					
Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998..				(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
Rescission of advance appropriation		(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)	
(Limitation on obligations)	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
(Loan authorization)	(488,000)		(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+164,000,000)	(-105,488,000)
(By transfer)	(51,100,000)	(53,200,000)	(58,200,000)	(58,210,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)	
(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)			(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	
Mandatory budget authority	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600	+180,133,600
Total appropriations in bill (net)	975,324,000	1,918,834,000	376,035,000	801,670,600	-1,117,163,400	+425,635,600
SUMMARY OF 1997 SPENDING						
Total discretionary spending, title I	2,098,214,000	2,039,880,000	1,805,480,000	1,929,480,000	-110,400,000	+124,000,000
Total rescissions and offsets, title I	-4,872,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	-1,929,632,000	+110,715,000	-23,689,000
Total discretionary spending, title II	2,431,521,000	5,901,322,000	6,681,922,000	6,071,221,000	+169,899,000	-610,701,000
Total rescissions and offsets, title II	-391,111,000	-4,701,221,000	-6,210,800,000	-6,091,732,000	-1,390,511,000	+119,068,000
Total mandatory spending, title II	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600	+180,133,600
Total spending in bill	5,286,935,000	8,698,402,000	9,244,602,000	8,938,034,600	+239,632,600	-306,567,400

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, on March 19 the President sent a request to this Congress for an emergency supplemental to pay for flood damage relief in some 35 States and to reimburse the Pentagon for additional costs incurred by America's responsibilities in Bosnia. That request was for around \$5 billion.

Today is June 6, almost 80 days after the President sent his request to this Congress. Today, this House is apparently about to send to the President a bill that contains considerably more money and, unfortunately, it also contains three blatant political riders which have nothing whatsoever to do with disaster recovery or military readiness. Those riders will, and, in fact, they are doing it right now, they are, for all practical purposes, resulting in a second Government shutdown for the areas of the country who are desperately awaiting relief from Washington and are not getting it because of these three riders.

The first rider is a political restriction on the census. Now, I happen to agree with the language of that rider. I do not like the idea of having sample census supplement the enumeration in the census. But I also recognize that that fight ought to be made on the State-Commerce-Justice appropriation bill. It does not belong on an emergency proposal to get help to 35 States which need it very badly.

□ 1730

There is also a second rider which has to do with constructing roads on environmentally sensitive public lands in some 17 States across the country, most especially Alaska. No matter how one feels about the provision, that language does not belong on an emergency appropriation bill trying to help the American people.

Thirdly, there is another rider, which is posed as being a benign rider, which will simply extend the activities of Government at the end of the fiscal year. In fact, that rider is a pernicious effort to create a new imbalance of power between the Congress and the Presidency, because the effect of that rider is to essentially allow the majority in this House to pass through the Congress those appropriation bills which they want to cut, but it allows them to hold back any appropriation bill which contains administration priorities. That means that the President is being asked to put himself in a hole in terms of being able to defend what he considers to be legitimate national priorities. No matter how one feels about that, that language again does not belong on an emergency appropriation bill.

Now, this bill is going nowhere. It is going to be vetoed over those three riders. The American people know that once again Congress is putting, by its action on these three riders, it is put-

ting partisan political considerations ahead of the needs of the American people, and I think we ought to see to it that that does not happen this evening.

What we ought to do is to stop the political games. We ought to stop the delays which are preventing real help from getting out there to real people. So I am simply going to ask people tonight to vote "no" on the proposition. A "no" vote will actually speed up the needed relief to the affected areas of the country because we could, in fact, tonight go back to conference, strip that bill of these three offending riders, and in that way enable aid to get to these areas in the fastest possible way.

That is what I think we should do. We should pass the effective equal, H.R. 1796, which I have deposited at the desk today, which will contain all of the provisions in this proposition before us today except those three riders that are causing this bill to go nowhere. That is the responsible thing to do if we are worried about meeting the needs of our troops in Bosnia, if we are worried about meeting the needs of the Americans in the affected areas.

I would urge a "no" vote on this bill, not only because it is delaying the needed aid to these areas, but because it also is rapidly getting us into a place where our military is going to have to take a number of actions which are not in the national interest of this country.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], who deserves all the credit as the prime sponsor of the continuing resolution involved in this bill.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a resolution that is geared to prevent the shutdown of Government. What is so wrong about that? The same voices that are saying we cannot pass legislation to prevent Government shutdown are the voices that the last time were heard, "You have shut down the Government. Why did you shut down the Government?"

This is a simple way, a common-sense way, and maybe that is why I cannot get it through to everybody, it is a commonsense way to prevent Government shutdowns.

What did the President say during the last time when the Government was shut down that should be part of the record for this debate here today? He said, and I quote, "It is deeply wrong to shut the Government down while we negotiate under the illusion that somehow that will affect the decisions that I would make on specific issues. As I said, this is only casting a shadow over our talks. I will continue to do everything I can in good faith to reach an agreement, but it is wrong to shut the Government down."

The President should be addressed in a way to indicate that this is exactly what we are doing: We are listening to his words, we should not shut down the Government. Same President, same arena.

In the last shutdown alone, the Federal Housing Administration was unable to insure single-family home loans for tens of thousands of deserving applicants, and many, many thousands of citizens could not get passports. Some veterans could not get benefits. Many Medicare claims could not be processed. Small businesses, lots of them, could not get loans to create new jobs, all of because of a shutdown.

We are asking in this particular amendment that we permit a common-sense way to prevent Government shutdown. The President said this about the cost of a shutdown on Saturday, January 20, 1996: "We believe that we can go a long way towards bringing the forces of goodwill to a measure that everyone agrees should occur to prevent Government shutdown."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

(Mr. MURTHA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me talk a little bit about the problems we have in defense. I include for the RECORD three letters, one addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, the other addressed to Secretary Cohen from the Army, and the other addressed to Secretary Cohen from the Air Force.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL, I want to thank you for your action to date on the FY 1997 Bosnia/Southwest Asia Supplemental request, but I want to share with you my concern and that of the Service Chiefs about the impact on operations and training if the supplemental is not approved soon.

In my testimony and discussions with Congress, I have emphasized the need for early action on the supplemental. Based on its likely passage by Memorial Day, few actions were taken by the Department to offset supplemental costs. However, since our request was not approved last month, the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and the Air Force have renewed their concern over the possibility of delayed passage of the supplemental. I have enclosed copies of recent memoranda from them. To ensure that their overall operations are properly funded, the Chiefs have indicated that they cannot risk being left with no options for funding Bosnia/Southwest Asia costs if the supplemental is delayed much longer.

I remain hopeful that quick action can be taken on the supplemental to preclude the disruptive impact to the Department's programs, especially those related to maintaining our readiness capability.

Sincerely,

BILL.

U.S. ARMY,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I need your assistance in expediting the Bosnia Supplemental currently on the Hill. In early April, I advised Congress that in the absence of supplemental funding or the clear assurance that such funding would be forthcoming, I would be forced to begin actions in early May that would result in a degradation of readiness. I have not initiated the planned actions to deal with the lack of supplemental funding because the progress made had convinced me that supplemental funding would be forthcoming.

Recent developments indicate passage of the supplemental may be at risk. This puts the Army in the position of having to provide fourth quarter resource allocation to the field without having supplemental funding in hand. We have a fiscal responsibility to ensure that the allocation of fourth quarter resources is done within current limitations. There are several actions presently under consideration to cope with this situation. Each will have direct readiness and quality of life implications. Actions include the cancellation of Army participation in JCS exercises, Combat Training Center (CTC) rotations, home station training, weapons qualification training, and the deferral of some real property and depot maintenance. Some of these actions could carry over into the next fiscal year. For example, canceling home station training in the fourth quarter of this fiscal year could impact on CTC rotations in the first quarter of FY 1998.

We continue to monitor the supplemental very closely. As the situation develops, the Army will initiate any and all actions necessary to train and operate within the means available to us.

Very Respectfully,

DENNIS J. REIMER.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1997.
Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense
From: HQ USAF/CC, 1670 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1670
Subject: FY97 DoD Contingency Supplemental

I understand that quick passage of the Supplemental may be in jeopardy. The purpose of this memorandum is to make you aware of the impacts of delayed passage (beyond June) on Air Force day-to-day operations.

The Air Force is currently cash flowing over \$700 million in support of Bosnia and SWA operations. We are doing so out of third and fourth quarter funding but are fast running out of flexibility and must soon take very dramatic action to avoid incurring an anti-deficiency in our O&M appropriation. On or about 1 July, Air Force commanders must begin taking the following kinds of actions:

Severely curtail or cease non-flying training—skill and proficiency levels reduced, e.g., weapons maintenance.

Severely curtail or cease flying training—squadrons and wings stand down—aircrew readiness degraded.

Cease all non-mission critical travel.

Defer further depot maintenance inductions—aircraft grounded.

Terminate benchstock fills—aircraft spares and consumables inventories drained.

Park non-mission critical vehicles.

Place moratoriums on all but safety related facility maintenance, including runway repair.

Impose civilian hiring freezes.
I know you are aware of the importance of this issue. We are well beyond the point where we can avoid serious disruption to Air Force operations if there is no supplemental. Timing is now critical.

RONALD R. FOGLEMAN,
General, USAF, Chief of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, we started doing our business as soon as we got the request. Chairman YOUNG called the subcommittee together. We recognized the concern of the military if we did not replenish their supplies, because of the Bosnia operation. There are a number of people that were against the deployment to Bosnia, but our position in the Congress has always been, we are going to take care of the troops.

So we went to work immediately trying to make sure that we did our part in this supplemental. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations recognized the need. He has been on this subcommittee for years, and he recognized the need to do something immediately about it. Let me say that the military is really in a bind. The quicker we get this done, the sooner we will alleviate the problems in the military. But let me go back a few years and show you the difference.

In 1977, Johnstown, PA had a disastrous flood. The legislation had run out for flood relief. At that time it was handled by the Small Business Administration. I stayed for 2 or 3 days in Johnstown, and I recognized we could not do anything until we got legislation to extend and extended the coverage for the Small Business Administration.

I came back to Washington, talked to the Speaker at that time, who was Tip O'Neill. He called the President of the United States, Jimmy Carter. Within a week, we had passed the necessary legislation and we could go forward with opening up the disaster relief centers that were needed so desperately in our area.

The Federal Government spent \$350 million in a very small area, within about a 4- or 5-month period, because of the cooperation of everybody in the House Chamber. There were no extraneous matters on the legislation. Everything was done in order to expedite it.

I know how those people feel. I understand their pain. We went through it. Three times we have had disastrous floods in our area. We are, in effect, shutting down the Government because of extraneous material. Here we are with the CR. If we could not do our job, the Government shuts down. The Committee on Appropriations realizes the importance of passing this legislation without a continuing resolution.

I remember the President of the United States standing up there with a continuing resolution passed under the Democrats, it was 2 or 3 feet thick, and he said this should never happen again. What we are doing here is trying to

pass a continuing resolution, when we do not even know what would be in this, because we shut down the Government a year ago.

That is a mistake, and I feel very strongly that the Committee on Appropriations does not need the advice of the Whole House in telling us how to do our business. We do our business. We pass the legislation. If we had an opportunity, we would pass this legislation without any extraneous matters.

The census hurts Pennsylvania, this census matter that they are trying to pass in this legislation. So I would hope that we would pass this quickly, the President will veto it and get it back here, so we can get this flood relief and this defense relief that is so desperately needed for the people out there passed and signed into law and get help to them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to echo some of the thoughts that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] has just spoken of. I would remind the Members, and as I have told Mr. MURTHA, when I was 5 years old and lived in a little house on the banks of the Allegheny River in western Pennsylvania, I had an opportunity to watch that little house get knocked off of its foundation by the flooded Allegheny River, and at that point we had no idea where we might be going to live. So I know firsthand, although it has been a while ago, I know firsthand the feeling and frustration of people that lose their homes because of natural disasters, and in this case floods.

Also, I would say that the needs of the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard need to be met and need to be met quickly. In support of the work of the Committee on Appropriations, and especially the Subcommittee on National Security, we have done our job. We did it well.

When we got the request for the supplemental for the Armed Services, we were asked to wait until the disaster supplemental was sent also from the White House, so we did wait for that. It arrived at the end of March. The subcommittee marked up the defense supplemental on April 16. We were through the full committee on markup on April 24. The Senate passed the supplemental on May 8. The supplemental went to the House floor, was defeated by an overwhelming vote on that side, unfortunately. So we had to bring the supplemental rule back to the House again on May 15. We finally passed it and went to conference on May 20.

On the first day of the conference, the conferees on the national security issue, the defense supplemental, settled our differences with the other body, and we were prepared to move that legislation then. We recognized the need

that the Armed Services had. We did not delay. We have been prepared to go on this issue ever since May 20.

So I hope that we can settle this issue today. I hope that we can send it to the White House. I hope the President will recognize that what we are doing here is in good faith, sign this bill, get the disaster relief where it is needed, and get the money to the military before they have to stand down their training and other issues that might seriously affect readiness.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the sampling prohibition buried deeply within this measure. Legislating census methodology is not only wholly inappropriate, but holding disaster victims hostage to its political aims is unconscionable. For them, this is a Government shutdown.

Consider this: We have just told the world's premier statistical agency that they cannot use statistical methods. The truth is that sampling and statistical methods are not new to the census, but even decades-old traditional uses would be banned, and would guarantee that tens of millions of Americans all across this country will be missed and millions more will be double-counted. Even worse, errors resulting from this count will reverberate and compound themselves year after year in the maldistributions of hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade.

Without sampling, we will never be able to count every head by simply relying on return census forms and dedicated amateur enumerators. Who says so? Well, in 1991 the now Speaker of the House urged the use of statistical methods to improve the count. GAO and the Commerce Inspector General criticized the Census Bureau for not going far enough to incorporate sampling, and three separate panels of the National Academy of Sciences recommended the use of sampling and statistical methods to make the count more accurate.

Dr. Barbara Bryant, President Bush's director of the Census, said that the most accurate count possible will be the one that combines the best techniques for direct enumeration with the best known technology for sampling and estimating the unmeasured.

□ 1745

The bill before us rejects those judgments. There is nothing unconstitutional about the use of sampling or statistical methods. But prohibiting its use and holding disaster victims hostage to this very bad idea is unconscionable. This is for them a government shutdown. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations to engage in a colloquy.

The conference agreement contains an appropriation for the emergency repair and renovation of the Botanic Garden, which we all know is absolutely necessary. As the gentleman knows, the Joint Committee on the Library has jurisdiction over that program. Does the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on the Library extend to the direction of the expenditure of the funds for the renovation project that is contained in this supplemental?

Mr. WALSH. My response is yes. This is a supplemental appropriation which supplements the regular fiscal year 1997 appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Botanic Garden. The language in that supplemental says, and I quote, "for an additional amount that is an additional amount over and above the appropriation in the regular appropriations bill and under the same terms and conditions as the regular fiscal year appropriation."

The regular fiscal year appropriation clearly states, at 110 statute 2406 in Public Law 104-197, that "all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden are under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library."

I confirm, therefore, that the repair and renovation project are covered by the terms and conditions of the basic appropriation. That means it will be conducted under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and I thank the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the U.S. census sampling language contained in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The prohibition of sampling will guarantee a miscount of the American people. The U.S. Census Bureau and the National Academy of Science's research and evaluations have proven that statistical sampling is absolutely necessary to improve the accuracy of the census count. In addition, the U.S. Department of Commerce inspector general has determined that the use of sampling to measure and correct the census undercount is the only way to eliminate the historic disproportionate undercount of people of color and the poor.

Mr. Speaker, the House leadership must not deny the American people their constitutional right to be counted. This is an issue of fundamental fairness and basic economics. Not only is the count used for reapportioning the House of Representatives, it is used in determining the allocation of billions upon billions of hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

To deny the American people their right to be accurately counted in the U.S. census is not only a blatant act of discrimination, it is also irresponsible. The 1990 census failed to count an estimated 4 million people and cost the American people a record high of \$2.6 billion. The census counting system is broken and must be fixed. I ask my colleagues to join with me in voting "no" on the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I speak as the representative of the citizens of this country that have perhaps been hit the hardest by all of the natural disasters addressed in this bill.

The bill before us represents some of the very best and some of the very worst inclinations of this body.

Six days after the dikes broke in Grand Forks and the city was inundated, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was kind enough to add relief in the markup on this bill to respond to our situation. The very next day, the Speaker of the House gave up personal family time over the weekend to come and view the area. Two days after that the majority leader led a bipartisan delegation also to view the area and assess the damages. The very next week meaningful relief was added to the bill on the House floor, thanks to the work of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], another bipartisan effort.

Then, just when it looked to the people of the country that Congress perhaps could act in a bipartisan way to meaningfully respond to a disaster, the games started and brought the whole effort to a screeching halt, leading up to the disgraceful exit of this body at Memorial Day recess without addressing the flood disaster.

The bill before us still contains the political games that have slowed this effort and delayed relief to the people that need it, but I ask that it be enacted and sent to the White House. I have become convinced that we need to move this relief measure forward and that playing this silly game out, sending the bill up with the veto bait attached, ensuring the veto which will come, ensuring the sustaining of the veto which we know will then come, will then get us to a position where the bill can be passed, as it should have been all along, with just the relief component, so that at last, at long last, the families that I represent and others throughout the area that I am from, families that in some instances do not

have homes to go to tonight, families that will not have seen their children for 6 weeks, a city that does not know which way to turn until this bill is passed, only then can we begin the process of moving forward. Despite the reservations, I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WICKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise this afternoon in favor of the conference report. I would like to address one of the three objections mentioned by the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and that deals with the issue of census sampling. The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin says that he agrees with the language of the conference report on sampling but he simply does not believe it is appropriate in this particular piece of legislation.

What are we talking about? There are people in the administration and in the Census Bureau who are proposing essentially to count approximately 90 percent of the people of our country and then to guess at the other 10 percent based on a computer sampling. That is the issue we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, we need an accurate count of every American. Constitutional principles dictate that we count every American. I am constantly amazed by the wisdom and foresight of our Founding Fathers. The U.S. Constitution, in Article I, section 2, calls for "an actual enumeration" of the people. Not a sample, not a guess.

Further, the 14th Amendment of the Constitution calls for apportionment based on "counting the whole number of persons in each State," not just some of them and not guessing at the others. Each and every one of our constituents needs to be counted.

This "Census Guessing Scheme 2000," as I call it, is not only unconstitutional but it is also inaccurate. According to independent studies from Congress, the proposal has a margin of error of up to 35 percent. We do not need to have an estimate where there are 100 people and it could be 65 or it could be 135. That is not the way it should be done. We will provide the money to count each and every American.

This issue is essential. It goes to the franchise of our citizens. It rises to constitutional dimensions, and it needs to be settled right now. I cannot for the life of me understand why the President of the United States would veto this essential bill on this particular issue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

(Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this

conference report because it has the needed resources that we need in our community. I would also like to thank my friends in the majority for putting this bill together and making this a priority coming out and seeing our area. I represent the city of East Grand Forks and some other communities that have been damaged by this flood and, believe it or not, we have I think more damage to homes and more damage to businesses in our community than they have had in Grand Forks. We are a smaller community, a community of 9,000 people. We do not have the resources of some of the bigger communities, and we really need this legislation to help us put this community back together. We have to move probably 40 percent of this community. We have to rebuild the entire downtown area. We have got a lot of work ahead of us. We very much need this legislation.

One thing that really disturbs me and disturbs the people of our area is that we have got these extraneous items that are attached to this bill. The mayor was here yesterday. They are very frustrated that we are getting partisan political issues added to this bill that have no business being included, they have nothing to do with this bill, and it is really unfortunate that we are in this situation. This bill is going to be vetoed, and we are going to have to go through this process.

The other thing I would say is am really disappointed that we are not going to be here tomorrow and we are not going to be here Monday. We were planning on being here and I think we ought to be here. That way we could have the President veto the bill and we could have this thing shuttle back and forth and we could get it passed.

Every week that we lose is more of a problem for us. We are in a very cold climate. We have a very short window of opportunity to rebuild this community. If we have to wait until Tuesday and we have got more vetoes and more going back and forth, it is going to put us in a bigger problem. I reluctantly support this agreement in its current form and hope that we can get through this process, get to a clean bill and get the money to the people of the area that need it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that we now see Members whose districts have been impacted seriously by the floods being put in the situation of a bill that is now unacceptable because it continues to carry riders.

One of the most egregious riders in this legislation is the one that deals with the issue of roads and public lands, the RS-2477 roads, if you will. Just as the floods destroyed much of the property of the people in the upper Midwest and in California earlier this year, this rider is designed to destroy much of the wilderness and the public

lands in the United States. The reason it is on this legislation is very simple. It could not pass the House of Representatives any other way and it cannot pass the Senate any other way. It may not even be able to get out of a Senate committee. Yet what we find is the sponsors of this measure are the chairs of those committees but they do not want to subject it to public scrutiny. They want to put it on a rider in appropriations that is supposed to speak to the desperate situation of people who have lost their homes, their lives, their property. That ought not to be allowed. This amendment ought not to be allowed. This amendment suggests that if you find any historical trail, any tracings of somebody going across public lands, that somehow that can then be exploited and turned into an improved road. Then of course that improved road is used to say that that land will not qualify for wilderness because it has a road on it. It is a little bit like the young man who killed his mother and father and then pleaded for mercy from the court because he was an orphan. This ought not to be allowed. This should be subjected to hearings in committees. This should be subjected to a full debate in the House of Representatives where it will be overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis rejected. But the senior Senator from Alaska decides that he would rather hold the flood victims hostage. The senior Senator from Alaska has decided rather than have open debate, he would rather stick it into a bill for people in a desperate situation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that the rules prohibit the last statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Is the gentleman making a point of order against the words?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not ask that the gentleman's words be taken down because of the lateness of the day. But I would make a point of order that the gentleman's words were out of order.

□ 1800

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly clear to stand to be corrected, if that is the case, and I guess I need to be reminded again about how we identify who is being talked about if we are talking about somebody in the Senate? What does one say? A Senator?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members not to mention specific Senators in a derogatory manner.

Mr. MILLER of California. Can we get fingerprints on the resolution then, or how do we do this?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would request the opportunity to place in the RECORD an earnest letter from my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], urging the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the population numbers to support sampling to reflect the fact that 300,000 people were missed in Georgia. The letter is dated April 30, 1991.

How times have changed. I feel it is very wrong to legislate on the CR and certainly to change the census law banning sampling on the CR.

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1991.

Hon. ROBERT A. MOSBACHER,
Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR ROBERT: Based on recent press reports, it appears that there has been an undercount of the Georgia population in an amount in excess of 200,000. I respectfully request that the Census numbers for the state of Georgia be readjusted to reflect the accurate population of the state so as to include the over 100,000 which were not previously included.

Needless to say, if the undercount is not corrected, it would have a serious negative impact on Georgia. For example, if the population is adjusted to reflect the 200,000, then Georgia would be entitled to an additional congressional seat. In addition, without the adjustment, minority voting strength in Georgia will be seriously diluted. Based on available information, without an adjustment to compensate for the undercount, minorities in Georgia could lose two State Senate seats and 4-5 House seats. As a result of conversations with black legislators, it is my understanding that they have not only concurred with this request, but stated that they believe it is required under the Voting Rights Act.

In addition to these repercussions, the failure to make an adjustment based upon the admitted undercount would seriously affect federal funding which Georgia receives. In effect, Georgia would be required to utilize funds to provide for an additional 200,000 for which it was not receiving funding.

Based on these factors, I strongly urge you to adjust Georgia's population figures to reflect the correct population. I would appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH.

By including the sampling ban in the disaster relief bill you're effectively dumping on two segments of the population. Those who need flood relief, so they can recover their homes and businesses, and those minorities and poor—who are constantly overlooked by the majority in this House.

The House leadership talks a lot about inclusion. What's worse, the language in this bill prevents the bureau from checking for duplications, or even from making sure enough people are employed to do the door-to-door visits.

This bill even forces the Census Bureau to make mistakes and not tell anyone about it. I want to be clear about this. The 1990 census missed 10 million people. It then overcounted 6 million. It was the most inaccurate, unfair census in history.

Sampling would correct this attack on democracy. We need to let Americans know they can count on us not to count them out.

In fact one House leader talked a little more about inclusion. I have an earnest letter from my colleague, NEWT GINGRICH, urging the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the population numbers to reflect the fact that 300,000 people were missed in Georgia. The letter is dated April 30, 1991. How times change.

Banning sampling from the year 2000 census is a tidy way of making sure millions of Americans, mostly minorities and poor people, are not counted, and therefore have no representation on this floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote no on this supplemental. I voted yes the first time, hoping that it would be fixed in conference frankly. The ravages of rain and flood have victimized hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens. Yet we are holding them hostage, very frankly, holding them hostage so that we can get some special issues addressed and to try to hold the President of the United States in a position of being hostage himself.

That is not what this body ought to do. We should have long before this passed a clean supplemental appropriation for the victims of the floods and to supplement our troops keeping peace in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of our committee who would have tried to do that and who wanted to do that, in my opinion. His leadership was sound, it should have been followed.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support this supplemental.

I rise in opposition to this conference report.

We are simply continuing the delay in getting much-needed aid out to the Midwest. The President has made it clear that he will veto this bill based on provisions that have nothing to do with providing disaster relief to our fellow Americans.

This bill provides more than \$5 billion for victims of disasters in 33 States. I support that funding which could have been approved before the Memorial Day recess, sent to the President, and signed into law.

I voted against the Memorial Day adjournment because I felt we could and should have finished work on a clean supplemental bill.

Instead, about a month after House passage, all we have is a bill that will be vetoed. How many more days, weeks, or months do my Republican friends want these disaster victims to wait?

Ironically, one of the administration's chief concerns is the automatic CR provision. In the name of preventing another Government shutdown next fall, the Republican leadership has sacrificed relief for victims of disasters. By giving the President a bill he cannot sign, we will effectively shut down many Federal disaster relief efforts. If we get about the business of getting our work done, there would be no fear of a shutdown.

The time we have spent dickering over extraneous provisions could have been used getting to the regular appropriations bills.

Holding disaster relief political hostage is not fair and it's not responsible. We ought to pass a clean appropriations measure and we ought to do it today.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I find our failure to reach agreement on the provision of funds for sorely needed public school repairs, and a deserved and overdue pay raise for police officers in the District of Columbia, highly regrettable.

District Subcommittee Chairman TAYLOR's concern and frustration with the pace of reforms in the District and with the District's leadership are not without some justification. However, I would remind my colleagues that these funds were sought by the control board, not the mayor.

Moreover, such concerns, however justified, must not lead us to turn a blind eye to the legitimate and pressing needs of both the District's citizens and those who do their very best, day in and day out, to serve and protect them—and us.

It will be unfortunate indeed if the District's schools are not able to open on time this September because we, who are in a position to preclude that outcome, declined to do so—and purely out of spite.

Mr. Speaker, the District's children, and the courageous Metropolitan police officers who protect the public safety of the District's residents and visitors—using scant resources, and in the face of increasing danger to their own lives—deserve better.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to craft a fiscal year 1998 funding bill which will address responsibly the education and public safety needs of the District.

In the meantime, I hope, for the sake of the victims, that we will soon put politics aside and pass a disaster relief bill the President can sign.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PASCARELL].

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

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical issue. This is a rider based on whim and certainly not science. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences has endorsed sampling as an accurate and effective way of doing the census.

The census spent \$35 million in 1995 in 3 communities in the United States to carry out this sampling. This is not guess, this is not whim, this is science. We have the state-of-the-art. We cannot count heads by counting noses. We have done it in the 1970, 1980 and the 1990 census.

Follow the science like it's always being talked about. We have the facts; let us use it, Mr. Speaker. This is not doing it by whim or guessing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both gentleman have 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding this time to me.

I do not have to tell my colleagues how frustrating this entire process has been for me, and I would add that I believe that the patience of the people in the heartland is wearing very thin, and to the credit of the Committee on Appropriations they have tried under, I think, some very trying circumstances to move this process forward, but we are here today, it has been frustrating. This process has certainly tried my soul.

But the disaster victims cannot wait any longer, and I believe that the credibility of the Congress and the Presidency is at stake if we fail to deliver on the commitment that we have made to the people who are in need.

Now I have been a proponent from the very start of this thing to keep this particular disaster relief bill clean from all the unrelated things that have been attached, but nevertheless the fact is that we are going to be voting on a bill today that includes those provisions, and I would simply ask that as we send this bill to the White House that the White House would not delay disaster assistance any further and not veto the bill over a provision that asks that we count people accurately or over a provision that will keep the government from shutting down. Those are both things that are attached to this bill.

I believe that we cannot afford to wait any longer. In my State, in particular, the construction season is very short. We have very short summers and long winters, and we have to get the work underway. There are things in this bill that are important to the people that I represent as well as to many other people around this country.

We have made a commitment. The Congress, the House and the Senate have approved this legislation. It is time that we deliver and that we get on with it and send it to the President, and I would call on the President as well to sign this bill and to get the disaster assistance out there, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to point out that the gentleman from South Dakota has from the very inception of the floods in his State, in Minnesota, and North Dakota been there along with the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY]. They have been working very, very hard to try to move this bill forward. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON] and others; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] likewise, have all really knocked themselves out to try to move and progress this bill and make sure that it was signed into law by the President so that we could quit dicker-ing with it legislatively.

Through no fault of theirs has this process been prolonged, and I just want to compliment the gentleman from South Dakota as well as the others for their strenuous hard work. They have made their case here. It is up to us to

produce, and I urge the President to sign this bill so it will not go on any longer as well.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, this is an exceedingly important bill for hundreds of thousands of victims of disasters in 35 States. The area I represent has seen \$2 billion in losses and nine people die in the floods of January. We need this bill. But sadly it has become for those people in the affected areas another Government shut-down because we are walking right into the face of an inevitable veto, deferring even longer than is necessary the help that the people who elected us to come here and deal with their basic problems fundamentally need.

My constituents understand a Christmas tree. They understand how in Congress so often we tack on extraneous amendments that really impede our ability to get the job done. In this case there are two giant ornaments, one of which is an attempt, a partisan political attempt, to frustrate the most accurate census we could have, that census which the National Academy of Sciences and judicial experts say is not only constitutional, most accurate.

In addition, they attempt to cut back on the budget agreement in the name of keeping Government open.

This bill needs to go to the President, come right back here to be passed again.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, when the worst flood in 500 years swept through the Northern Plains 2 months ago, it was a natural disaster of historic proportions. Neighborhoods were evacuated, city blocks went up in flames, entire towns were under water. Overcome by these waters, the people called out for help. And how have the Republicans in Congress answered this call for help?

Well, I will tell my colleagues how. They have tried to high-jack this disaster relief legislation, loading it down with unrelated, politically motivated provisions that have nothing to do whatsoever with disaster relief, provisions that would slash student aid, deny veterans medical aid, devastate our national parks, and prevent the Census Bureau from taking an accurate census in the year 2000.

The American people know what an emergency is. They know that an emergency demands help and it demands help immediately. So what is the leadership of the majority doing in response to this flood? They are tinkering with mathematical formulas for the census in the year 2000.

Now what if the Founding Fathers had sent Paul Revere out on his midnight run, but asked him to drag along an iron bathtub, pick up a kitchen sink

on his way to Lexington? Now, sadly, this disaster relief bill, with all of this political baggage, turns this into a legislative pack horse that will not be able to get out of the starting gate. The Republican leadership should send the President a clean disaster relief bill that deals with just that, disaster relief.

This whole process, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of how the Republicans shut down the Government not once, but twice, in an attempt to force their agenda on the American people. That was wrong, and this is wrong.

I urge my colleagues to quit holding flood victims hostage. Exploiting these suffering families for their own political agenda is just plain wrong. Let us get on with the business of a clean bill that we can send to the President and take care of the needs of the American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report.

I want to talk briefly about the census. My subcommittee supervised, and funded the census in 1990, and we are doing the same, of course, for the year 2000 census. We want every American counted, not guessed at, not estimated, not manipulated. Counted. Nothing less than the U.S. Constitution says that every American shall be actually enumerated. It does not say guess, estimate, pontificate, manipulate. It says count, enumerate, and we are following the U.S. Constitution when we say there shall be no sampling.

We have never done sampling in the history of this country. This is a complete new departure. We insist in the House that there not be manipulation of the population count used to make up this body that governs the country. If one does what they want to do, if they want to guess, if they want to manipulate, try it. We will not stand for it because the Constitution says you shall actually enumerate citizens for the purpose of the apportionment of the U.S. House.

That is the way it has been, that is the way it shall be, and that is the way the Founding Fathers said that it should be done. We will not allow sampling. It is unconstitutional.

Lower courts have issued contradictory opinions on whether or not sampling is even possible.

Sampling is not the solution to the problem that we encountered in the 1990 census. The undercount in 1990 was because we had a cumbersome form, we did not market it, we did not send people out to find correct addresses. We had bad address lists. There was ineffective advertising, promotion, outreach and the like. We are correcting that in the census for 2000. We are appropriating nearly \$4 billion to the 2000

census for the purpose of counting Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we want to count everyone in the inner cities, in the rural areas and every part of the country, and that is why we are spending \$4 billion for that very purpose.

Now if we use sampling in the census, we are going to have the courts questioning the result for years to come, and we will have the census thrown out. We will have wasted \$4 billion. More importantly, we will have a defective census and count of citizens that will not gain any confidence anywhere in the country. It is a prescription for chaos, Mr. Speaker. The bill that is before us prohibits sampling in the census and requires that we count every single American because we think every single American is important.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairman yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I currently have the privilege of being the chairman of the subcommittee of appropriations that deals with the disaster relief part of this bill. Throughout my career I have made a very serious effort to attempt to, where I could, eliminate partisan vitriol from subjects that relate to our subcommittee, but specially in the area of disaster relief.

□ 1815

When we recessed not so long ago, I was working in the conference dealing with this major bill. During that conference we had two or three items that were hanging up the bill, so we could not get the work done before that recess. Everybody but everybody knew there was enough money in the FEMA, that is the Federal Emergency Management Agency pipeline, to fund that which we could do in the very short term. There was some discussion of a slimmed-down version to make people feel good, but the facts were there was enough money to cover that 10-day period.

Because of that, I was astonished, while working in my district, to hear the President of the United States using his weekly radio address to suggest that one way or another, the Congress had walked away from those disaster victims. He suggested that they were unconcerned about the people of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Minnesota, and he said, as they go on vacation, ladies and gentlemen, disaster does not know of a vacation.

I was astonished that the President would take that position, when he knew full well, or at least he should have known, that there was money in the pipeline to cover that very short recess.

Now we find ourselves, we found ourselves today considering legislation in which the Republican committees have added \$3.5 billion more than the President requested for disaster relief and put extra money in a housing program to make sure we can solve the problems of moving families from the floodplain way beyond the President's request in these cases, way beyond the President's request. And now we find ourselves with that same President who is talking about our vacation, threatening to veto this very important measure, because of two technicalities really, one having to do with the census in which we suggest at least everybody ought to be counted; and the other end has to do with whether we allow the President to deal with a continuing resolution, shutting down the House or not. He wants to strike the language that would eliminate the shutting down of the House.

I cannot understand why he would want to do that. Nonetheless, on technicalities, he is going to veto this bill and presume that that is not a vacation, presume these people do not have this problem any further.

Mr. President, you should sign this bill if you really care about those people in the disaster areas of this country.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect and affection for my friend from California [Mr. LEWIS], but I come from a rural area, and I know that a lot of folks in this Congress do not understand much about small towns in rural America. In fact, a lot of them do not know the difference between a jersey and a guernsey. But I have to say that, if my colleagues think that there is enough money in the disaster pipeline to deal with the problems of rural areas, my colleagues need to think again.

There is not enough money in the pipeline to help with the crop planting that is essential if farmers are to recover in a number of States in this country. There is not enough money in the pipeline to deal with livestock replenishment, which is crucial to any farmer who has lost his operation or his herd. There is not enough money in the pipeline to deal with the long-term housing problems that each of these mayors have. They need to know how to plan, and they cannot plan if they do not know what this Congress is going to do.

There is enough money in the pipeline to deal with the short-term emergency problems that people have, with the exceptions of some of the agricultural problems I have just laid out, but there is not enough money in the pipeline to enable people to plan for the long-term recovery of these communities. When one is a mayor trying to hold one's city together, every day counts.

What I want to say to my colleagues is simply this: The committee majority

knows that these riders should not be in this bill. The committee majority tried to cooperate. In fact, the chairman of the committee—and I have great respect for him—the chairman of the committee tried to bring a clean bill to this House. But the leadership of his party had other ideas. So now, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], my good friend, is once again being asked to make a good argument for a bad case. He makes a very good argument, but the case is still bad.

I want to suggest that the 80-day delay which has been caused by the insistence of the majority party leadership in adding these three extraneous riders has effectively resulted in a second government shutdown for all of the areas of the country who need this help. There are 35 States who are still waiting for government to work for them, now, in their area on their problems. They are not interested in Washington games or Washington problems. They are interested in the problems of Carolina, of Florida, of California, of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota, and the other areas. That is what they want to see action on.

In my view, the quickest way to end this political nonsense is to vote no on this bill, make the committee go back to work tonight, strip those riders out of this bill so that we can send the President a bill which is respectable, responsible, and can be signed. If we do not do that, this bill is going nowhere. We will all simply be back here next week doing what duty ought to require us to do this week, which is to end the Washington games and get on with helping real people with real things.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This bill provides \$8.9 billion for people who are afflicted by disasters in 35 States, as well as to repay the Defense Department for the money that has been spent in Bosnia and Southwest Asia and elsewhere.

This money is needed. Yes, there are two extraneous provisions. There has been some criticism from the other side of the aisle that those extraneous provisions are in there. But, as recently as 1993 the other side put extraneous provisions on supplemental disaster bills. This is not new. It has always happened. Throughout the history of Congress it has happened. These are important provisions. If the President wants to veto the bill and say to the American people that he does not want to count each and every American in the census, if he wants to say that he does not mind shutting down Government, he will veto this bill. I hope he does not. People need help, and this bill will let them have the opportunity to get that help.

I urge my colleagues, do not get caught up in the political squabbles, do not rationalize this bill to death. Move the bill, vote for the bill, and, Mr. President, sign the bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. I do so reluctantly because it has many important provisions, including badly needed funding for flood relief measures in California and elsewhere across the country. As senior Democrat on the House committee with prime stewardship responsibilities for natural resources, I recognize that the conference report would provide significant assistance for repairs and enhancement of Yosemite National Park facilities and also would help with the restoration of watersheds, road decommissioning, and other flood-related priorities in our national forests.

But what makes this conference report unacceptable are the utterly nongermane legislative riders stuck into this conference report that have absolutely no relationship to the plight of flood victims and the needs to restore flood damage national parks. They will bring down this conference report, and make no mistake, they will delay much-needed, and unanimously supported, relief for the victims of the recent flooding as well as for peacekeeping in Bosnia.

The nongermane rider on RS 2477 road rights-of-way, a matter within jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources, should concern every Member of this House regardless of your position on the issue, because it is an insult to the jurisdiction and the rules of this House.

RS 2477 is a 19th-century statute enacted in the same era of Western giveaways of public resources that also produced the Mining Law of 1872. RS 2477 was repealed by Congress in 1976, so the current debate concerns only rights-of-way which were valid at that time. An amendment narrowly adopted in the other body was intended to overrule the Secretary of the Interior's current policies, leaving it to the States to determine which rights are valid and where roads can be built in national parks and other public lands.

The conferees have adopted an alternative that will establish a commission with members from affected States to determine the fate of these public lands that belong to all the American people. The commission is mandated to recommend changes in Federal law regarding road rights-of-way on Federal lands, ignoring the option that current policy on the Department of the Interior should be maintained and implemented. Should the Secretary of the Interior agree with the commission recommendations, the legislation provides for fast track consideration of legislation implementing the changes, including discharging of committees from consideration of the bill, limitations on amendments, and restrictions on debate time on the House floor.

Let me make a few clear statements on this provision.

First, this legislation is an insult to the House.

This is a big issue for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the other side, and he demanded that this section be inserted into the report. Last year, he brought us the Government shut-down by demanding inclusion in a continuing resolution of a nongermane rider concerning the Tongass Forest in Alaska. Apparently, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations committee intends to use every appropriations bill, CR, and supple-

mental to promote his personal anti-environmental agenda. The House had better think about whether that is the way in which we will allow major environmental issues to be resolved.

Second, we don't need a commission to get this issue before the Congress. All the chairman of the Senate committee needs to do—if this is so important to his State—is to call up his Alaska colleagues who chair the respective authorization committees and demand that they bring such legislation out of the committees through the normal legislative process. Instead, we are subjected to this utter contempt for the regular legislating process.

Third, this provision allows Members of the other body, who surely are neither members of the House Resources committee nor the House Rules Committee, to dictate with no input whatsoever from those committees of jurisdiction the provisions of important national legislation to be considered by the House, as well as the conditions under which that legislation will be considered: who gets to speak, for how long, and what form the resulting bill may take.

With all due respect, any member of either committee who votes to sanctify this process needs to reconsider why he or she is serving on that committee.

We don't mandate fast track for bills affecting health care for children. We don't mandate fast track for bills to assist farmers, or seniors, or students, or taxes. We don't even fast track emergency supplementals. But now, we are told, we must fast track RS 2477, and we have nothing to say about it. Just how much insult is this body prepared to accept?

The reason that we have not considered RS 2477 road right-of-way claims is because Senator STEVENS and others know full well that the House and the Senate would reject this giveaway for many of the same reasons that we have repeatedly voted to stop the giveaway of land claims under the Mining Law of 1872. Because it is a huge ripoff that threatens taxpayers and our public resources.

What is at stake here is a very serious threat to the integrity of our national parks, forests and other public lands throughout the West. In Alaska, Congress has created a world-class system of over 100 million acres of parks and other conservation areas which is riddled with claims to road access by miners with bulldozers, among others. In Utah, local development interests are anxious to use these road claims to prevent Congress from designating new wilderness areas on the public lands, and even illegally bulldoze to assert claims that the products of such activity negate inclusion of the area in future wilderness designations.

Mr. Speaker, the President made a serious error when he agreed to accept the anti-environmental the timber salvage rider on the 1995 Rescissions Act. We all learned a lesson from that experience, and he was right to veto Interior appropriations riders like the plan to increase logging in the Tongass National Forest. He should not be held hostage to this attempt to carry this pave-the-parks rider on the backs of flood victims. And I urge my colleagues to stand up for themselves and for the rights of this House and reject this conference report so that this insulting and inappropriate rider will be removed.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1469, the emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1997.

This conference report will allow for supplemental appropriations which was originally introduced to provide assistance to flood victims. Unfortunately, the pain and suffering of those flood victims was not enough to prevent good old-fashioned partisan Hill politics from corrupting this bill.

There are serious problems with the emergency supplemental appropriations which are so great that the President indicated early in the conference process that if they were included he would veto the bill.

The conference on H.R. 1469 today will only delay the much-needed assistance that the flood victims are waiting on.

Contained in the emergency supplemental appropriation's conference bill is a provision to create an automatic continuing budget resolution if funds have not been appropriated at the close of an agency's fiscal year.

There is an important reason that this Nation's Founding Fathers explicitly established that Congress is accountable for administering the Federal Government. We must remain accountable for tough decisions and not allow ourselves to give into anxiety over how or when we will resolve budgetary matters between the Congress and the administration.

We should not place the Federal Government on automatic pilot with changes like the one suggested in this emergency supplemental funding legislation. There are programs which should be reduced in funding or changes made to meet current or foreseeable future situations.

A major part of the Congress' work deals with the authorization and appropriation of the Federal Government's spending.

Last year, I joined with many of our colleagues to address the problems of the last Congress' budget disagreements. I attempted to avoid the Government shutdowns which occurred by introducing legislation to raise the debt ceiling limit to avoid a Federal Government default of its financial obligations and insulate critical agencies.

I stood with many Members on the issue of the budget crisis and fought to resolve the issue.

I believe that this conference report would complicate the budget process by attempting to meet the Government's obligations without requiring the Congress to do its job.

The reconciliation directives in a budget resolution usually require changes in permanent laws. They instruct each designated committee to make changes in the laws under the committee's jurisdiction that will change the levels of receipts and spending controlled by the laws.

The 435 Members of the House who have the honor of being Members of this body must and should insist on remaining accountable for all of their actions.

The constituents of the 18th Congressional District deserve no less than my best effort to participate actively and enthusiastically in all of the business of the people's House as their elected representative.

We should not give into the anxiety created by our experience of the last Congress. We should work with each other during the budgetary process through our management of this House to do this job well.

With over 200 years of history to support the way we have provided funds to operate the U.S. Government there is no precedent for making this amendment law.

I am further concerned with the supplemental appropriation's legislation by the inclusion of language which would effectively and permanently bar the use of statistical sampling for the 2000 Census and beyond.

The subject of the Census was so serious that it was addressed in article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States. It explicitly states that, "The actual Enumeration shall be made within three years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of Ten Years." The proposed change to the 2000 Census and beyond would require large increases in funding to attempt to physically count every resident of the United States, which would be a tremendous waste of taxpayer dollars.

Three separate panels convened by the National Academy of Sciences have recommended that the Census Bureau use sampling in the 2000 census to save money and improve census accuracy. The conclusions of this unbiased professional group of scientists should be respected by allowing the version of the conference bill to reflect their conclusion regarding statistical sampling.

The ability to take samples during the 2000 census will insure that any undercounting which may occur in this census because of sparsely populated regions of our State and the dense populations of our cities, can be held to a minimum. Undercounting the results of the 2000 census would negatively impact Texas's share of Federal funds for block grants, housing, education, health, transportation and numerous other federally funded programs. The census, as you know, is also used in projections and planning decisions made by every State, all counties within those States and their city governments.

I would like to ask that my colleagues join in opposition of this conference report.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1469, the Disaster Recovery Act of 1997. The disastrous floods of January 1997 had an enormous impact on my congressional district in California and the effects of the flooding will be with us for years to come.

The scenes last month of the Red River flooding in North Dakota and South Dakota are very familiar to my constituents. The flooded homes, the damaged businesses, and the destroyed crops are what people in my district will remember of this winter's floods. What they will also remember is the tremendous outpouring of help from their neighbors and friends. The community response to the flood disasters was truly overwhelming.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank those men and women in the various agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments that worked tirelessly to ensure that all residents were protected from harms way. I am certain that my fellow northern California colleagues will agree with me when I say they did an extraordinary job considering what they were up against. I know that my constituents will be forever grateful.

I think it is very important to note that, just as bad as the Red River flood damage was, my district was equally crippled by the floods. My constituents have an incredible challenge ahead of them to rebuild and recover from the damage. Damages from the California floods are expected to exceed \$1.6 billion. In my district alone, San Joaquin County endured an estimated \$59 million in damages to homes, over \$12.5 million to businesses, \$13 million to agriculture, and \$14.7 million to infrastructure. Of the area I represent in Sacramento County, the damages to agriculture have not yet been determined, but it is estimated that there is over \$1 million in damages to homes.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues just one of the very important issues that have arisen from the California floods this winter. This issue concerns the Cosumnes River in the northern part of my district, which lies in Sacramento County. The levees along the Cosumnes suffered catastrophic failure resulting from this year's California floods. More than 30 levee failures allowed river waters to flood homes and destroy fertile farmlands along the Cosumnes. H.R. 1469 provides assistance to local officials in my district for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, and replacement of the levees along the Cosumnes River.

I would like to reinforce that the figures listed above are purely estimates and more than likely will increase as floodwaters subside. However, we all need to recognize that the flooding in northern California is not necessarily over. More flooding is expected in the near future when the Sierra Nevada snowpack begins to melt. Since final estimates of damage caused by the floods have not been determined in all cases, I believe Congress must be vigilant in its efforts to ensure that additional emergency funding requests are met if they become necessary.

It is my hope that I do not have to return to the House floor next year and speak on this subject again because my district is underwater. However, I feel that without common sense policy towards flood control systems to prevent future flood calamities, we will continue to live with the fear of future flooding.

It is unfortunate that flooding has become a way of life for many communities throughout the United States. As my constituents in the 11th Congressional District of California can attest to, flooding at any level can be devastating. It is essential that this Congress pass H.R. 1469, which provides much needed assistance for urgent levee repair programs as well as other Federal natural disaster emergency programs.

In the interest of protecting the lives and property of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1469 to assist in resolving these problems caused by the California floods.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are finally considering the conference report to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Our Nation has faced an unusual array of natural disasters recently and the bulk of the money in this bill is earmarked for recovery efforts. It is my hope that the President will sign this legislation so that Americans impacted by these disasters can continue the process of rebuilding their lives.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of a provision in the conference report that extends the San Carlos Apache Tribe Water Rights Settlement

Act of 1992, I want to clarify one aspect of the settlement agreement. Section 6003 of the conference report to H.R. 1469 contains a section allowing the United States, and subsequently, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, to take over the operation of the Black River Pump Station from Phelps Dodge Corp. This section also provides for the lease of 14,000 acre feet per year of the tribe's Central Arizona Project [CAP] water to Phelps Dodge Corp. for a term of up to 50 years, with a right of renewal based upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior.

The language is clear, understandable, and supported by Department of Interior officials, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, and Phelps Dodge Corp. But to avoid any confusion regarding the intent of the provision, I want to further clarify the language relating to the \$5 million lease payment which Phelps Dodge is required to make to the tribe at the beginning of the initial lease term. This sum constitutes a one-time prepayment for the first 4166 acre feet of water which will be delivered in each year during the 50 year term of the lease. In effect, Phelps Dodge Corp. will be paying the tribe in advance for the delivery of 208,300 acre feet of CAP water, that will be delivered under the lease at the rate of 4166 acre feet per year over the 50 year initial lease period. The remaining water to be delivered each year under the lease will be paid for by Phelps Dodge Corp. as provided in the legislation.

Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity to clarify this provision.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the inclusion of provisions in this conference report to require the Census Bureau to conduct, as the Constitution says, an "actual enumeration" rather than using the statistical technique known as sampling. Following the 1990 census we had a debate over whether to use the number resulting from the actual enumeration or a number adjusted by sampling. This time the bureau does not even intend to try to count everyone. As I understand it, the plan is to try to count 90 percent of the people and estimate the rest.

I oppose the use of sampling for several reasons. It would leave the census numbers open to political manipulation and would tend to undermine the public's confidence in the census. We have seen various administrations manipulate the FBI, IRS, and reportedly even the Immigration and Naturalization Service for political gain. Once we move away from a hard count what guarantee do we have that this or a future administration will not manipulate the census numbers for partisan gains?

A member of the other body has recently stated that we should all support sampling since we all rely on something similar, public opinion polls, to get elected. The problem with this thinking is that we may use polls to guide us but we don't let them determine the winner. I would have no objection if the bureau uses sampling to determine where there may have been an undercount, and then goes back in and redoubles its efforts to count those people. That would be analogous to the way we use opinion polls. But to rely on sampling rather than a physical count is comparable to changing election returns if they are at variance with the polls.

Sampling is said to adjust for undercounts in major cities. But once you estimate how many people are in a given city, to what wards, neighborhoods and precincts do they belong?

How can State legislatures and school boards and city councils be apportioned if we don't know where these estimated people live? Is sampling really accurate enough to tell us if some small town has 3,300 people instead of the 3,000 from a hard count? When a State, such as Wisconsin, has hundreds of towns of such size, will sampling adjust for an undercount there the way it might in Los Angeles or some other major city? In 1990 an entire ward in one town in my district was missed. The community leaders pointed this out during the postcensus review and the mistake was corrected. For 2000 the bureau will not do a postcensus review, presumably because no one can know what mistakes were made since everyone wasn't supposed to be counted anyway.

Will the undercount of Indian reservations, of which there are several in Wisconsin, be corrected? My understanding is that the bureau plans to do a hard count on Indian reservations. Yet native Americans were among the most undercounted in the last census. How then can it be claimed that the reason the bureau wants to use sampling is to correct for past undercounts?

I do believe that it is appropriate to bring this issue up in an appropriations bill as the main argument of those supporting sampling is that it will save money. Well that may or may not be true but that can't be the only basis for designing the census. The cheapest possible census would be if the numbers were just made up altogether. We obviously aren't going to do that but the point is that saving money is not the one and only goal. Fairness is a goal and sampling is unfair to smaller communities and rural States. Following the Constitution, which calls for an actual enumeration, is a goal and the Supreme Court has never ruled on the issue.

What happens if we complete the 2000 census using sampling to estimate 10 percent of the population and then the Supreme Court throws it out? Then we will have wasted the \$4 billion spent on the original census not to mention who knows how much in litigation. Rather than saving money, sampling could end up costing the taxpayers two or three times as much money as a hard count if we have to redo the whole thing.

I believe a greater effort should be made to reach all Americans to provide an accurate hard count. 50 percent of the undercount from the last census was caused by people never receiving the forms. Better mailing lists and better coordination with the Post Office and local governments can correct this problem. Approximately 32 percent of the undercount can be corrected through the use of easier to read forms and perhaps an 800 information number. The rest will have to be reached through better outreach. Instead the bureau plans to spend less money on outreach, figuring that sampling can make up the difference.

I don't believe the bureau's plan will provide for the fairest and most accurate census.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, however, about rescissions of trust fund moneys and additional transportation spending that is included in this bill and is unrelated to disaster relief.

The bill rescinds almost \$1.6 billion in contract authority, including nearly \$900 million from the transit program.

These rescissions were included in the House bill and were stricken by the Transpor-

tation Committee on a point of order. Yet this bill adds them back in.

The spending provided for highways by the Senate goes beyond correcting any error and directs funding to specific States. This is unnecessary and I am opposed to this type of extraneous provisions in a disaster supplemental bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this supplemental emergency assistance measure. I very much regret that the substance of this proposal has superimposed issues on the emergency response provisions included in the bill. This is being used as a way of avoiding full debate and attempting to force the President to accept such policy and law that he and others oppose.

The emergency funding in this measure is very much needed in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and the other States affected by flooding and natural disasters this spring. I supported the House-passed measure and helped improve that measure when we initially considered this matter 3 weeks ago, with the expectation that in counsel with the Senate and administration the differences concerning the controversial unrelated riders could be resolved.

I was very disappointed that the House didn't conclude its work on this emergency measure prior to the Memorial Day congressional recess, and now after nearly 2 weeks of delay, the end product before the House, and to be sent to the President not only doesn't resolve the matter of the controversial riders and changes in law, but increases the total number of problems and exceptions.

Our GOP colleagues in the past Congress shut down the Government in an attempt to enact into law massive cuts in health care, education and the environment—a GOP retreat from basic programs that form the foundation of trust and the tools that the American families need to care for themselves and one another. And the GOP Congress in the last session proposed a massive tax break giveaways which would have made deficit reduction and the goal of balancing the budget a mirage.

When the Government was shut down for months, based on the GOP refusal to back down from these radical positions and wild proposals, the American people rightly rejected the GOP tactics just as they rejected the policies on their merits. The fight to add antishutdown language to this bill is an effort to rewrite history and in the bargain to try and gain an advantage for GOP spending priorities. The American people need neither revisionist history or a rearrangement of the congressional powers regarding the power of the purse. Congress should accept its responsibility with the constitutional and legal framework to pass the annual spending measures and work out differences with the President in time to avoid government shutdowns.

The GOP census rider is a blatant attempt to attack the technical and scientific means of counting our population every decade for a Republican partisan advantage—it is unfair, unworkable, and unacceptable.

The new GOP rider from the Senate in this conference report undercuts the Federal Government's role to manage public lands in the 17 Western States and would slice and dice the Federal lands, parks, and wilderness into pieces and in the end cost billions of taxpayer dollars to buy back that which the American

people already own. This legislative blackmail under the guise of "rights of way access" and a newly minted Commission is just one more in a series of ongoing efforts to deny the American people their natural heritage of landscapes and public domain. This Civil War era policy made little sense in 1866 and makes no sense in 1997.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the much-needed help for natural disasters and Bosnia peacekeeping, we must not permit this pattern of policymaking to become successful. Vote "no," and if this passes, the President will veto it. Hopefully, we will uphold such a veto and then enact a measure which will not include these controversial provisions in a timely manner.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to oppose the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act conference report. Although this bill will provide needed relief for disaster victims—which I support—for the victims of this bill, it will be a disaster. This is not a clean bill—this is not a good bill.

This bill is loaded down with extraneous items that have no place in this measure. One item is an antienvironmental rider which diminishes the quality of our public natural resources.

However, the most disturbing item is the prohibition of statistical sampling in the census. This language, inserted by the conferees, was not agreed to by the full House. This is a blatant attempt to legislate through an appropriations bill.

As a representative of California's 37th Congressional District, I am particularly opposed to any language that would impair the Census Bureau's ability to make an accurate count of the U.S. population. Too many Americans were left out of the count during the last census. Ten million Americans were not counted and 6 million were counted twice—which distorted our attempts to ensure equal representation for all Americans. In 1990, 800,000 people were undercounted in California. California represented 20 percent of the 1990 undercount.

This undercount was not uniform across the population. The undercount between the African-American population and the non-African-American population rose dramatically to reach the highest level since 1940. In 1990, the census was six times more likely to leave out an African-American than a non-Hispanic white American. The 1990 census left out Hispanic-Americans at a rate of seven times the undercount for non-Hispanic white Americans.

The Census Bureau is developing a design for the 2000 census that corrects past mistakes and makes the upcoming census the most accurate in our history—and sampling is one tool that will help. An accurate count of the population is required to apportion congressional seats. An accurate count brings fairness to the distribution of billions of dollars in funding and planning decisions such as school and highway construction.

We can't afford to leave Americans out of the census. This bill is, in fact, muddier than the flood waters it purports to clean up. I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully must oppose this spending legislation, which commits taxpayers to foot the bill for dozens of special-interest items having nothing to do with disaster relief.

First, the House-Senate compromise bill costs \$200 million more than the House bill.

Second, it includes \$262.2 million in non-emergency spending, an increase of \$150.4 million over the House passed version.

Third, it includes such nonemergency items as: \$35 million for the Advanced Technology Program of the National Institute for Standards and Technology under the Commerce Department; \$2 million for the Commission on the Advancement of Law Enforcement; \$3 million for Ogden, UT, in anticipation of the 2002 Winter Olympics; \$650,000 for the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education; \$101 million in education grants; \$33.5 million for Botanic Garden Conservatory in DC; \$15 million for health research; \$1.9 million for the Denver Summit of the G-8, June 20-22, 1997; \$16 million to the Customs Service for the Automated Targeting System; \$5.383 million to the U.S. Postal Service to subsidize free and reduced rate mail; \$12.3 million for a multistory parking lot in a Cleveland, OH, Veterans' Administration facility; \$1 million "special purpose grant" of which \$500,000 goes to a parking lot and \$500,000 for renovation of the Paramount Theater in Ashland, KY; and \$30.2 million for HUD Demonstration Act purposes.

This is supposed to be an emergency measure to help flood and disaster victims. The inclusion of such expenditures indicates it is not. In the exercise of fiscal prudence, I must therefore vote "no".

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. This important legislation is key to the long-term rehabilitation of communities devastated by natural disasters across this great country. It is also essential to ensure our continued military preparedness through the replenishment of critical defense accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Water Development chapter of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill represents the dedicated efforts of Members from both sides of the aisle and from both sides of the Hill to deliver needed assistance to those areas of our country which have suffered the crippling effects of uncontrolled floods. From the Pacific Northwest to the Ohio Valley, from the Deep South to the Great Plains, floodwaters have been especially furious during the past year. We have all been deeply touched by the heart-wrenching images of dislocated families, destroyed homes, and inundated cities. Recognizing the emergency nature of these consequences, the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development have acted expeditiously, responsibly, and in good faith to help flood victims get back on their feet.

The conference agreement includes \$585 million for the Corps of Engineers and \$7.4 million for the Bureau of Reclamation to address flood related needs. These desperately needed funds will support the rehabilitation of levees, the repair of Federal flood control

works, and the performance of emergency dredging. These public works are more than mere infrastructure; they represent a foundation for the continued vitality, protection, and economic viability of the towns, villages, and cities that constitute a free and strong America.

In order to help pay for emergency disaster assistance, the conference agreement includes a rescission of \$11.2 million from the Energy Supply, Research and Development account of the Department of Energy. Another rescission of \$11.3 million from the Western Area Power Administration will also help offset the costs of this supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and thank the members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for their dedicated efforts in producing this critical legislation. I am especially appreciative of the efforts of the ranking minority Member, the Honorable Vic Fazio. His cooperation and hard work have been indispensable, and I look forward to continuing our bipartisan working relationship as we move on to the consideration of the regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the conference report.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in firm opposition to a ban in the fiscal year 1997 Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report that disallows the use of statistical sampling in the 200 census. We must not dictate to the experts in the U.S. Census Bureau how they are to conduct this most important, Constitution mandated count of our population. Furthermore, this ban would ignore the need to restore accuracy to the census by accounting for groups grossly undercounted in the last decennial census—minorities and low-income individuals.

The bill language states, "the proposed use of statistical sampling by the Bureau of the Census exposes taxpayers to the unacceptable risk of an inaccurate, invalid, and unconstitutional census." Rather, a ban on the use of sampling poses this unacceptable risk and increases the cost to taxpayers for the 2000 census.

All evidence reviewed from the 1990 census clearly demonstrates the inaccuracy of a persistent undercount. The Census Bureau acknowledges that this last decennial count failed to include more than 4 million residents—the highest undercount ever recorded. These included a disproportionate number of racial and ethnic minorities in this country. Hundreds of thousands of Asian-Pacific-Americans were not counted by census, at an estimated rate of 2.3 percent. For Hispanics this rate was 5.0 percent and for African-Americans, 4.4 percent. It is inexcusable that these rates were two times, five times and four times greater than the undercount for white Americans. Inaccuracy to this degree itself is an invalidation.

As to the claim of unconstitutionality, a letter of May 8, 1997, from Census Bureau Director D. Martha Farnsworth Riche to Speaker GINGRICH recapped three options from the U.S. De-

partment of Justice under the Carter, Bush, and Clinton administrations: "All three opinions concluded that the Constitution and relevant statutes permit the use of sampling in the decennial census. Every federal court that has addressed the issue had held that the Constitution and federal statutes allow sampling." The clear constitutionality of the use of census sampling has been stated repeatedly, in a nonpartisan manner.

Sampling opponents further claim that this new methodology would only be to the benefit of large cities. A recent dear colleague from a supporter of the ban stated "If a smaller town in undercounted, chances are we would never even know about it much less be able to adjust the census." This situation existed under previously used methods. However, under new sampling methods, the Census Bureau would in 2000 adjust for the undercount to the census block level in every single poor and rural community, rural and urban, for greater accuracy and fairness. The sampling plan would also:

Complete the count of those who do not mail back their form or phone in the answers—only 65 percent of households mailed back the census form;

Include those people missed in the census—about 10 million in 1990—and remove duplications—about 6 million in 1990; and

To collect information from a sample of the population for poverty, highway, and housing programs.

Sampling is necessary because it would:

Save approximately \$500 million in taxpayer dollars, rather than spend more money for a census that is less accurate;

Locate those people traditionally missed and take out those counted twice; and

Allow the census to provide correct numbers for the distribution of Federal funds.

By the words of the Commerce Department's Inspector General, in a recent report to the Senate, the use of sampling to measure and correct the undercount is the "only proven method to correct the greatest obstacle to an accurate count." The General Accounting Office supports this recommendation as well.

Three separate panels convened by the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] recommended the use of sampling in the 2000 census for improved accuracy and savings, instead of greater cost, "Simply providing additional funds to enable the Census Bureau to carry out the 2000 census using traditional methods, as it has in previous censuses, will not lead to improved data coverage or data quality." We must not ignore the counsel from these scientific, statistical experts.

We are here today to say that everyone counts—whether you are a person of color, poor or elderly, whether you are a recent immigrant or a citizen, whether you live in an urban or rural area. The charge of the Census Bureau is to make an accurate count of all those within our borders.

The simple fact is that in a country as immense and diverse as ours, we should use the most advanced methodologies to assure an accurate census count of all our population, even those that are hard to reach. Not because we want a certain political party to

gain seats in the Congress. Not because we want to favor urban areas over rural areas, but because we want a fair and accurate enumeration of our population.

Too many times in our history it has been the person of color and the poor that have gone uncounted. If we do not allow sampling in the 2000 census history tells us that we will once again make many of these individuals invisible, like they simply do not exist.

This attack on utilizing a scientifically proven method of enumeration is an attack on the people of color in this country. It is another example of the Republican effort to downgrade, to diminish the voice of minorities in this country. We cannot allow this to happen.

This is not simply a technical issue of concern only to statisticians. The accurate count of our population has enormous consequences from the apportionment of our elected offices to the allocation of Federal and State funds. And if people of color and the poor are not accurately accounted for their voice in our Government and our communities is weakened.

For the sake of an accurate and fair census, we must reject any legislation to limit the use of sampling in the 2000 census. We must ensure that everyone counts. I urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious language in the fiscal year 1997 supplemental appropriations bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 201, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Capps	Foley
Army	Chabot	Forbes
Bachus	Chambliss	Fowler
Baesler	Chenoweth	Fox
Baker	Christensen	Franks (NJ)
Ballenger	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Barcia	Combest	Gallegly
Barr	Condit	Ganske
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Gekas
Bartlett	Cooksey	Gibbons
Barton	Crane	Gilchrest
Bateman	Crapo	Gillmor
Bereuter	Cubin	Gilman
Berry	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bilbray	Danner	Goodling
Bilirakis	Davis (VA)	Gordon
Bliley	DeLay	Goss
Blunt	Dickey	Graham
Boehrlert	Dingell	Granger
Boehner	Dolittle	Greenwood
Bonilla	Dreier	Gutknecht
Bono	Duncan	Hall (TX)
Brady	Dunn	Hamilton
Bryant	Ehlers	Hansen
Bunning	Ehrlich	Hastert
Burton	Emerson	Hastings (WA)
Buyer	English	Hayworth
Callahan	Ensign	Herger
Calvert	Everett	Hill
Camp	Ewing	Hilleary
Canady	Fawell	Hobson
Cannon	Fazio	Hooley

Horn	Minge	Shaw
Hostettler	Molinari	Shimkus
Houghton	Moran (KS)	Shuster
Hunter	Morella	Skeen
Hutchinson	Myrick	Skelton
Hyde	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)
Istook	Ney	Smith (OR)
Jenkins	Northup	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Nussle	Smith, Linda
Johnson, Sam	Ortiz	Snowbarger
Kasich	Oxley	Solomon
Kelly	Packard	Souder
Kim	Pappas	Spence
King (NY)	Parker	Strickland
Klecza	Paxon	Stump
Knollenberg	Pease	Sununu
Kolbe	Peterson (MN)	Talent
LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Tanner
Latham	Petri	Tauscher
LaTourette	Pitts	Tauzin
Lazio	Pombo	Taylor (MS)
Leach	Pomeroy	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Portman	Thornberry
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Thune
Livingston	Quinn	Tiahrt
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Trafigant
Lucas	Rahall	Walsh
Luther	Ramstad	Wamp
Manzullo	Redmond	Watkins
Matsui	Regula	Watts (OK)
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Weldon (FL)
McCollum	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
McCrery	Riley	Weller
McDade	Roemer	White
McHale	Rogan	Whitfield
McHugh	Rogers	Wicker
McIntosh	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
McIntyre	Royce	Young (AK)
McKeon	Ryun	Young (FL)
Meek	Saxton	
Metcalf	Sessions	

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Etheridge	Lofgren
Ackerman	Evans	Lowey
Allen	Fattah	Maloney (CT)
Baldacci	Filner	Maloney (NY)
Barrett (WI)	Flake	Manton
Bass	Foglietta	Markey
Becerra	Ford	Martinez
Bentsen	Frank (MA)	Mascara
Berman	Frost	McCarthy (MO)
Bishop	Furse	McDermott
Blagojevich	Gejdenson	McGovern
Blumenauer	Gephardt	McInnis
Bonior	Gonzalez	McNulty
Borski	Green	Meehan
Boswell	Gutierrez	Menendez
Boucher	Hall (OH)	Mica
Boyd	Harman	Millender-
Brown (CA)	Hastings (FL)	McDonald
Brown (FL)	Hefley	Miller (CA)
Brown (OH)	Hefner	Miller (FL)
Burr	Hilliard	Mink
Campbell	Hinchee	Moakley
Cardin	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Carson	Hoekstra	Moran (VA)
Castle	Holden	Murtha
Clay	Hoyer	Nadler
Clayton	Hulshof	Neal
Clement	Inglis	Neumann
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Norwood
Coburn	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Collins	(TX)	Obey
Conyers	John	Olver
Costello	Johnson (WI)	Owens
Cox	Johnson, E.B.	Pallone
Coyne	Jones	Pascrell
Cramer	Kanjorski	Pastor
Cummings	Kaptur	Paul
Davis (FL)	Kennedy (MA)	Payne
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Deal	Kennelly	Pickert
DeFazio	Kildee	Poshard
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Delahunt	Kind (WI)	Rangel
DeLauro	Kingston	Rivers
Dellums	Klink	Rodriguez
Dicks	Klug	Rohrabacher
Dixon	Kucinich	Rothman
Doggett	LaFalce	Roukema
Dooley	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Doyle	Largent	Rush
Edwards	Levin	Sabo
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Salmon
Eshoo	Lipinski	Sanchez

Sanders	Slaughter	Towns
Sandlin	Smith (MI)	Upton
Sanford	Smith, Adam	Velazquez
Sawyer	Snyder	Vento
Scarborough	Spratt	Visclosky
Schaefer, Dan	Stabenow	Waters
Schaffer, Bob	Stark	Watt (NC)
Scott	Stearns	Waxman
Sensenbrenner	Stenholm	Wexler
Serrano	Stokes	Weygand
Shadegg	Stupak	Wise
Shays	Thompson	Woolsey
Sherman	Thurman	Wynn
Sisisky	Tierney	Yates
Skaggs	Torres	

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews	Goode	Schiff
Archer	Jefferson	Schumer
Deutsch	Lantos	Turner
Diaz-Balart	McKinney	
Farr	Pickering	

□ 1841

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Goode for, with Mr. Turner against.

Messrs. MORAN of Virginia, BROWN of Ohio, and INGLIS of South Carolina changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. TAUSCHER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 169, the Conference Report for H.R. 1469, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to return to Washington, DC, today due to a death in my family and missed the following votes:

Rollcall vote No. 165, passage of the rule on House Resolution 160. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 166, on agreeing to the Conference Report House Concurrent Resolution 84, the FY 1998 Budget Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 167, the Campbell Amendment (No. 52) to the Smith Amendment (No. 41) on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. Had I been present, I would voted "nay."

Rollcall vote No. 168, the Smith Amendment (No. 41) to H.R. 1757, to prohibit U.S. population assistance for foreign organizations that perform abortions in foreign countries, or lobby for changes in such laws. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall vote No. 169, on agreeing to the Conference Report H.R. 1469, the Disaster Recovery Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-94)

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COMBEST] 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:

As required by section 204 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(c)) and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1641(c)), I transmit herewith a 6-month report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994, in response to the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons ("weapons of mass destruction") and of the means of delivering such weapons.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 5, 1997.

□ 1845

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING PAGES

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as chairman of the House Page Board to pay tribute to our departing pages. I know I speak on behalf of all of my House colleagues when I say thanks for a job well done. You, the pages, have had a unique and historic experience and one which we hope will serve you well as you continue your education and begin your careers.

So much of what we do in Congress is done for the next generation, for you, our pages, who are here in the back of the room today are the next generation. You can be proud that what we have done in this Congress has not only been done for you but with you. Like each Member of Congress, you are now a part of this institution, and as of Friday you will be a part of its history. Some of you may even be part of its future, returning some day as staff members or even Representatives yourselves like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], or our late colleague, Representative Emerson, the former chairman of the Page Board.

We know that whatever path you choose in life, it will have been enriched by your experience here in the United States House of Representatives. As you prepare to graduate on Friday, we want you to know that this entire House is grateful for your serv-

ice to us and to our country. We wish you all well.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I will include for the Congressional RECORD the names of the pages that we salute today:

Joshua Abrons, Clinton Bonelli, Joshua Booth, Justin Boyson, Elizabeth Bracken, Brett Bruen, William Carr, Marny Cavanaugh, Holli Cavender, Amanda Charters, Kari Charters, Virginia Cloutier, Sara Cobb, Katie Dewberry, Kathryn Eddy, Ryan Edmunds, Jami Feinberg, Ashley Fellers, Lisi Fernandez, Elizabeth Frank, Stephanie Freund.

Wayne Green, Page Griffin, Ryan Hemker, Antonia Henry, Kim Holcomb, Edward Holman, Peter Janelle, Christina King, Todd Koehler, Mary Konitzer, Matt Kummernuss, Sam Langholz, Sarah Lash, Melissa Leuck, Mary Elizabeth Madden, Jennifer Madjarov, Kevin Marlow, Kevin McCumber, Eric Nesbitt, Erik Newton.

Philip Nielsen, Luke Peterson, Melissa Poe, Aaron Polkey, Sabrina Porcelli, Jenifer Scott, Mary Megan Siedlarczyk, Lizzie Smart, Brandon Snesko, Howard Snowdon, Paul Soderberg, Katie Sylvis, Megan Taormino, Erin Tario, Maria Toler, Tyson Vivyan, Pete Voss, Angela Williams, Timothy Willimason, Sarah Wilson.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of minority leader GEPHARDT and minority whip BONIOR and the chairman of our Caucus, the gentleman from California, Mr. FAZIO, all of the leadership and all of the Members on this side of the aisle, I am very pleased to join the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida in congratulating our pages.

Mr. Speaker, the pages represent, as the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] said, the future. I have risen before on this floor and talked about the page program. I was privileged to be President of the Maryland Senate, and one of the duties of the President of the Maryland Senate was to recruit high school students for the page program.

I would tell, Mr. Speaker, the young people, if I could address them directly, consistent with the rules, I would tell them that this experience will affect you for all of your lives. You will be better citizens. You have had an experience that few citizens in our Nation have. You have been on this floor and seen democracy in action. You have seen how conscientious the Members of this House are.

Too many Americans, I say, Mr. Speaker, if I could directly to the pages, too many Americans do not have a full understanding of how hard Members work. How conscientious they are and how much they care about doing the right thing for their country, irrespective of whether they are conservatives or liberals, moderates, Republicans, Democrats or Independents. You have learned that firsthand. So you will have something that millions and millions of your neighbors and friends and relatives will not have had: firsthand experience, how the greatest

democratic institution in the world works.

And you will have the opportunity to go back and tell our fellow citizens, too many of whom tend to be cynical, that the system works and that they need to participate, not necessarily run for Congress, maybe some of you will do that, but to participate by voting, by speaking out, by writing, communicating, by involving themselves in the democratic process.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to join the very distinguished gentlewoman from Florida as a former member of the Page Board, never a page but an intern to a Member here, so like you, having had an early experience, I say to our young people, go back to your communities, go back to your schools, go back to your States and help teach democracy. Make our country better. We will be the better for it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona, former member of the Page Board.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. I thank her for taking this time for those who serve here to take a moment out of our day at the end of this week and at the end of a year of experience for our pages to thank them. Normally we stand in the well of this House here and we address our colleagues who are out here in front of us. But this evening we stand here and address the pages who stand behind the rail over there and have served us so well and, I might add, the pages who sit behind me over here at the documentarian's table.

To all of these pages, let me say that we thank you. We thank you for the service that you have given, we thank you for the confidence that you give us in the future of our country.

I began, as I think most of the pages know, I began my own service in public service, my own service in Government nearly 40 years ago when I came here as a page. In those days the program was quite different and I came as a sophomore in high school and stayed through my senior year.

I know from that experience what a difference it has made in my life, how it has fundamentally changed my own life. When I think back on the class of 1960, two of whom in addition to myself have served this House so ably, Donn Anderson, the Clerk of the House, Ron Lasch, who is the Republican floor assistant over on our side. And I think of the others who have not chosen to participate in the Congress of the United States but participate in their own communities and participate in our public life in other ways.

So what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] said is so very true, that no matter where you go, no matter what career, no matter what profession you follow, no matter where life takes you, this experience will always

be a profoundly important one for you. I cannot make any other prediction for you, but I can guarantee you that, 40 years from now, you will look back on this experience and say that it has been an extraordinarily important one for you.

There are many people who have said that the page program is unnecessary, that it is too difficult, that we really ought to change it, that we ought to not have high school students, that we ought to have regular employees doing the work. We have resisted that through the years. I think there has been strong support in this House of Representatives to keep the page program as it is for young men and women who come to us from all over the country, from all walks of life, all communities, from every kind of ethnic and economic background because of what they represent and because of what they stand for as the future of our country and for the hope that they give us and the message that they take back to their communities. So you are a part.

The gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER] has said, now, of the history of this House of Representatives and your service is not forgotten. We have a lot of people who make the flow and the work in this House go well. It takes a lot of people for an organization this big to carry on its daily activities. It may seem to you sometimes that your work has not been that important, but collectively and together it is a vital cog of the machinery of the House of Representatives that makes this place function smoothly, not always so smoothly but usually smoothly, to function smoothly and to function well.

I think that each and every one of us has enjoyed the opportunity over the course of this last year or, for some of you, the last 5 months to get to know you, to get to understand your hopes and your dreams, your aspirations. Through you we also understand just a little bit better about the young people of America, about the hopes for our country and for ourselves. So we thank you for the service that you have given us and we thank you even more for what you represent for this country.

Speaking personally, I want to say I wish you all very well. I know that you are going to go back to your schools and your communities and I predict each and every one of you is going to be a great and wonderful success with your life. We hope we have contributed to a little bit of your understanding and we hope that when you go home to your schools next year, to your communities this summer, and you hear somebody say about how bad government is and they express the cynicism that I know you have heard before and we will all hear again, that you will say, stand up and say, but there are a lot of good people that are involved and there are a lot of people that work hard, a lot of people that care. And this is what the process is all about and

this is what democracy, this is what liberty, this is what our freedoms are all about. You are a part of that and we thank you for that service. Godspeed.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, another member of the Page Board.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

The very first vote I cast in the House of Representatives in January 1977 was to cast my vote to elect Tip O'Neill Speaker of the House. And the best assignment that Tip O'Neill gave to me many, many years ago was to serve on the Page Board. It has been a very enjoyable assignment. It has been an assignment where my hope for the future has been sustained every year as class after class of pages have come through.

Let me say this from the bottom of my heart. No class, no group of pages has surpassed or been better than this class this year. Indeed, you made the chairman, myself as ranking member, our job very, very easy this year. You have been extraordinarily good. There is a program in America, a very good program for young people called Close Up, and it is a great program. And I always meet with my Close Up students. Some of you may have participated in that at one time. But no group of young people see the Congress and the Government as close up as you. You have seen history. You have seen us at our best, and sometimes perhaps you have seen us at our worst. But you have seen Government. I think that you leave here not with cynicism but with hope and trust in the Government.

When I was about your age, Franklin D. Roosevelt was President of the United States. He spoke these words many, many years ago, but I think they are as applicable today, perhaps even more so, than when he spoke them. He said there is a strange cycle in human events; to some generations much is given, of other generations, much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

□ 1900

Meeting you, the pages, this year, I am very confident that all of you can meet the challenges of that rendezvous, and I ask that God bless you.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say, as my colleagues, to all of the pages who will be leaving this evening, thank you very much for a job well done. I guess tomorrow night is the time. But thank you very much for a job well done.

This has been an outstanding class. Many of you know that I served 4 years as a page in Congress from 1963 to 1967. Some of the defining moments in my

life were based on that time period: The day President Kennedy was shot, the vote on the test ban treaty, the debates over civil rights.

Paging has changed since that time. It is a much more select group, for one, than when I started. Screened academically. A very carefully run program today, producing some outstanding results.

We have talked about how hard Members work, but we need to take note of how hard you have worked, and, hopefully, you have learned some lessons during this time. Hard work and attention to academics, focus, the long hours you put in and the discipline that you have had to find in yourself, with all of the different things going on around you has been helpful and will put you in great stead as you progress through life, whether you stay active in politics and government or whether you do not. But we have seen some good results.

And we have shared some good times together. The passage of the balanced budget today, I think, is a fitting tribute to you, because we do this with our next generation in mind, as we put together a balanced budget resolution that hopefully will lead to the first balanced budget in a generation by the year 2002, to give your generation an opportunity to succeed. And it is with you in the future that we did this.

The experiences that I have had have stayed with me through my life and defined what I have done. I have always had an appreciation for government, but whether you end up running for office, staying active in government and politics, or just going out and being ambassadors to your community, we have given you an opportunity that few young people have. I know you have learned from this and will take it with you.

And from our experience here and from our perspective as Members, we wish you Godspeed in the time ahead and thank you for a job very well done. We are proud to have been a part of the process that you have undergone in the last few months.

Mrs. FOWLER. Before I yield further, Mr. Speaker, I understand that we can have the pages come up and sit. The Parliamentarian says it is okay, so that their parents and friends at home can see you better.

So while we complete honoring you, why do you not come have a seat in our chairs so that you can enjoy this better.

So if the gentleman from Mississippi does not mind for just one minute, hopefully the cameras will get a good view of them and the folks back home can see them as well and these great young men and women that we are honoring now.

And I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] for coming up with this great idea of having them come forward. We should know someone from the media would come up with this sort of idea.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and also thank the gentleman from Arizona for his excellent idea of bringing these young people forward.

Let me add my comments to those very eloquent remarks that have been made this evening on behalf of the pages and to thank you for your time of service here.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] mentioned that he was a page for 4 years in the United States Senate. I was a page for only 1 month, and that was in 1967, in October of 1967, and it is hard for me to believe that it has been almost 30 years since I came here to serve as a congressional page for the honorable Jamie Whitten, who later on became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and served 53 years in the United States House.

But this is a very excellent group of young people, Mr. Speaker. They are a particularly good looking group, too. And they worked mighty hard for us and they performed good service for their country and for the United States House of Representatives.

They have seen us on the floor in debate, they have seen us also in a more human sense walking up and down the back aisles there and in the cloakrooms. And I simply would say to these young people, I hope you will go back as goodwill ambassadors for this House of Representatives and for our system of government; the greatest system of government ever known to the mind of man, the oldest Constitution existing on the planet today.

You have seen a great deal of history. You saw the second inauguration of President Clinton, you saw the reelection of a Republican majority for the first time since the 1920's, therefore you saw divided government and all of the challenges that that brought for us, a President of one party and a Congress of the other party having to come together. And today you saw the fruition of that, rising to the occasion to pass on a bipartisan basis a balanced budget which will bring us to the first balanced budget since I was in high school.

Some of you today had the opportunity to see Mother Teresa of Calcutta. Others may have had to see that on closed circuit. But you really saw a remarkable little piece of history there with Mother Teresa. And to see this distinguished lady receive the Medal of Honor from Congress, a woman slight of stature, with very little personal wealth, and to think of the impact that that one individual has had across the face of the globe. I am certainly glad that you had that opportunity.

Mother Teresa wished for us today and for our children joy, peace and love, and she expressed the prayer that we would persevere in the time to come, and that is my wish and my

prayer for you as you leave this job. Godspeed to you and thank you very much.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the page board for making such a great selection of such a fine group of young people to be here to serve their country and to specifically help us.

We heard my colleagues all say about the fact that they were pages or they worked as a staff member here when they were very young and the memories they had. I was never a page. The first time I came on the floor of the House of Representatives was when I was sworn in in 1987. And so I say to you what a grand opportunity you have had at such a young age to be here in the Chamber of the House of Representatives where all the joint sessions are held, where all of the policy is molded here, where your friends and families can turn on C-SPAN and see what is happening, but you are here and you have been part of it and it is going to continue to be part of you. You will have been touched in so many ways that you will realize many of them at a later time.

I very much appreciate the kind of service that you have given us. I have always found, and I know my colleagues agree, I have always found that despite the hour, you have been upbeat, you have been enthusiastic, you have at least smiled and pretended to have been enthusiastic about what you did. When we had requests, you were always there, always responded to us.

As a matter of fact, I was always amazed, I think that you could recognize more Members of Congress than I thought I could at times, because you had the pictures and you knew who it was.

I can remember sometimes in the Cloakroom where you had a message for somebody and somebody might have been sleeping, and you say is that so-and-so; now, do I dare to wake him? It happened very rarely, but there were nights when we were here very, very late and you were here very, very late.

I recognize the fact that you also had to go to classes, and I think 10 o'clock was the cutoff; that if you were here up until 10 o'clock, you might not have class the next day, but you would have to make up for it. Whatever. My point is, for young people you had to juggle a very burdensome schedule that was exceedingly difficult, because you had to study, you had to be awake, you had to be alert, you had to follow through with your own studies as well as come here and move around and move with the rhythms of this very vibrant House of Representatives.

I am sure at times you wanted to change the schedule yourself, and you might have felt that had you been there you would have had voting in a more timely manner.

I was lucky this time, too, because I was able to nominate somebody who became a page with you, Christina King, and I know she did a great job, and I have always been very proud of her and she would pop into the office to say hello. But I felt that each and every one of you were my pages. It is because of the way you handled yourself, the way you handled your jobs. Any one of you I could have stopped and asked for something and you would have been very responsive.

I know there were times when we were rather tired, and maybe despondent, although we do not really get too despondent around here, but we would look to you and you would enliven us because you represented the future and you represented people who have an enthusiasm, who have an energy, who have personality, who work hard and who are driven by ethics.

So I commend you. I want to thank you. Again, I know that this will be part of your lives in the future; that you will all do well. I know you have all met each other, and I think that is pretty exciting, people from so many different States, and you realize that each State is not an individual country, that each State does have much in common with the other and that people are people.

So when you go out into the world, and I remember something from "Everything I Needed to Know About Life I Learned in Kindergarten," and that is when you go out into the world, watch out for traffic, hold hands, and stick together. And I hope that you will have an opportunity to be able to stick together as you go out into the world. And I personally thank you very much.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FOWLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have an opportunity to say a few words. I am actually here by mistake. I was just passing by and stumbled in and said, wow, look at this. This is a great looking group, I said to myself. I think you would probably look better than the crowd that sits in here every day. So I decided to sit and to listen, and I am glad I did.

I would like to first of all congratulate the page board members who have taken an interest, and to the chairperson, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER], for the outstanding job that she has done with the leadership of this very important board, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], who I have the privilege of serving with on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Let me just echo what my colleagues have said. It just has not been said by everyone, so I am going to simply join in with the praises to you.

I have the opportunity sometimes, when I bump into some of you as I ride the trolley, and I will say hello and ask your names and where you are from

and what grade you are in, because I am always curious and interested in young people. I think that young people are indeed our most valuable possessions and as a nation we have an obligation to try to make opportunities for young people because that will guarantee that this great Nation will continue to be great.

I started my career as a school-teacher. I was a secondary school-teacher in the city of Newark. Many of the young people there did not have many opportunities. I brought them to the local YMCA and they were able to have opportunities at the local YMCA in Newark. They became involved in a program called Youth in Government, where they were able to become mock legislators, and they would go to the statehouse to be legislators during a period of time where they would learn legislation. So you have had that opportunity to really be here to see how legislation is crafted and created.

Your work is so important. When you go back, I think you have to be diplomats. You have to talk to your colleagues and tell them about your opportunities, and you have to encourage them to become interested in government. You know, young people are not as interested in our elective process as they ought to be, and I think you have a responsibility now, an obligation, to go back and tell young people when they become 18 that they should register to vote; that we need to have people participating in the electoral system to make it strong and to make it good.

So you have an obligation that goes forth from this place and this time to tell them, the cynics, that they have to get involved, that if they dislike what is going on, they have to change it.

□ 1915

Senior citizens vote. That is why we have so much senior citizens, housing. Have you heard of any young people's housing lately? No. Well, we have got to get young people involved. We have to get them participating.

So I am just here, like I said, to congratulate all of the pages. I, too, will have the opportunity to have my first page that will be coming in on Sunday, Andre, from the town of Irvington; and I feel very, very excited about it. Our Page Board selected him, and I really have not met him yet. I am going to meet him on Saturday and his family before he comes down. So I am just as excited, I think, as he is. It is a tremendous program. Keep up the good work.

Just one other thing. There is an interesting thing that happened in my district. Three little boys, 9, 10 and 11, found \$500 in Newark, cash. But they also found the name of the person with this \$500, and what these boys did was to go to a lady in the neighborhood and said, "We found this \$500," it was about a week ago, and they said that it should be returned to the person.

When we found out about it, we found out that none of these three boys ever

owned a bike, none of them had ever been to a summer camp, they lived in public housing, and they lived in very impoverished situations, lived with relatives, grandparents. But for them to say that this did not belong to them and to try to find the person that it belonged to, and actually these little boys, and it just happened a week ago, were ridiculed by some of the kids in the neighborhood. How stupid it was, they said, for them to give back \$500 that they found, that they should try to get it back to the person who lost it and that they do not even own a bicycle.

I do not know, but they probably got about five bicycles each by now because the community came out. They are going to go to camp for the first time in their lives. They are going to go there with all nice new clothes on because we want to make sure all of that happens.

So I just say that to say that the future belongs to those who prepare for it. Our Nation, I believe, is in good hands because of people like you. You have to go back to your neighborhoods and convert others to being just like you.

Mrs. FOWLER. On behalf of all of the Members of the House, we want to thank the pages for their service and wish them well in their future endeavors.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment from our legislative business to recognize and commemorate the end of a tour of duty for our 1996-97 House pages. This year, 61 young men and women from across America took time away from their families and friends to come to Washington and perform a time-honored public service.

The tasks of a House page are not always glamorous, but are nonetheless necessary and valuable. They serve as messengers and aides. They learn about the workings of Government and observe history being made. In fact, I believe some of my colleagues in this House once had the honor of serving in the page program.

I wish I could take the time to name all of our pages, but allow me to at least make mention of those in our Michigan delegation: Ryan Hemker, Virginia Cloutier, Antonia Henry, Paul Soderberg, and Aric Nesbitt.

I have had the privilege of sponsoring one of these fine pages: Ryan Hemker of Coldwater, MI. Ryan, a top student at Quincy High School, has demonstrated all of the characteristics we have come to expect from our pages. He is industrious, intelligent, and a true leader in the page program. It was my privilege to have the opportunity to get to know him and the other pages in this year's program.

Now, as their term as pages comes to a close, I wanted to salute these young people for their efforts, their dedication, and their enthusiasm to serve the Members of this, the people's House. I am confident that their contributions here will be long remembered and that they will distinguish themselves in their communities just as they have here in Washington.

To all of our pages, I offer my best wishes and thanks.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1469) an act making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) a concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1998 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002.

HOUR OF MEETING ON SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, June 6, 1997, that it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Saturday, June 7, 1997.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1997, TO TUESDAY, JUNE 10, 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Saturday, June 7, 1997, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 10, 1997, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS
WEEK

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

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, as Members know, this is National Small Business Week. I want to take time out to recognize the thousands of men and women back home in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District who run and own small businesses. I cannot think of a more worthy group to honor.

Small business, as is often said, is the backbone of our economy, accounting for 99.7 percent of the Nation's employers and for 47 percent of all sales in this country. In fact, in the 12 calendar months between December 1994 and December 1995, employment in small business-dominated industries increased 2.7 percent, creating 1.25 billion new jobs, or 75 percent of the total new jobs in the economy.

There are many small businesses back in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District that deserve praise, but tonight I want to highlight one of them, the Twainland Cheesecake Co. and Cafe in Hannibal, MO, owned by Lynn Carr. Twainland Cheesecake Co. and Cafe employes 14 women in a cheesecake-making operation where they make 110 types of cheesecakes. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have not brought samples for the House. But I would extend a personal invitation for Members to come to Hannibal, MO to try some of Ms. Carr's famous turtle cheesecake. Nonetheless, Lynn Carr is an American success story.

At age 29, Lynn Carr could not read. In the mid-eighties, for a period of time Lynn Carr was homeless. Lynn Carr spent most of her adult life either on welfare or in low-paying jobs. She continued to believe in the American dream. She prayed for a better life. She kept in her heart a ray of hope, a sliver of self-esteem.

Eventually Lynn learned how to read and earned a GED, the equivalent of a high school diploma. She got a loan, she put her talents to work, and the rest is history in the making. She started a cheesecake business in Hannibal, MO's historic downtown.

This is a success story, Mr. Speaker, but there is more. Lynn Carr has decided to launch her own private welfare-to-work program, giving other women a chance to succeed just like she did. Using her words, she says, "Such as I have been given, I want to give back to the community." Lynn knows that some people will never break out of the welfare cycle. "But," she adds, "then you have people who were like myself who are just down on their luck and need a hand up instead of a handout." She went on to say, "If we could just save one or two families and change their lives for the better, then it is all worth it."

To further give back to the community, Lynn Carr plans to open a larger factory employing up to 50 women. She

wants to give jobs to unemployed and undereducated women living in poverty. She hopes to have a learning center and a day-care center on site. Women will enter the program by working in the day-care center, where they can learn parenting and nutritional skills. After several weeks, the women will then divide their time between the cheesecake factory and the learning center. In order to qualify for work, a woman would be required to get a GED certificate. While doing this, Lynn Carr hopes to inspire others with motivational programs.

Mr. Speaker, motivation is not a problem once you get the chance to meet Lynn Carr. Lynn Carr is a living example of how an individual can lift themselves up one rung of the ladder at a time, become a successful business person, and then, to make the picture complete, invest in other individuals living in the community.

Congratulations are in order for Lynn Carr and the thousands of other men and women who are responsible for the thriving small businesses in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District and across this great country.

FLOOD RELIEF AND FLOOD
PROTECTION

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, I voted against the emergency supplemental flood relief measure with heavy heart. I voted against it even though it had some funds for West Virginia. But the problem was that, as this bill moved along designed to provide flood relief and flood prevention for hard-hit areas, it got loaded up with things having nothing to do with floods.

My constituents sometimes express wonder and confusion and anger at the fact that the Congress can start out with goal A in mind and somehow load it up with not just goal A but goals B, C, and D even though they have nothing to do with goal A, and that is what happened here.

I want flood relief as much as anyone does. The people who already need flood relief, the people who need emergency housing and emergency response, that money is there. This goes to stream bank rehabilitation, assistance to farmers to assist with their crops where fences were damaged, rebuilding streams, that sort of thing.

I want that as much as anybody. But in order to get that, I was going to have to vote for a lot of other extraneous language that had nothing to do with flood prevention and flood rebuilding. I was going to have to vote for controversial language dealing with potential Government shutdowns. So I was faced with a quandary hereof, if I voted for the money to rehabilitate the river bank around flood-hit Herbert Hoover High School, I could in the future be endangering some level of Pell

grants for students attending that high school. That did not make any sense to me.

This bill got loaded up with controversial language about how to conduct the census in the year 2000. We have got floods in 1997, and somebody wants to put in controversial language about conducting a census in this country in the year 2000. We better hurry up and pass this clean flood relief bill or there will not be as many of us to count in that next census if we do not do something about flood prevention.

It is quite clear that the President has already said, and he said weeks ago, that if we load this bill up and do something besides flood relief, he is going to veto it. So this bill, because it has passed the Senate and passed the House, will go to the President hopefully this weekend. He will veto it. It will come back to the Congress right away, and hopefully next week it can be a clean bill, one that deals only with flood relief and flood protection.

I voted 2 weeks ago, maybe more than 2 weeks ago, for a version of this bill as it left the House. And the reason was that I wanted to keep it moving, hoping that in the other body and that in the congressional deliberations that take place between the House and the Senate that it would get cleaned up, the extraneous provisions would be taken off and it would deal with just flood protection and flood relief. Not only were those provisions not taken off, more were added, including the controversial census counting measures.

So Mr. Speaker, it is my great hope that when the bill is vetoed, it will be back on the floor next week, little time will be lost, and it will come back as a clean bill. I was greatly frustrated when, after having voted for this bill just 2 weeks ago, the Congress immediately took a 10-day break over Memorial Day to go home. So where was the sense of urgency that I think was so important?

So Mr. Speaker, it is my great regret that what started out as flood protection and flood relief turned into a vehicle for everybody's wish list, having nothing to do with flooding. Unfortunately there were a lot of provisions that stayed in this bill that had nothing to do with flood relief and flood protection. But the good news is that the Congress can correct that, it ought to be in session this weekend, but the Congress can correct that early next week, pass a clean bill, and get it back to the President.

Mr. Speaker, let us make sure that everyone in this country understands we can have flood protection and flood relief. It should be done immediately. That should be the goal of this Congress. We should debate controversial measures that have nothing to do with flood protection and flood relief; we can debate those other days, other times, when there is not as much urgency around those issues as there is around this one.

I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, next week to seeing a clean bill so that Republicans and Democrats alike can join in providing what everyone agrees needs to be done, genuine flood protection and flood relief.

□ 1930

AMERICAN TROOPS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the issue of United States troops in Bosnia, I sincerely believe enough is enough. First President Clinton said that America's commitment in Bosnia would only last one year. Then he announced the extension of our military presence in Bosnia until June 1998. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed to learn that the President has indicated that American troops may be there even longer.

Our troops have been in Bosnia long enough. They should not spend another day in Bosnia. I believe that our soldiers should not be placed in harm's way for a mission that is not in America's vital national interest.

Our troops have been in Bosnia for 2 years and the American public still questions our role. Mr. Speaker, is this mission truly in our national interest? Have we not achieved our goal? When will we be able to bring our troops home?

President Clinton stated this past weekend that progress in Bosnia has been slow. As we all know, the conflict in Bosnia is a regional conflict that resulted from centuries of hate among ethnic groups. It cannot be solved quickly.

The fact is America has already fulfilled our commitment made under the Dayton peace accord. At present, America has dedicated more than \$6 billion to the Bosnia mission. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker. At the present time America has dedicated more than \$6 billion to the Bosnia mission.

Every dollar we spend on this mission is a dollar we cannot spend on critical military priorities, like research and development, procurement or troop readiness. The military budget is already being drained and costs like this one in Bosnia only makes it harder.

I hate to think that we are closing military bases due to the shrinking defense budget and yet we continue to spend billions of dollars on a regional conflict in Bosnia. This is not in the best interests of the American people. The United States can no longer afford to be the world's policeman. Although we are the most powerful Nation in the world, the simple fact is we just cannot have American troops peacekeeping between every warring faction around the world.

Although the President is the Commander-in-Chief, Congress has a vital role and a necessary role in determining military policy. President Clinton has misled us long enough about the troops in Bosnia. At this point there is no telling how long he plans to keep our troops in Bosnia.

When the lives of American soldiers are at stake, we in Congress have a responsibility to make our voices heard. For too long our troops in Bosnia have been forgotten. I urge my colleagues to join the bipartisan effort to bring our troops home by the end of this year, 1997.

MFN FOR CHINA

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this time to talk about an issue which has come to the forefront. Many people are addressing it, and we apparently will be voting on this issue the week of June 23, most likely the 25th of June, that being whether or not we should renew most-favored-nation status for the People's Republic of China.

There are a wide range of issues that are addressed here, whether it is arms proliferation, human rights, the kinds of things that have come to the forefront, trade issues. I will say that I am very concerned about every single one of them. But I would like to take this few minutes to talk about an issue which has troubled me greatly.

I should say at the outset that, as has been the case in the past, I am very, very strongly supportive of maintaining most-favored-nation trading status for the People's Republic of China because in the 4,000-year history of China, the single most powerful force for positive change in that period of time has been economic reform. Let me say how important that has been and an issue which is of concern to me and many others, and that is the policy of forced abortion that exists in China.

It is terrible to have the so-called one-child policy that exists there. I believe that we should do everything that we can to change that, because that policy cannot be tolerated. Mr. Speaker, not many people know that the policy of engagement and economic reform which has existed in China is undermining the one-child policy there.

There is a young woman, 27 years old, who lives in a tiny town called Dongguan which is in the Guangdong Province which adjoins Hong Kong. Her name is Ye Xiuying. She worked for \$35 a month as a factory worker in this area. A plant was opened up from a U.S. business, and she was able to establish her own small business near this plant. Her income went from \$35 a month to \$1,200 a month, an amazing growth, something that has empowered her.

Because of the fact that she was able to gain such economic strength, she

was able to pay the government the one-time \$1,800 charge, and in fact not suffer an abortion as many of the provinces have imposed in China but in fact have her second child. She in fact had a girl, something that the government opposes. They want to have boys. She was able to have a second child; she was able to have a girl.

As I listen to many of my colleagues talk about the idea of sending a message to the government of China by bringing an end to most-favored-nation trading status, that kind of policy would in fact encourage more abortions in China. As we listen to people regularly claim that we will be able to bring an end to the human rights violations, the saber rattling in the Taiwan straits, the horrible treatment of Tibet, the transfer of weapons, the military buildup in China if we end our contact with them through most-favored-nation trading status, clearly they are wrong.

Because if we look at the recent past in China, during the great leap forward under Mao Zedong, 60 million people were starved. Also under Mao, during the cultural revolution, 1 million people were murdered by the government. And, of course, the world was not made aware of this.

What has happened? As we opened up China, and did in fact what Ronald Reagan said he wanted to have done in Eastern and Central Europe when he said, "Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall," so that those in Eastern and Central Europe could mingle with the West, the same thing has been happening with China. It would be tantamount to declaring economic and political war with China if we were to tamper with or revoke what is an inappropriate name to describe it, most-favored-nation trading status, which simply means regular trading arrangements that exist there.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the fact that we have not solved every problem there, and I demonstrate my outrage over the human rights violations, I have talked with dissidents, I marched to the Chinese Embassy following the Tiananmen Square massacre to demonstrate my outrage, I have come to the conclusion that what would happen if we revoked MFN would be that we would not be isolating China from the world but we would in fact be isolating the United States of America from the most populous nation on the face of the earth.

There are many missionaries today who are very involved in China and, yes, there is religious persecution and it is unacceptable, reprehensible and should be addressed. But if we ended MFN, we would clearly jeopardize the chance for those missionaries who are there from the United States and other parts of the world to be successful.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say when this vote comes up in 2 weeks, I urge a vote against the resolution of disapproval so that we can do everything, including undermining the one-child policy.

REVITALIZING AMERICAN
EDUCATION

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the poet Maya Angelo once said a cynical child is one who has made the transition from knowing nothing to believing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of education is not just to grant knowledge to our students, it is also to give them hope. Sadly, many of our schools today fail on both counts. Yes, it is true that many of our young people today are not able to write words or calculate numbers as they should, but perhaps more profoundly, many of our young people are discouraged and disillusioned. They have lost hope in themselves and they have lost hope in America. That is an American tragedy.

The effects of this tragedy are felt everywhere. We can sense it in our inner cities where crime is rampant and violence is a way of life. We can see it in the eyes of an 18-year-old dropout who has aged far beyond his years and lives life knowing his best years are already over. We can hear it in the voices of thousands of young people, people for whom the promise of America has long since been lost.

These precious young people are the ones who ultimately pay the price when our schools fail. These young people are the victims of schools that have failed them and communities that have given up on them. This is a situation we must and we can do something about.

I believe that no first-class nation can have second-class citizens. But being an optimist, I believe there are also answers. To those parents and students who have been failed by our schools, I say yes, you have lost much but you have not lost everything. To those teachers and principals who are trying to make a difference, I say yes, you are doing many good things, you are building their futures and you are building ours.

Tonight I rise not to condemn American education but to challenge it. I want to challenge teachers to work harder and students to study longer. I want to encourage school administrators, school board members and school principals to create safe environments, better schools, and more creative classrooms. I want to urge moms and dads not just to be parents at home but also partners in the schools.

We can revitalize American education. We have all the necessary ingredients. We have the best teachers in the world and the brightest young minds, if only we can create a climate where teachers and students can do what they do best, teach and learn. I believe we can do that and I know we should. Today more than ever our schools and our children need our help.

When our children head off to college, they need our help even more. To-

night I think help has arrived. Tonight, I am pleased to introduce, along with the gentleman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the majority whip, and others, the HELP Act, the Higher Education and Learning Promotion Act.

This legislation is designed to give families an additional option for their \$500-per-child tax credit which both the President and the Congress are pledged to support. This historic legislation would allow our families to begin financing higher education through savings instead of debt.

As an incentive to encourage families to save and invest for their children's college education, this legislation would allow parents to invest this child tax credit in an education savings account. These accounts will earn interest tax free and can be withdrawn tax free for their child's education, and families will be able to double the amount of the tax credit if they choose to invest in an education savings account.

This would give families the option of using this tax credit and other savings to help plan for their children's future. A family with two children will be able to invest \$1,500 each year for each of their children in an education savings account. That is \$3,000 for their children's education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the HELP Act is an important part of revitalizing American education, and I urge my colleagues to include this important proposal in the upcoming tax relief package for families.

Mr. Speaker, with the help of parents and teachers and the hope of our young people, we can build schools which will train fertile minds, prepare young lives and foster dreams. Our vision is a glorious one, an America where our children are not only well educated but, more importantly, an America where our children believe in themselves and they believe in their country. Mr. Speaker, the future is theirs but the responsibility is ours.

TRIBUTE TO SMALL BUSINESS
ENTREPRENEURS

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this evening as well to pay tribute as we are this week to the small business entrepreneurs in our country, those who continue to drive the economic engine that makes this the greatest economy in the world. I have some personal history with that. My grandfather came to this country from Norway back around the turn of the century to pursue his American dream, and he and my great uncle, who did not speak a word of English, came through Ellis Island, ended up in the middle of South Dakota, and went into

the hardware business and had the opportunity like so many people at that time who came here, the freedom to succeed and the freedom as well to fail. But they came here because the opportunity existed in America. The South Dakota landscape just abounds with wonderful stories of entrepreneurial success, people who have taken risks. Some have succeeded, some have failed.

□ 1945

But many out there have been willing to move forward in a way that will continue to advance the American dream in this country, and I look at countless examples of those, and particularly in my State of South Dakota most of the businesses in our State are small businesses. We are a State which consists of many small towns and many main streets, and without those small businesses our State would not have the economic life that it does. It is our life blood.

So this evening and this week we have paid tribute to those many people.

I had the opportunity to have lunch 2 days ago with Richard and Janet Cone of Cone Ag Service, Inc., in Pierre, which is this year's small business award winner in South Dakota. They were here to celebrate and to be recognized, and they are just one of many who have taken again advantage of the opportunity that is afforded us in this country and then part of the American dream.

As you look at those that have succeeded in South Dakota I harken back to, and for those who have traveled in my State you will know as you drive down Interstate 90 you will see countless signs for a place called Wall Drug. Wall Drug is a wonderful story about someone who started with an idea of free ice water and 5-cent coffee, and to this day those continue to be their trademarks, free ice water and 5-cent coffee, and they have turned that into a wonderful marketing masterpiece. It has been incredibly successful and provides jobs and opportunities in that small community.

I think of Mike's Jack and Jill in Webster, SD, a good friend of mine. The mayor of that community is someone who is very involved in the community. And one of the things that I think you witness when you see small businesses that have success in this country is the commitment that they have to incorporate and to civic responsibility and citizenship. They have enjoyed the freedoms that we have in America, and they have also taken very seriously the responsibility to contribute and to give back, and most of the people in those small towns are those who are consistently involved in their municipal governments and their civic organizations and their service organizations and the Little League baseball teams, and I can give you many, many examples of that.

But we have a small business culture in this country, an entrepreneurial culture that we want to continue to promote, and one of the things I think that we can do is encourage the self-sufficiency, the independence that will allow and give those people the environment they need in which to prosper and to continue to succeed in their businesses. Most of the people who are in small business are people of character. They are visionaries. They are people of incredible commitment and dedication, and they have a very, very strong work ethic, and that is something I think we want to continue to encourage.

One of the things in the debate that we are about today, this week and just earlier today approved the budget resolution which includes some tax relief for those who are out there creating the jobs and making the investments and taking the risks that continue to drive this economy forward, and I believe that we need a government that lends them a helping hand, that will be a partner with them and that reinforces those values and those traditions rather than destroying them. And one of the things that we are talking about doing in this budget resolution is bringing estate tax relief, and that is something that I think will encourage the family farms to continue, the small businesses to continue as we allow and make it easier for small business entrepreneurs to pass on that family business to the next generation.

We are talking about lowering the tax burden on savings, investment and job creation, the capital gains tax, and that is something as well that I think will be an enormous benefit to the small businessowners in this country and enable them again to continue to do what they do best, and that is to make those investments that build the economies in those small towns and continue to contribute to the fabric of this Nation and to encourage innovation, entrepreneurship, and many things and many qualities that we look to in this country and the things that I think have for so long defined what we have come to know as the American dream, and that is that when you come to this country, we have the opportunity again to succeed, the freedom to fail. But we have remarkable success stories out there, and I think it is very fitting that this week we pay tribute to those small businesses that continue to drive this economy and renew our commitment to making, creating an environment that is conducive for them to succeed and to prosper.

So I look forward to working toward that end.

THE CENSUS HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH HELPING FLOOD VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to bring some light and some sense to the actions of this House just a few minutes ago. Unfortunately, I think that there was more of an eagerness to play politics as opposed to responding to a simple question that my 11-year-old son, Jason Lee, raised with me last evening, and that was a concern for those individuals in South Dakota and other parts who suffered a lot this spring, Americans who we have a great concern for and have really attempted for the past couple of weeks to effectively and through the right way provide funding for their needs. Unfortunately, a political game was played tonight, and in this emergency supplemental appropriations we did not do the right thing. We did not do the right thing because we did not get to the bottom line, and that is to provide the support needed for those in the military who needed training to be able to provide assistance to these communities that have suffered from this terrible flooding and fires. We did not do the right thing by providing the moneys for community development funds for rebuilding of their housing.

Mr. Speaker, what we actually did was play politics. We proceeded to cut the moneys less than what was already included in the budget. We proceeded to cut discretionary funding and defense funding, although there are some who think that that money was included.

We also tried to do damage to a very important aspect of the American psychic and the American responsibility, and that is to count its citizens.

We did tonight something that had nothing to do with helping the citizens in South Dakota and other places that were negatively impacted. We put a straightjacket on the census. We declared Americans uncountable. We said that they are not important to find out who lives in the rural communities and urban centers. In an emergency appropriations bill we put in a straightjacket on taking the census for the year 2000.

I would argue does that make any sense? It certainly does not. Apples and oranges; somebody said mangoes and papayas.

What we did was to deny to American cities and rural communities the right to get their fair share of the tax dollars by denying the procedure of sampling and taking the census. Do you realize that we counted some 6 million people twice in the last census in 1990 and did not count 10 million citizens? It does not make sense when we began to distribute funds that we would find a circumstance where this Congress will straightjacket a function that is so very important to this Nation. In fact, the Constitution said the actual enumeration shall be made within 3 years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, with every subsequent term of 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the census is written into the Constitution, and yet playing

politics instead of voting and putting forth the response to those citizens in the West who need our help, we now have intermingled and strangled this emergency supplemental appropriations bill so that the President will veto it because what it says is that we are not going to count our citizens and distribute our tax dollars fairly.

I almost wish we could go back to the drawing board and answer the question of my son, age 11: Why can we not simply just give them the money and give them the money fairly and straightly to deal with their problems and stop the politics?

I hope that we will be able to clear the air, if you will, to take this terrible language out of this supplemental appropriations bill so that we do not stranglehold the counting of citizens and we be able to move forward in the year 2000 and use a sampling that gets every one of our citizens. No matter where they are, whether they are homeless or not, they deserve to be counted so that we in America can distribute funds for education, the environment, Medicare and Medicaid, and not use your moneys frivolously, so that States who need more money because there are more people can fairly receive those funds instead of looking into smoke and mirrors and trying to decide who is in our State and who is in our country.

Every child, every senior citizen, every working man and woman, every person in this country deserves to be counted in the census, and yet on this day of June 5, 1997, instead of giving money to the people who need it, we are fooling around and hiding the ball in the census in the year 2000.

Someone said it does not seem to match two things: census and money for the folks who need it. You are right, it does not. Let us do the right thing and make sure that we pass a appropriations bill that serves those folk in South Dakota and other places who just simply ask to be treated like Americans.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has finished its legislative business for the week.

The House will meet for pro forma sessions at 9 a.m. tomorrow and 10 a.m. Saturday. Of course there will be no legislative business and no votes on those days.

On Tuesday, June 10, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning session and 12 noon for legislative business. Members should note that we do expect recorded votes soon after 2 p.m. on Tuesday.

As our first order of business on Tuesday, June 10, the House will consider the following four suspensions: H.R. 848, Extending the Deadline for AuSable Hydroelectric Project in New York; H.R. 1184, Extending the Deadline for Bear Creek Hydroelectric Project in Washington; H.R. 1217, Extending the Deadline for Hydroelectric Project in Washington State; and H. Con. Res. 60—Relating to the 30th Anniversary of the Reunification of the City of Jerusalem.

After suspensions, the House will resume consideration of H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. The House will also vote on previously ordered amendments to that bill.

On Wednesday, June 11, and Thursday, June 12, the House will meet at 10 a.m. and on Friday, June 13, the House will meet at 9 a.m. to consider the following bills, all of which will be subject to rules: H.R. 1758, The European Security Act; H.R. 437, The National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act of 1997; and H.J. Res. 54, Proposing an Amendment to the U.S. Constitution Authorizing the Congress to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the U.S. Flag.

Mr. Speaker, we should finish legislative business and have Members on their way home by 2 p.m. on Friday, June 13.

THE CONTINUING EDUCATION DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we have had two important pieces of legislation in the past few days, one related to disaster. As the gentlewoman from Texas has just related, we had a bill to deal with the disaster relief. I think the whole bill is about \$8 billion, and \$5 billion of that was for disaster relief for places that are very much in need of help and they need it now. We recognize in this Nation and repeatedly the Congress comes to the aid of any States, any communities that have natural disasters.

Today I want to talk about the continuing education disaster that many of my colleagues, Democrats as well as Republicans, who just do not believe that we have an education disaster raging in our big cities, our inner city communities, and New York is just one, but Chicago, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, all over, you have a problem that cannot be resolved or solved with business as usual.

We have a disaster. It is a man-made disaster, but it is a continuing disaster

in that we are not providing education of the kind that is needed in order for young people to cope with the 20th century demands, let alone to go into the 21st century.

We talk a lot about the need for computer education, computer literacy. We applaud the fact that telecommunications are being introduced, and now at an affordable rate in schools. Recently we had a landmark action by the Federal Communications Commission where they followed the mandate of legislation that we had passed, and they created a universal fund for schools and libraries so the schools and libraries can get at a 90-percent discount in the poorest areas the wiring for telecommunication services, computers, even just more telephones, and they can have a 90-percent discount indefinitely. They will be able to pay a telephone bill that costs \$1 with 10 cents. That is what a 90-percent discount means.

The poorest districts in America will have a 90-percent discount, and even the wealthiest districts in America will have a 20-percent discount. That is a major piece of government action that creates hope. But in the big city school systems there is not enough in place at this point to take advantage of this new revolution in the provision of assistance for telecommunications to schools and libraries.

The education disaster is there now, the education disaster grows worse because of demands on our school systems and the need for education and the complexities of the kind of education needed are increasing while our schools are falling further and further behind.

I want to speak in particular about New York City because we have just returned recently from a recess where I had the opportunity to get closer to problems in my district, problems that I thought I understood very well before. I find that they are even worse than I have imagined, that there are problems with dimensions that shock even myself, and I have been in Congress now for 15 years. Before that I was an elected official in the New York State Senate, and before that I was an official in the New York City government. But the magnitude of these problems in New York City education are staggering, and an experienced observer is shocked by some of the things that happen, and I want to talk about that.

Just first a footnote on the two important pieces of legislation that passed this past few days. One, the budget conference report that passed today where the Senate and the House now agreed on a budget, and basically I think the White House has agreed on most of the elements of that budget too.

□ 2000

It is important to note that that budget agreement does not have to go to the White House for the signature of

the President. Budgets do not have to go to the White House. They are agreements between the Senate and the House.

The President started the process with his budget. In this case, the President sat in with the representatives of both Houses and they reached an agreement. I did not vote for that agreement because there were a lot of things missing there that I felt ought to be there.

One of those things, of course, is the \$5 billion for construction initiatives for schools which was proposed by the President to help stimulate construction of new schools or to renovate existing schools or to rehabilitate existing schools, to remove the danger of safety hazards from schools. If schools have asbestos problems, if they have lead pipe problems, any of those problems could have been taken care of in this \$5 billion initiative.

Now, the President initiated this, and we thought that in the budget agreement this would be a major item that would emerge intact. But unfortunately, Members of Congress, either in the House of Representatives or the other body, insisted that the \$5 billion initiative for school construction be taken out. They were adamant, and the President finally yielded. Many of them insisted it should be taken out because they want to make the argument that local governments, the cities, the States, and the citizens of the States must be fully responsible for school construction.

I want to just quickly note that they would still be mostly responsible, no matter what the Federal Government does. A \$5 billion initiative to help with school construction would be just a tiny portion of the amount of money needed. The General Accounting Office estimates that we need \$135 billion to bring our schools into the 21st century, \$135 billion. So if the Federal Government is responsible for just \$5 billion, it will not begin to solve the problem, but it will be a stimulant, and evidently, because we continue to fail to make the necessary promises at the State and local level, we need this Federal stimulant.

So it is unfortunate that the budget conference report that went forward today does not have that \$5 billion for school construction.

We will not cease the fight, we will not give up. We are not elected to give up, we are not elected to stop the fight. Between now and the time that we adjourn sometime in the fall, we will continue to fight. The members of the Congressional Black Caucus have made this a priority item. We appeal to all of our comrades, all of our colleagues, to make certain that they keep sight of the fact that this is a major item of the budget.

There is a bill that has been introduced by my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], and 190 signatures were on that bill to carry forward the President's \$5 billion construction initiative. So we think

there is enough support to keep this item on the agenda. We think that it is not incompatible with the budget agreement that has already been made.

Within the context of that budget agreement there is room for the school construction initiative to be revitalized. In the area of capital gains tax reductions, maybe corporate tax credits, corporate tax writeoffs of some kind could be used as a device to return to some kind of school construction initiative of an appropriate magnitude.

We also passed the supplemental appropriation that I just mentioned before, which contains the disaster relief for communities that are suffering from floods and from exorbitant amounts of natural disasters that have occurred in the last 6 months. We think that is very much in order, but as I said before, disaster relief of another kind is needed in our big cities.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with voting for disaster relief. I voted for \$8 billion for California with its earthquakes and mud slides. I voted for \$6 billion when we had to give money for the hurricane that took place in Florida, and \$6 billion for flood relief in the Midwest several years ago. We apportion large amounts of Federal resources into helping people who need help.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, New York does not have earthquakes, it does not have floods. We have not had any mud slides. So New York is a donor State. We continue to pay more into the Federal Treasury than we ever get back, so we deserve some consideration, and probably most of the big cities deserve some consideration in terms of another kind of disaster relief. First of all, of course, our colleagues here in the Congress have to recognize that it is a disaster. What is happening in our big city schools is a disaster.

I had a discussion with one of my Democratic colleagues just yesterday who insisted that we should not have the Federal Government involved in school construction. It is a disaster. We find no other way to relieve the disaster. Bad decisions have been made, the wrong decisions have been made by local officials in some cases and by State officials. We have unfortunately allowed a situation to develop which is so far out of hand now that it has to have help from the outside, we must have help from the outside.

Most of the help, as I said, will not come from the outside, but we need the stimulus. We need every public official at the city level, county level, and the Federal level, every public official should be put on the spot by having the Federal Government say, "Here is part of the money, a small part of it. If you will just match it, if you will show some incentive, some initiatives, then we can go forward and provide the additional share to accomplish the task."

I am not apologizing at all for local officials or for State officials. The mayor of the city of New York cut the school budget by more than \$1.5 billion

over the last 3 years. Part of the cuts that took place there were cuts that had an effect on the budget for renovation and for repairs and for school construction. So decisions being made by local elected officials are part of the problem. The State has not come forward with any great new initiative on construction in a long time. Decisions being made at the State level are part of the problem.

Recently we had a State environmental bond initiative on the ballot, and the Governor came out and campaigned for that, identifying with the environmentalists, whom he had previously called beatniks and in various ways ridiculed, but suddenly the power of the environmentalist vote led the Governor to come out and campaign. The Senator from that State came out and campaigned, and they all are now on the environmentalist bandwagon.

We are happy about that. We passed the bond. I was happy to note that in that bond issue they specifically said that they would give some small amount of the environmental cleanup money to New York City so that New York City could get rid of its coal-burning schools. Coal-burning schools in New York City. We still have coal-burning schools.

They said in the brochure that urged people to come out and vote that funds would be available for 30 schools to change their boilers from coal-burning boilers to gas or oil boilers, eliminating the coal dust in the air that is perpetuating and increasing epidemic asthma and some other respiratory diseases. So we were proud of the fact that specifically they had mentioned relieving us of coal-burning furnaces.

Despite the fact that I have been in New York a long time, I thought well, that would be the elimination of a major problem, 30 coal-burning schools will be no longer there. I did not know it at the time, but throughout the city we have almost 300 coal-burning schools, almost 300, and 30 means that we are going to eliminate 10 percent with this environmental bond issue.

I know the numbers, when we start talking about New York City, always people's eyes glaze over or they just lose track because the numbers are so great. We have 1,100 schools in New York City, 1,100 schools serving nearly 8 million people, so the numbers are great. But out of that 1,100 schools, we have some which are way back in the previous century. They burn coal, and that coal in a city of 8 million people living in a relatively small space, we can see how the coal dust alone is a major environmental hazard being perpetrated at a place where young kids congregate on a regular basis. So we are creating a major problem. It is a disaster.

If one will not accept the general condition of the school system as a disaster, then at least accept the fact that when it comes to safety and health, we have a disaster in 300 schools that burn coal. In our Federal construction ini-

tiative, if nothing else, the Federal construction initiative should set us free from those coal-burning schools, but that is not the case.

We have in the budget conference report a proposal for tax cuts, and some colleagues have said well, since we did not get the President's initiative in terms of the budget as an outright item, then let us look at the tax cuts that are proposed in the budget agreement. There is a provision for 85 billion dollars worth of tax cuts over a period of 5 years, \$85 billion in tax cuts are part of the agreement, and \$35 billion of that \$85 billion are related to education, related to tax credits for tuition, to merit scholarships, to a number of items that are important, and they belong in there and they should be in there.

However, in addition to that, we ought to have at least \$5 billion more of that tax cut dedicated to doing something to deal with the construction crisis, the school facility crisis, the safety and health crisis in our schools with respect to the big cities. Fifty billion dollars in tax cuts, somehow there ought to be created an imaginative way to get corporations and businesses involved to the tune of \$5 billion in tax writeoffs or tax credits, or some way to have \$5 billion of that \$50 billion in tax cuts contributed toward solving the construction problem, the facility problem, contributed toward being a stimulant to solving the construction and facility problem in our school systems.

Construction is a major kingpin in the whole effort to improve our schools. Construction is at the core of it in the sense that if we do not have buildings that are adequate, then nothing else that we do will have the proper impact. If children are in overcrowded schools as they are in New York City, we had a finite, very dramatic example of what the problem is last September, when on the day the school opened 91,000 children did not have a place to sit.

Now, it did not mean that we did not have 91,000 seats, but it meant we had a lot of the 91,000 with no place to sit anywhere. No matter how much we adjusted the system, transferred the schools from one community to another, busing youngsters further away, we still had large numbers who had no place to sit and places had to be found in hallways, places had to be found in storage rooms, places had to be found in corners of cafeterias, in assembly halls, all kinds of places that were not classrooms.

In addition to that, we had to increase the size of the classes. Even if we had the money for additional teachers, we did not have a place for the teachers to teach, so the number of children in each class had to be increased. So all of the classes in certain areas of our city have more children than they are supposed to have according to the agreed-upon contract with the teachers. Instead of 26 at certain

grade levels, you have 35. That is a big difference in terms of the quality of teaching.

So just the magnitude of the problem that you see in numbers and in overcrowding creates a situation that makes it harder for the teacher to do their job. But of course if you add to that the safety hazards, the asbestos that is a problem that we still have not dealt with in many of the schools, and we add to that the lead poisoning, lead being in some of the pipes and the paint.

We add to that of course the fact that some schools are so old that the top floor, they have two floors, if one goes up to the second floor one will find that the walls of the classrooms on the second floor are continually shedding off because of the dampness, and the roofs that have been repaired over and over again no longer can be repaired to keep the water out, it just keeps coming in, or the money needed to properly repair the roofs and the walls is just not there.

So we have manifestations of a physical problem that directly impacts upon the children in the school. If the walls of the room are damp, there is a health hazard and a distraction. If windows are knocked out and not replaced right away, that is a distraction. If the lighting of the school is improper, that is a distraction. We know what good schools look like. We can travel from New York City to the suburbs and find what good schools look like.

□ 2015

Even within the city we have a two-tiered system. There are some neighborhoods that have excellent schools that would pass muster anywhere, but there are too many that have schools that belong to another century. Instead of carrying us forward to the 21st century they are still lingering in the 19th century.

So we have right now a window of opportunity to do something about education in general, and the effort to improve education in general has to start specifically with the physical facilities, or the physical facility improvement becomes symbolic of what we really want to do. If we are not willing to do the basics, if we are not willing to give a child a comfortable place to sit, a place to sit which is conducive to learning, then the other efforts become a little ridiculous.

We talk about all third-grade children should learn to read and be reading on third-grade level when they get to third grade. We talk about the fact that we want all students when they graduate to be able to measure up to certain standards. We want to be first in math and science. We have six goals that became eight or nine goals. They are all laudable goals, but how do you recognize these goals when you cannot provide a safe place to sit? How do you talk about a national curriculum, we would impose a national curriculum, where every subject of five or six sub-

jects will be more or less taught the same way and have the same outcome aspirations, the same attempt to get to certain levels? When we talk about that in the context of falling schools, walls crumbling down, leaking roofs, and asbestos in the wall, you begin to generate cynicism and hopelessness.

We have a revolution going on with telecommunications, but if you cannot bore a hole in the wall because when you bore the hole the asbestos comes out, then we cannot wire the schools that have the asbestos problem. So construction becomes a symbol. It becomes a kingpin.

Construction of facilities, if they are not proper, then we usually find that other matters are not being taken care of either. Where we have construction problems, when we start asking questions, we find we have other problems. If we do not have school facilities that are proper, then usually those same schools do not have adequate supplies. The same schools have broken machinery or broken equipment. The same schools do not have quality teachers.

In my district, one of the districts that we have, they have the largest number of substitute teachers in the city, teachers who are not really certified teachers. The requirement is that you be certified, or the requirement is that teachers have to meet certain standards, but if they are not there and you have to hire substitutes, you take people who are not well trained.

This problem takes place in the same places where you have the space and facilities problem. It is symbolic. Communities that do not take care of their schools physically are not doing other things that are necessary to promote opportunities to learn.

Opportunity to learn standards, as I said before on this floor many times, is a set of standards that nobody wants to talk about. Everybody wants to talk about new curriculum standards, all across the Nation to have the same set of curriculum standards. They want to talk about new testing standards, where we test students across the Nation and compare their achievements. But in order to have students master the new curriculum, in order to have them pass the test, we need to create an opportunity to learn. It is simple common sense and simple logic. Part of the creation of an opportunity to learn, of course, is they have to have a safe place to sit, a place that is conducive to learning.

So cities are neglected. They are neglected partially for racist reasons. Large numbers of minority groups are congregated in cities. Cities are neglected partially because of income numbers. Large numbers of poor people are congregated in cities. Poor people do not vote in the same percentages as other people. It is a political problem. It is a problem that local officials and State officials have neglected.

How do we break out of it? Large percentages of our population live in

cities. Large percentages of our population that are the work force of tomorrow are not being appropriately educated. We have an anti-city bias in this country. The anti-city bias is played out in the compromise that we have to make on the Constitution.

The Constitution appropriates Representative's seats by population, so that is a one man-one vote ratio. Places which have the most population get the most power, the most votes in the House of Representatives. But the great compromise was that each State should have two Senators. No matter how small the State is, they have two Senators, so we have Senators in large numbers who are elected by rural and suburban constituencies and they do not have big city populations, and the policy-making in this country has gone that way over the last 50 years: more and more neglect of big cities by the Federal Government, and the same pattern is played out often at the State level, where you have Governors being elected by non-city populations also.

So we have a problem that cries out for resolution. We have a disaster that needs attention. We have a window of opportunity now. I am standing here because I will not give up. I hope my colleagues will not give up. I appeal to everybody out there with common sense to understand this magic window of opportunity.

The cold war is over. We do not have to dedicate large amounts of resources to fighting the evil empire of the Soviet Union anymore. We have a President who wants to be known as the education President. He has put forward a very progressive, a very comprehensive program.

We have the leadership of the majority in the House of Representatives stating that they are committed to the improvement of education in America. There is a disagreement on how we should approach it, but we can resolve that disagreement probably sometime in the future, maybe, but the important thing is that both parties, both houses of Congress and the White House, are committed to improving education.

We have a window of opportunity. There is a need for people to come to this floor and talk specifically about how we take advantage of that window of opportunity. There is a need for us not to allow a Potemkin Village approach to be taken to education; that is, we have a few outstanding examples of what is happening that is progressive and positive in the country, and we hold up those examples and say, great, we are doing a great job, and we fool ourselves and we fool the American people in general, and make them think that we are really progressing and we have an appropriate education system.

Any system of education in America which does not educate most of the population is a failure. We cannot exist, we cannot survive if the total population is not educated. The elite

education may be the best in the world, the education of the graduate students and the scientists and technicians at the very top. The Ph.D. degrees in our higher education institutions, they may be the very best education in the world but they are educating a very small percentage of the total population. The world does not run on the basis of Ph.D's, top scientists, or top technicians. The world runs only when people all up and down the scale have some degree of education.

The example I have used before is when you get on an airplane, do not worry about the pilot. The pilot has the best training in the world. I think we spend more to train pilots than we do any other occupation. Pilots of airplanes in America especially have the best training that you can get, the most up-to-date training. They have rigorous standards imposed upon them.

We may complain about the FAA not being tough enough on airlines in terms of certain safety requirements of the planes and certain equipment failures, et cetera, but nobody ever complains about inadequate training of pilots. So they are well educated.

But when you get on a plane, you had better worry about the guy who put the oil in the oil pits. You have to worry about the man who put the gasoline in, if he read the meters right. You have to worry about the mechanic who tightened the bolts, and a whole array of people who did not go to graduate school, who did not receive very expensive and thorough training. All of them, too, they have to be educated.

It is true of our total society. There is hardly an operation within our society where we do not have people all up and down the scale who need more education in order to do the job well. If they do not do the job well, then we may have some disasters resulting. Serious things happen when people who do not necessarily have high education credentials do not have the education they need to do their job at whatever level they have to do it.

We have serious consequences when the productivity of the total society goes down, because the people who are needed for those production jobs at various levels are not there. We cannot exist and compete as a Nation if we neglect large numbers of our students in our inner-city communities. We need an across-the-board approach where the suburbs, the cities, everybody is keyed to being given the best education possible. Opportunities to learn and opportunity to learn standards have to be important to everybody.

I want to describe the comprehensive approach that we talked about when I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education. We reorganized the Office of Education, Research, and Improvement. We said, you have to take a comprehensive approach. I am talking mainly about construction and the need to address ourselves to school facilities and provide a safe environment, a healthy environment as step

one. But we have to have an overall comprehensive approach. That is basic and that is No. 1. The comprehensive approach means that every aspect of the problems related to education have to be examined.

A comprehensive approach means that Americans should stop oversimplifying what is necessary to educate our children. Everybody is an expert on education. They think they are experts in education.

While it is important that everybody be in on the dialogue, because the dialogue means that maybe they will wake up to how important it is, and when the time comes to vote for elected officials, the time comes to select the people who are going to educate our children, we are aware; everybody needs to be aware. But let us not assume that everybody is qualified to determine how our schools should operate.

We should not oversimplify. We do not oversimplify in the area of defense and armaments. We know experts are needed. All of us have a stake in what happens in terms of the protection we receive from the Department of Defense, but we do not oversimplify and assume we can do it. We should not oversimplify in education. We should understand everything across-the-board, and that is one point we tried to make when we reorganized the Office of Education, Research and Improvement.

We called for certain institutes: an institute for the education of at-risk students to deal with some of the problems that our inner cities face with our students.

We called for an institute for early childhood education. More and more we are learning that early childhood education is critical, because children learn more in their early years than we imagined, and what happens in those early years can set the tone for the ability of a child to learn for the rest of their lives.

We called for an institute for curriculum improvement. We also called for an institute for governance and management. I am going to talk a bit about governance and management of schools, because I think that governance at the macrolevel, governance at the level of the Congress of the United States, means we ought to make decisions here about education which are really going to promote the improvement of education.

Governance at the microlevel means that down at the local education level, the superintendents of schools, the school principals, we have to have the best governance and the best management there, too.

Although improving facilities and physical environments is critical, there are other problems. One of those problems I stumbled upon when I was in my district for the past district work period that surprised me greatly.

We have a space problem in New York, as I said before. There were 91,000

young people that did not have a place to sit when school opened last September. As a result of that space problem, one group that I worked with, the Central Brooklyn Martin Luther King Commission, which is dedicated to improving education in central Brooklyn, that group decided to join with me in making a survey of the schools in my congressional district.

We wanted to make a survey to find out who are these schools, which schools still have a major space problem, which schools have overcrowding to a degree that is unacceptable. As we started to make the survey, we started by checking written documents and found that they were of little use, because people were not telling the truth. You would have a situation where a school would state that they had no overcrowding problem, but when you went to the school you found out that they had three lunch periods. One school had five lunch periods.

□ 2030

Why do schools have three lunch periods? Because they are overcrowded, and they cannot get the students a lunch period in a reasonable amount of time. So instead of having one or two lunch periods, there are so many children they have to have three. I found one school that had to have five. Most people cannot comprehend this because even I find it hard to comprehend.

I discovered in my district a school where children start eating lunch at 9:45. They have to eat lunch at 9:45 because the school is so crowded that is the only way they will get lunch served. The last ones are served at 2:30. The first lunch period begins at 9:45. It is that overcrowded. So no matter what they say on paper about not being overcrowded, you can tell by just asking how many lunch periods do you have.

But then you can walk around and find groups of kids sitting in the halls. You can find storage rooms which have groups of kids, obvious things are happening when you walk around and look that you see that indicate that you still have a major overcrowding problem.

There is one overcrowding problem, there is one aspect of this problem that really shocked me that I could not see with my own eyes, and that is in one of the districts, district 23. I do not want to bore anybody, but in New York City we have 32 school districts which are subunits of the local education agency. The board of education comprises the local education agency for New York City. It is broken down into 32 subdivisions. Each one of the subdivisions has a superintendent. And the overall board of education has a chief executive officer who is called the chancellor.

So in my district I have parts, in my congressional district I have parts of five subunits, five local school districts. These local school districts are all shaped by natural neighborhood

boundaries so they are not all the same size. But if you have a situation in a city as a whole where overcrowding is taking place, the last thing you expect is to find any district that does not have an overcrowding problem. You certainly do not expect to find a district that has empty classrooms, that has a situation where construction is not the problem but governance and management are the problem. And because of the governance and management of this particular district, because of its problems, you have overcrowding increased in the surrounding districts. And I am talking about district 23, which covers an area that became famous in 1967 and 1968, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville District.

Ocean Hill-Brownsville became famous because it was one of the first experiments of community control and the local community control effort clashed with the teachers union. And we had a long strike in New York City that got national and sometimes international attention. So Ocean Hill-Brownsville is the place, a district that comprised the district boundary of district 23.

Our overcrowding survey led to this discovery: that district 23 does not have an overcrowding problem but a shrinkage problem, where despite the fact that districts all around it are overcrowded and getting worse in terms of their population increase, the number of pupils going to school at district 23 is shrinking. It was a phenomenon which I decided to look at in far greater detail, and you cannot examine the overcrowding problems in this district without knowing some of the history.

Ocean Hill-Brownsville had national attention when they had the great teachers strike, but then it moved off the front page when peace came. There was a settlement. Unfortunately that settlement included a takeover by the local political club, the assemblymen of the local political club politically moved in in an election and they gained control of the local school board. And you had peace, but the peace was a peace with corruption, a peace with violence in the schools, low attendance. The district became known as a place which was an extension of the patronage system, the local clubhouse. It did not matter whether people did their job right or not, as long as they were approved by the local clubhouse.

It took a long fight to get rid of the political takeover of district 23, Ocean Hill-Brownsville. I was a part of the struggle to set the district free. We finally freed it of political control, and one of our rallying cries was, stop political interference and let the educators educate.

As the State senator for that area, I certainly worked hard to make certain that other elected officials would not get involved anymore in hamstringing the quality of education within the Ocean Hill-Brownsville school district.

The problem is that that was a stupid position to take.

Politicians, public officials should never say that they are not going to be involved in local schools or education at any level. Yes, public officials should not interfere. They should not seek to use schools for patronage, but district 23 is a perfect example how when the public officials back away, they are no longer looking, leave it to the educators, terrible things can happen.

What has happened in district 23, because we took it out of the spotlight for 14 years, minimum political scrutiny, certainly no political interference, a superintendent was selected 14 years ago. And that superintendent has been there 14 years in a situation which is very unusual in New York City. Most school superintendents do not survive, do not stay in one place for 14 years. So we have a superintendent of this particular district who has been there 14 years.

The district is so bad, however, parents are fleeing the district. They have no overcrowding problem because parents have decided they do not want their kids to go to the school, to the district schools. So large numbers of schools have empty space in a city which is racked by the problem of overcrowding. District 23 has no overcrowding problem. The parents are pulling their kids out in great numbers.

The same district, the State has been observing the quality of education there. The overall citywide school board of education has been observing and several schools are under probation to make it simpler. They call them cert schools, schools which are under review. At least five schools are under review. Two schools recently were taken over by the chancellor for the overall school system. And the chancellor has what he calls a chancellor's district where he has created a district out of the 32 districts. Any long time, low performing schools are taken and put into a special supervisory situation where the chancellor's office oversees these schools. So two schools have been taken and at least three more are on the list in district 23.

I am giving you a case history related to governance and management and how governance and management in this particular case exacerbates our space problem.

The parents have made a decision. They know what is going on. Instead of fighting to improve the school district, they are just pulling the children out. Parents voted, nevertheless, to get rid of the old school board. They voted out the old school board. So in addition to understanding what is going on to the extent where they refuse to let their children go to school in the district, they also put forth an effort to get rid of the old school board and voted a new school board.

The new school board now decides that the district superintendent who has been there for 14 years has had an

opportunity to prove that he can educate children and can run a decent system. He can meet the challenges of that particular district or he cannot. They assume he cannot. Things have steadily gotten worse. District 23 is now at the very bottom of the list in terms of math and reading achievement. They have citywide tests, and you compare the scores from one district to another, this district is on the bottom. So it is pretty clear that the superintendent cannot, who has been there 14 years, cannot do the job.

The new school board votes not to renew his contract. Instead of him gracefully admitting he cannot do the job, this particular superintendent has decided to wage war against the new school board. They voted not to renew his contract. That is the procedure. You start advertising for other superintendents and they are in the process of doing that. But in the meantime the present superintendent is using the resources of the school system, the children, the parents to fight against the policy decision of the present local school board and he is determined to stay there. They are now reviewing resumes of people who want to become superintendents in the district. Among the resumes the old superintendent, who has been there 14 years and failed miserably, has submitted his resume. The old superintendent, still the present superintendent until June 30, also recommended five principals for tenure. As he is going on, he recommends principals for tenure. Once principals are recommended for tenure and receive tenure, they cannot be fired. According to the way the system operates, tenure means you are there and you cannot be moved.

Three of these five principals that were recommended were from these lowest performing schools. Again, the new school board decided to meet the challenge. They challenged the superintendent's recommendation of the five principals for tenure and said these are people who have failed and the failure is illustrated dramatically and documented by State records and by the chancellor's own criticisms of the district. Nevertheless, because of the arcane laws that relate to tenure, they will receive tenure, five failed principals will receive tenure. That is the way the law is written. If the superintendent recommends you, all the years that you have been there he has given you a satisfactory rating, there is no way to deny tenure.

So we are saddled probably with five principals who have created a problem by overseeing the lowest performing schools. The majority of the teachers in this district are also substitute teachers, because the word gets around that it is not a good place to be and it is hard to get good teachers to come in. Those old teachers who were there, were the best, lured out to other districts or they were even encouraged to retire because part of the mayor's reduction of the budget for the board of

education in the past 3 years has been an incentive plan to encourage the most experienced teachers and administrators to retire. More experienced people make higher salaries. If you get rid of the experienced people with the higher salaries, you lower your budget. But nobody bothered to use common sense and said, if you get rid of experienced people, you also lower the quality of everything there: administration, teaching.

So we have a massive failure that is exacerbated by the fact that the city and the State are encouraging experienced people to leave the system and new people coming in have no mentors, no way to be trained.

We have one element after another which piles on this disastrous situation within district 23. Most of the teachers who teach math and science in junior high schools did not major in math and science in junior high schools. You have a situation where there is a total collapse. There is a total collapse.

Education is not taking place in district 23, Ocean Hill-Brownsville; 11,000 children go to school here. Again, the figures in New York are very grandiose figures. This is one of the smallest districts in New York City. Each school district is supposed to comprise no less than 15,000 youngsters. They only have 11,000 because so many have fled. They have fled the disaster.

The district right next to it, district 17, has 30,000 pupils. District 18 has 20,000 pupils. They have an overcrowding problem in that district because the parents do not want their children to go to school in district 23.

You have a situation where education is not taking place in district 23. There has been a total collapse. But nevertheless the superintendent, Michael Vega—I am using his name because I think it is outrageous what is happening there—Superintendent Michael Vega is still insisting that he should remain a superintendent. He is waging war against the school board that is trying to remove him.

He is using the resources of the school, sending notes home with kids to parents. He has parent-teacher associations that he has cultivated over the years, very small groups, only a handful of parents involved. But they are the ones who get involved so they are elected. They are the officers. He has cultivated them and they are assisting him as he wages war against the district to try to remain in the district where he has been for 14 years, failed totally. The district has collapsed all around him and we have a war going on.

For that reason, Michael Vega becomes a parasite. Michael Vega in that district becomes the enemy of education. All the parents need to understand, he is the enemy of education. We have a situation where moral indignation is appropriate from every level. We should have moral indignation by every elected official in the area.

The chancellor of the whole school system was given new powers by the

State legislature just this year in early January. No, late last fall, he was given new powers, and he can move in and do things that he could not do before in local districts. So the moral indignation of the chancellor is needed. The chancellor has criticized the system for its failure. Nevertheless, Michael Vega continues to move in ways which might result in him being re-appointed as the superintendent.

We have a commissioner of education for the State. The moral indignation of the commissioner, the powers of the commissioner should be brought to bear to get rid of a situation with respect to governance and management which is totally unacceptable.

We have a powerful United Federation of Teachers, a union. They should weigh in against this immoral situation. The mayor should weigh in against this situation where because of our arcane procedures and laws, a superintendent who has been there 14 years, failed, and an attempt is being made by the newly elected board to move him out, he still feels that he has the power. And he is still using the resources of the taxpayers, the resources of the district to fight the decision to be moved.

□ 2045

I have given this case history example, because I want to admit that all of the problems of our schools are not going to be resolved by any action by a government at the Federal level or by action at even State level. There are problems at the local level that have to be taken care of, and we have to deal with them as elected officials by confronting our own constituencies with the problems.

I served as a commissioner of a community development agency in New York with responsibility for the community action program, and we were major proponents of community control. We pushed hard for community control. And when the law was changed to set up community school districts, we were the major advocates and major proponents of community control.

What we have witnessed is that when we put local people in control, parents of the students in that area, poor people who live in the neighborhood, we can have some dramatic results that we would never expect. Corruption is not limited to middle class or rich people. Corruption takes place quickly also among people who are poor and who are local and who have something at stake in the system.

We were shocked to find that we could have a situation where one job, maybe pays \$15,000, to get one job secured, a member of a school board will move to ruin the lives of 15,000 youngsters. They do not care. They logroll with each other about jobs and they put in people who are not responsible and they allow all kinds of horrible situations to go on when their kids are in the schools and their neighbors' children are in the schools. It is shocking.

And for that reason, of course, I supported reforms which allowed the chancellor to have the power to step in.

Well, superintendents, like Michael Vega, chief executive officers, they are paid very well. They are supposed to make certain that laymen do not get away with these kinds of excesses. But instead of being the force that makes certain that professional education goes on, many superintendents become part of the problem. The corruption is driven from the office of the superintendent, a kind of corruption which we cannot arrest anybody for, a corruption which is an acquiescence to low standards, an acquiescence to mediocre, incompetent people in order to gain friendships.

For this superintendent, the most important thing is that he maintain friendships with enough people to get the votes he needs in order to continue there. And since the votes were taken away and the old school board that supported him was thrown out, he now is attempting to go to another level and get the power of the parents in each individual school, those few that he has nurtured along, and will promote a little revolution to maintain himself in power.

We should not let this exist, and I am taking this opportunity to give this case history here because I want to sound the alarm for people back in the 11th Congressional District, those who live in the District 23 area. The people who live in District 17, which is next to District 23, this is their fight too because their district is overcrowded as a result of kids fleeing from District 23. People whose children go to school in District 18, their district is overcrowded because children are fleeing from District 18.

It is a ridiculous situation, because throughout the whole city we have a shortage of places to sit, of classroom space, and District 23 has a surplus because nobody wants to go to school in District 23. We must deal with that situation.

We have a window of opportunity to really improve education in America. From where I stand, from where we are placed in the hierarchy of decision-making, the Members of Congress are not to take lightly this opportunity. We have a window of opportunity where the Nation is not faced with any great crisis, the Nation can focus its attention on education in a way it never could before, starting with the Federal Government.

We are not the major players in the education scenario. At best, we have only a minor role, but that role is important. The Federal Government is the stimulant. The Federal Government pushes things. The percentage of money spent by the Federal Government on education at most is about 7 percent. States and local governments provide the rest of the money for education, but despite this small percentage, Federal participation in education, through title I, through Head

Start, through various programs at the higher education level, Federal participation has a stimulant effect that is a very positive one.

We would not have certain kinds of standards that exist in our school settlements if it had not been for the impetus of the Federal Government. The education of children with disabilities, special education programs, would not exist if it were not for the Federal Government. The States and the localities are paying a greater percentage of the money, but the standards are being set and the high quality of education is being driven by the fact that the Federal Government is involved.

We have an opportunity to take advantage of certain historical events that have occurred recently. The fact that the Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and in that act they mandated that the FCC should find a way to give some kinds of special attention to schools and libraries with respect to lowering the cost for telecommunications by having the providers pay into a universal fund, that has happened now. It has come to pass.

On May 7 the Federal Communications Commission voted to establish a universal fund for libraries and schools. That universal fund will provide the necessary funding at a 20-percent discount for the richest schools and a 90-percent discount for the poorest schools. That is an opportunity we should not pass up.

We have an opportunity in that there is agreement between both parties that the Federal Government has a major role in education, and in this Congress, the 105th Congress, there is a greater possibility that we will have some positive steps taken on a bipartisan basis than ever before.

So let us not fail to understand how serious it is. We have a disaster out there. It may not be in all our communities, in the suburbs, in the rural areas, but we might want to take a look and accept the fact that in the inner cities of our Nation we have a disaster.

We have a disaster that is not unique to New York. It exists in practically all of our inner-city communities. We need help. We need disaster relief. We do not have floods, we do not have earthquakes, we do not have mud slides. God did not do it directly, it is a man-made crisis, and partially it is made by bad decisions that have been made at every level, bad decisions by the Governors, bad decisions by the local mayors, and of course at the local level the school boards often make bad decisions also, but the Federal stimulus is the best thing that we have to offer, and we should make certain that from where we are we continue the Federal stimulus to assist education, starting with a revival of the construction initiative that the President put forth before.

Let us not give up. We need the \$5 billion construction initiative in the Federal budget.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, my colleague in the chair, and to everyone else who is here, let me first of all apologize for making you stay late, but I have delayed my own departure this evening. I could be almost home with my family. I have delayed my own departure this evening by better than 3 hours, because I think what I have to talk about is very important.

And regardless of what my colleagues may think about my legislative voting record and regardless of what they think about anything else, I hope they realize that I am not one of the Members of the House who rises to speak every day; I am not up on every subject every day acting as though I am an authority on everything, but when I do know something, and when it is important to my district and when it is important to this Nation, I think I have a responsibility to speak up on it.

The matter I am going to talk about now is a matter that is of importance to everyone throughout this entire Nation. It is going to mean whether or not our economy expands, it is going to mean whether or not we have jobs or whether or not our industry moves offshore. That is what I believe. That is what many other people across this country believe. That is what many other Members in this Chamber believe.

We will get the answer to this question, I believe, by the middle of July. We do not have to wait very long. Probably, at most, about 6 weeks. Because the Environmental Protection Agency is in the process of recommending new air quality standards, this at a time when we have been cleaning our air, the air quality. And, believe me, my district is around Pittsburgh, PA, once described as hell with the lid off. Back in the days when people had to sweep off their lawns because of the dust that came from the mills. Back in the days when if we hung our clothes out, they probably were dirtier when we took them off the line than when we washed them and hung them out. We had to shake off those clothes to get the dust off. People would go to work in the morning, and by the time they got to work they had black rings around their collars from the dust that would settle on their bodies.

We had tremendous problems with air quality. Towns like Donora, PA, saw people dropping dead in the street from the pollution. We know about air pollution.

A group called GASP, the Group Against Smog and Pollution, was born in Pittsburgh out of this fear for people's health. As a news reporter for 24 years, I covered our city as we were cleaning up the air. As a father of two young children, I want clean air. But I

am convinced by the EPA making these standards more stringent, while we are cleaning our air, that in fact our air will remain dirtier longer, and there are scientists who agree with me on that.

We have already set the finish line in this race to clean our air. We have definitive goals that we want to reach. And once we begin this process, those goals are erased and we extend the time out 10 years, 12 years, in fact, we really do not know how long, until we will actually have to hit those very same goals or goals which may be a tiny bit more stringent.

So if we are concerned, for example, about the health of that asthmatic 8- or 9-year-old child on the playground, and we do not want that child to breathe dirty air, to have to gasp to get air in their lungs, then we should agree with what Carol Browner of the EPA is about to try to do, unless we want action now. Because what she wants to do will perhaps clean the air up, but it will do it when that 8- or 9-year-old child is in college.

So instead of hitting ozone targets that say, for example, if we have a goal that we have to reach by 1999, well, we may not have to hit that goal until the year 2010. So we are going to wait 10 more years, 11 more years, 12 more years until we hit those goals.

There is not only the problem of making that asthmatic child wait longer for the air to be clean, there is the problem that we have with our economy. Industries across this Nation have spent tens of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars individually, billions of dollars untold since the 1990 clean air amendments to clean the air. And now, all of a sudden, we are saying, wait a minute, what we said to spend money on, the particulate matter, that is the soot that is in the air, the soot which rises up out of the smokestacks of this country, we are not measuring it in a small enough measure. Instead of 10 microns, we want to make it 2.5 microns.

Sounds very scientific, but what we are saying is we want to measure smaller particles, but we are not saying what those particles should be. And we do not have enough science because, understand, we only have 50 monitors in this whole Nation which can measure 2.5 microns of the soot, the particulate matter, that EPA now wants us to go to. Fifty monitors are not enough and do not supply enough data that we can be sure that we are going to take this course of action which will cost over a million jobs, I believe, and others agree with me, and will cost untold billions of dollars.

Let me tell my colleagues about my district a little bit and why I am probably a little more concerned, and other people who are from what we call Rust Belt regions, have the same concerns.

In southwestern Pennsylvania, as we cleaned up that air that I talked about a few moments ago, partly because we were cleaning that air up, partly because the companies were investing in

those air pollution control devices instead of making capital improvements in the processes in which they were manufacturing the product, in other words dollars are going in to scrubbers in their smokestacks, where we needed that, we needed that to improve our health, but those dollars were not available to upgrade their manufacturing base, to buy new equipment, to invest in R&D and new technologies. And so many of our manufacturers fell behind.

□ 2100

Over a 13-county area in southwestern Pennsylvania we lost in the 1970's and 1980's 155,000 manufacturing jobs. As I said earlier, I was a reporter back then. I stood outside many of those steel mills, many of those glass plants, car manufacturing plants, car part manufacturing plants, and watched as thousands upon thousands of workers walked out of the door for the last time.

Now, as we are trying to rebuild that economy, we had a chance, at least a shot, a few weeks ago to lure back an automobile manufacturing plant. They were looking to occupy a 1,000-acre site, provide 2,500 families in southwestern Pennsylvania with jobs. But when they took a look at Pennsylvania being part of the Northeast ozone transport region, when they took a look as what was going to happen or what was going to be proposed perhaps with these new air pollution regulations, they said, we are not going to move there, we are not going to provide that opportunity.

I am not making this story up. It was published in the Pittsburgh Business Times. The company said they would have had to purchase over \$3 million in pollution credits to locate in Pennsylvania. But if they went upwind, where much of our pollution comes from, to our sister States to the west, they would not have had to purchase those very expensive credits.

What the EPA is proposing to do in tightening the regulations does not do anything to improve those States like Pennsylvania, which are getting dirty air from other States. And we have counties across this Nation, we have cities across this Nation, if we vacated them completely, moved all the manufacturing out, took all the cars out, moved all the vehicle traffic out, moved all the people out, those regions at certain days of the year would still be out of compliance.

Much of this particulate matter is found in nature. What are we going to do about that particulate matter in the air, that dust that is found in nature? Let me tell my colleagues, I understand that the EPA has a pretty bad track record in my State of Pennsylvania. It is a real credibility problem. So when they say, trust us, we are going to improve air quality by tightening these regulations in the midst of the air getting cleaner, so they are going to tell us, first of all, stop doing what

is working, stop doing what we told you to do before, do something new.

I am saying to them in Pennsylvania, your word is not very good. Because you see, you told us in Pennsylvania that we needed to go to a centralized emissions testing and then Gov. Robert Casey began to implement that system. He moved the necessary legislation. And we even had a contract with a company called Envirotest Systems. It was a company out of Arizona. They were hired to run this testing system. It was a 7-year contract that could have given this Envirotest Systems company profits of over \$100 million a year.

Many of us knew that this was a bad idea. The people of Pennsylvania did not want it. We fought it. We gathered over 100,000 signatures on petitions and we opposed the testing system. As it turned out, EPA had misled Pennsylvania, we did not have to go to that centralized system.

This was not necessary for Pennsylvania to comply with the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990. But by this point, we had the contract. By this point, we were stuck with 86 E-check centers built around the State's 67 counties. In late 1995, Envirotest threatened to sue Pennsylvania on that contract. They wanted more than \$350 million for expenses and for loss of profits.

But then we had a new Governor, Tom Rich. His administration decided it was better to deal with them, to strike an agreement. So he reached a settlement calling for the State of Pennsylvania, the citizens of Pennsylvania, to pay \$145 million to Envirotest. We settled it. Of that \$145 million, that big whoops by the EPA that they misled Pennsylvania, not one penny of that \$145 million cleaned up one speck of air.

I believe that these EPA proposed revisions to the national ambient air quality standards for ozone and particulate matter are really going to be costly to us as a Nation. It will, in fact, keep the air dirtier longer, as I said. It will cost industry. It will cost jobs. We really have to take time to think about what we are doing.

First of all, there is a question as to why we are moving ozone standards, which is, in effect, smog, at the same time we are moving the particulate matter standard, which of course particulate matter, as I said, is soot. We have to do something in regard to particulate matter, but all we have to do is review it.

Why do we have to review it? Well, the American Lung Association filed suit against the Environmental Protection Agency because every 5 years they are to review these standards. They had not done that since 1987. In 1992, 5 years later, they were to review these standards, but they had not. They do not have to tighten, they do not have to make it harder for Americans to clean up the air. All they have to do is stick with what is working still, stick

with good science, stick with what is improving the health of this Nation. But they have decided, I think, that they are going to take another course of action.

We have a problem with the fact that they have put ozone in with us because there was no lawsuit involving ozone. But they have thrown ozone in. What is the reason that they have decided to include ozone with the particulate matter? We do not know exactly what that reason is.

We had Ms. Browner in front of the Committee on Commerce, two of our subcommittees, for over 8 years. I am still not sure why it is that she has decided to blend those two issues together. But for sure, they would not have to do anything regarding the smog issue or ozone until next year. But for some reason, we are moving these two very complex issues together. The present standard for ozone is 0.12 parts per million averaged over a 1-hour period. The Scientific Advisory Board said that they thought it would be better to reduce that to a range from 0.12 parts per million to somewhere between 0.07 and 0.09 and do it over an 8-hour period.

I have no problem with going to an 8-hour period. But also we heard from one scientist after another is that there is no bright line where there are health benefits derived by the public within this range. So they have chosen somewhere in the middle that have range 0.08, which will in fact throw 400 counties, distribute counties across this Nation out of compliance.

What happens when you are out of compliance? Well, businesses in your region, businesses in the noncompliance area will not expand. They are not going to invest more money, and certainly other companies like that automobile plant that I mentioned are not going to move into your region. So economically you are strangled, you are hung up, you are not going to grow, jobs will not occur. And when you do not have jobs, people do not have health benefits, cannot afford to go to the doctors and they derive bad health benefits from that, just as if they were breathing the dirty air.

Let me take time right now to recognize my dear friend from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce and the Dean of the House of Representatives. He has been here continuously longer than any other Member of the House. And I think, beyond a shadow of a doubt, everyone recognizes that he knows more about the Clean Air Act, the clean air, and the amendments and this issue than anyone else in the House of Representatives. It has been my pleasure to work with my colleague and to learn from him as we have moved through with this issue.

I recognize now the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. JOHN DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my dear friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], who has provided

such valuable leadership in addressing the important issue that he now raises in the House. I want to commend him for his distinguished and able service here on behalf of the people that he serves and on behalf of the people of the United States. I also want to thank my colleague for his kind remarks towards me.

Mr. Speaker, the situation here is a serious one. It is interesting to note that we are making, according to Administrator Browner, significant progress in cleaning up the air and that that progress will continue for at least 5 years and that no change in the Clean Air Act is necessary to continue significant progress in terms of evading pollution. It is interesting that in the same appearance before the Committee on Commerce, in which she said those things, she had to admit that much of what are the supporting facts or science with regard to the changes that EPA proposes with regard to particulates and ozone, she does not know the answer and she does not have the science upon which she can base the judgments that she needs to.

Certain facts are very clear. The air is getting better, the air is getting cleaner. Significant progress will be made. One of the admissions made by Ms. Browner before the Committee on Energy and Commerce was that the changes she is suggesting will not significantly result in major improvement in air quality between now and the year 2002.

In addition to this, it is plain that the economic consequences of the rule-making now proposed by EPA will be very, very significant in terms of jobs, opportunity for our people, and competitiveness. It is very plain that the jobs in industrialized America will move to unindustrialized areas and that new brownfields will be created and new greenfields will be torn up for industrial change.

It is also very plain that significant loss of economic opportunity and economic impetus for this country impends and that the consequences of these rules being adopted will be that the United States will see significant jobs lost to Mexico, Canada, and other places around the world as American industry moves out.

One might ask why that situation will obtain. The answer is very simple. What is going to transpire is that the rules suggested by EPA will create no less than 400 nonattainment areas in the United States and those areas, while getting cleaner, will be legislated into nonattainment by the rules that are being suggested by EPA.

The consequences of this are that those areas will become subject to sanctions, will become subject to transportation limitations, will become subject to losses of jobs stemming from losses of building permits, and to changes which will be imposed on industry with regard to the fashion in which business is conducted.

More importantly, business will be faced with the significant problems of

achieving building permits. Ordinary citizens will face significant risk to lifestyle; and while those lifestyle changes are impossible to predict at this time, the rules which could be imposed on those areas could include things like controls on barbecuing, house painting, on running of power mowers, operation of motor boats, and other things in the areas which are nonattainment.

The consequences in terms of lost jobs, lost opportunity, loss of quality of life by Americans is indeed significant. While it is impossible to predict exactly what the consequences of this will be, they will be extremely onerous and need not be imposed upon American industry and upon American citizens.

The cost to the American people of the changes that this is going to impose will be enormous. One of the interesting things is that if we had, for example, a fourth grader playing in a grade school playground here in Washington, DC, under existing rules and regulations, that child is going to live in an area that meets existing standards by 1999, a mere 2 years from today. If EPA adopts the new standard, EPA hopes to force continued progress. But this attainment deadline will not be enforced, at least according to the transitional guidance issued by EPA with the proposed rules.

Instead, EPA will provide a new attainment date with the new standard. That allows States to take up to 12 years to bring an area into attainment. So in point of fact, what will transpire to this child is that 12 years after today he will live in an area which has reached attainment if all goes well.

If the past is prologue for the future, we know that EPA and the States will use the maximum amount of time allowed. So in point of fact, that child, instead of seeing the cleanup of his area or her area in 2 years, will observe it in a period of 12 years.

The number of counties that are going to be put into nonattainment area is significant, as I mentioned, better than 400 in the United States. It is interesting to note that amongst that number will be a significant number of counties in the State that I have the privilege and the pleasure to represent. Some 26 counties in Michigan will be legislated from attainment into nonattainment. Some 26 counties in Ohio will find same situations.

EPA's standards may result in cleaner air, but they may also result in significant hardship which will be imposed because of the requirements for sanctions and other things to be imposed.

□ 2115

It should be noted that of the 50 States, all 50 will see questions raised about the validity and the propriety of their State implementation plans. The consequence of this is again to subject every county within those States to the possibility of sanctions, penalties

and other things. And failure to comply with these will subject the cities, the counties and the States to the strong possibility of citizen suits which will take control away from the local units of government, away from the States and put them into the courts. The consequences of this, I reiterate to my colleagues, are indeed serious. I commend again the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership. One of the questions I did not mention that is going to confront us is the Clean Air Act as now constituted requires all Federal highway funds to be withheld by EPA as an automatic sanction for nonattainment areas, whether they be counties, whether they be cities or whether they be States. As a result, industrial and transportation projects can be delayed years and decades by the Clean Air Act requirements in nonattainment areas where good faith effort is now being made by the citizens and by their governments to comply with the law. These changes suggested by EPA are extremely destructive, hazardous of economic growth, unneeded and will result in serious hardship not only for American industry and competitiveness but also for the people of the United States. I would hope that those who are within reach of my voice or are observing what I am saying will take to heart what I have said and communicate with the administration about their concerns of the unwisdom of this kind of unnecessary step.

Mr. KLINK. I thank the gentleman for his input again and just laud him for everything that he has done to help us on this issue. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was the author and worked with us all on a letter to the administration where we as Democrats sought to sit down with our President to talk about the seriousness of this matter. We have been relatively quiet up until now, working very hard behind the scenes, trying to get through to the administration, trying to talk to Administrator Browner. The administration has dragged their feet. They do not want to seem to want to sit down and talk to us. We have issued letters, we have made phone calls. Many of us have buttonholed people who work at the White House who we think are close to the President trying to impress upon them how serious we are. I will not stand idly by and watch the same kind of degradation to our industrial base that I watched during the 1970's and 1980's. I know that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] likewise will not watch that in his State of Michigan or anywhere else in this country. Yet we have not heard from the administration. So now we have prepared a piece of legislation. I am hoping, and we have gotten a great start, it is going to be a bipartisan bill. We are working with our friends on the Republican side to say, "Don't change the standards. We're cleaning the air. The economy is moving forward." This is not something where we want to

have EPA say 5 years from now, billions of dollars later, millions of jobs lost later, "Whoops, we made a mistake."

We know that it will take at least 2 years, Mr. Speaker, for the only 2 companies that manufacture these PM-2.5 monitors to make enough to get them distributed around this Nation. Then according to the law, it has to be monitored for at least 3 years to have the data. Two years to manufacture and distribute, 3 years to collect the data, adds up to 5 years. At the end of that 5 years, by law, this matter will have to be reviewed again or there will be another group suing the EPA. We are saying, take that 5 years, make sure that the science is right and as Carol Browner said herself, as other people in the administration have said, as scientists have said, during that 5 years nothing is lost because we are cleaning the air. We are moving forward with improving the breathability and the healthiness of the air across this country.

I would mention one other thing that really bothers me. Industry is on our side on this issue. Labor is on our side on this issue. In southwestern Pennsylvania, the American Lung Association of western Pennsylvania is on our side on this issue. Also on our side are the State legislatures of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina and South Dakota, along with Tennessee, Utah and West Virginia. All of these legislatures and many of them, both the State House as well as the State Senate have passed resolutions or concurrent resolutions saying, "Don't do this. You're throwing it back on us, Federal Government. It is up to us, the State, to do the State implementation plan. We've begun our State implementation plan. We're cleaning the air. Now you're moving the finish line farther down the road, making it more expensive, making it more difficult and in fact stopping us from cleaning the air."

Who else is on our side? The Governor of Arizona, two Governors of Arkansas, both of which followed the current President into the governor's mansion. The Governor of Delaware has written a letter. The Governor of Florida, the Governor of Georgia, the Governor of Illinois, the Governor of Indiana, the Governor of Kansas, the Governor of Kentucky, the Governor of Louisiana, the Governor of Michigan, the Governor of Mississippi, the Governor of Missouri, the Governor of Montana, the Governor of North Carolina, the Governor of Ohio, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Governor of South Carolina, the Governor of Tennessee, the Governor of Texas, the Governor of Utah, the Governor of Virginia is with us as is the Governor of Wisconsin, the Governor of Wyoming, and then we have had many governors join together and sign letters together. We

have had letters from people within the Clinton administration, including Jerry Glover of the Small Business Administration, the Department of Air Force at Wright Patterson because you understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Defense Department may not be able to have aircraft flying in certain areas at certain times of the day because of the particulate matter given off by the exhaust of those aircraft. The same goes for commercial aircraft. I do not know what we would do, and we would really be in a pickle, it would seem to me, if our Nation would be attacked during a bad pollution day. I do not know if EPA would try to stop us from defending ourselves with these aircraft taking off or not.

That is almost how stupid all of this sounds. But we have a stack of resolutions, and I would tell my colleagues they are better than a foot high. These are letters, they are resolutions from industries and from State legislatures and governors across this Nation, telling us, this will impact their area negatively. It will inhibit their ability to clean the air. We talk about particulate matters. As I said this is something, the smaller particulate matter which is soot is composed of sulfates and nitrates and acids and ammoniums and elemental carbon and organic compounds, but a lot of this particulate matter also can be derived through industrial activities, through farming, mining, through driving down a dirt road. Because the particulate matter is 2.5 microns, which again I hate to get technical, but because it is of a certain size, does not necessarily mean it is as toxic as some other substance of that size. It does not mean it is as dense as another substance of that same size. Do toxicity and density and other kinds of things like this cause one particular PM-2.5 particle to cause you worse health effects than others? Is it when you have a blend of various substances that are taken into your lungs that you have a worse health matter? We do not have the answer, but yet it appears that the EPA and Director Browner are on their way down this pathway to hell for this country economically by rushing us into this before we know that we have all the scientific facts.

Again I would not ask my colleagues to depend on me because I am not a scientist, I am a lowly former news reporter, who has now been elected to Congress, who studied this issue. Let me call on those who I do know and I want to give Members some quotes.

Dr. Joe Mauderly is the current chairman of the scientific panel who has made their recommendations. As he appeared before the Committee on Commerce, he said, "While I support the proposed change for ozone as logical from a scientific viewpoint, I have to point out that it should also be considered that an equal or greater overall health benefit might be derived by using the Nation's resources to achieve compliance with the present standard

in presently noncompliant regions, than by enforcing nationwide compliance with a more restrictive standard."

In other words, what he is saying is we might be better off to make sure that we continue to clean the air to the specifications that we must adhere to now in areas that are in noncompliance rather than put everybody else to new levels of compliance and just start throwing money at that before we have all of the science.

He also points out that he is concerned about New Mexico and other arid regions with alkaline soil. He says, "The substantial portion of soil derived PM, particulate matter, that can exist as PM-2.5 may cause noncompliance with a standard aimed at controlling a different class of PM." In other words, what we are saying is you can have no industrial activity, none. But if you live in an arid region with alkaline soils, such as New Mexico, in nature, you might find yourself out of compliance. Yet we will be forcing industries across this Nation into trying to attain goals that are not attainable.

Let me just again go to Dr. Joe Mauderly, present chairman again of CASAC. He said, "I do not believe, however, that our present understanding of the relationship between PM and health provides a confident basis for implementing a standard that necessitates crippling expenditures or extreme changes in life-style or technology." That is exactly what this would do. First of all, we are going to have a crippling change in technology because we have got to get those PM-2.5 monitors manufactured. We have to get them out there. We have to get the readings and we have to make a determination as to exactly what is the impact of that.

It is going to cause crippling expenditures for industry. They know that. I have a little company that is in my district that was formerly owned by Arco, it is now owned by a company from Canada and we are happy to have Canadian companies come here and provide jobs for Americans. It is always good when that can occur. It is called Nova Chemical. They make styrofoam like you would find on the underside of the dashboard of your car or sometimes in the roof and the other components of the automobiles.

This is a small company, a small chemical company down in Beaver County, PA. But since the 1990 standards went into effect, this small company has spent \$40 million cleaning up the air. Just down the Ohio River a little bit farther in Midland, J & L Specialty Steel, they make stainless steel. We are proud because they are expanding right now, they are putting in a new specialty steel line. I do not know if they would or would not have done this if they when they began the process had been threatened with these new pollution regulations, because they have spent about \$160 million cleaning the air. And they have given us great benefits. They are not complaining

about that because they live in the community, just like the folks at Nova Chemical and Zinc Corp. of America, and USX and Allegheny Teledyne. They live in our community, they want the air to be clean, they have made the expenditure, but now we are moving the finish line farther away from them. That is a problem which all of this country will have to deal with. We have just reached for better or for worse, we will see how it goes, a balanced budget agreement, very historic, the first time since 1969. It was derived as the President sat down with the majority in the House of Representatives. But the basis for that agreement, as I understand, not having been in the room, were some very rosy economic assumptions. Those economic assumptions that we have made would go right out the door if all of a sudden our industry across this Nation were crippled by these new proposed standards. You can forget about it. People will not be taxpayers, they will be tax recipients because the jobs will not be created and in many regions they will lose the jobs. I know that the President, I know the administration, I know that Ms. Browner is hearing from the same mayors that we are hearing from, from the same county commissioners, and other local officials that we are hearing from. They are concerned about the impact that these kinds of changes at the midpoint of this race would have on their ability not only to clean up the air but their ability likewise to have a vibrant economy. Eventually it is up to them, it is up to the States to reach attainment, it is up to the locale to reach the attainment.

□ 2130

Yvonne Atkinson Gates, who is on the board of commissioners of Clark County, NV; that is where Las Vegas is, and everybody knows Clark County. It is booming, they are building homes, they got tremendous amounts of economic growth. But she told our committee this:

Since the economy of Clark County is almost entirely based upon tourism, EPA's designation of our county as nonattainment will do damage to our ability to market our community as safe and clean.

When you are in nonattainment, and as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] said, 400 counties like this would be out of attainment; when you are out of attainment, there is a stigma that is involved. If you want to apply to expand your plant or to put a new plant in, you are in nonattainment, you have got problems. It is going to cost a lot more. You probably will not even attempt to do it. If people are seeking building permits as they are in Clark County to build those thousands upon thousands of homes each month as that area booms and grows, they will not be able to have building permits.

Now a lot has been said about the change of lifestyle, would people be

able to burn their wood burning stoves, would they be able in rural areas to burn brush and leaves and trash as they have in the past? That is going to be up to the local communities to have to make that decision as to how they comply. They may feel and they may indeed not have any alternative but to say to the citizens of this country you are going to have to change your lifestyle, you are going to have to have a new vehicle that burns reformulated gas whether you like it or not. You might have to have a car that is the California style car with the air pollution control, and the cost, 1,500 or \$2,000 more. What will that do for your ability to be able to afford to buy new cars? What will that do to the automobile industry in this country? What will that do for the auto parts industry of this country?

Let me jump just across the border. Let us go to San Jose, CA. Trixie Johnson, vice chair of the National League of Cities, told the Committee on Commerce about this proposed change of air pollution standards. Many of the State implementation plans developed as a result of the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments are just now being implemented. The implementation strategies incorporated in these plans have not been in effect long enough to determine their impact. And now we are saying to the States with that plan you have been working on, that plan that you have had in mind to clean up the air in your state so that you can comply with the federal law, forget about it. Start over again. The target used to be here. Now we are moving it way over there. See if you can hit that. And it is up to you and your industries and your citizens to figure out how to do it. We are out of it, we are the EPA. We are bigger than you. We could change the rules as we move along.

That is exactly what we are being told.

Dr. Barbara Beck I thought was very good when she was in front of the committee. She was from Gradient Corporation. About the ozone standard she said again remember we do not have to move on ozone now. We have to take a look at PM. We do not have to change it; we just have to review it according to the courts. But ozone could wait a year. But about this she said although the approach used by EPA in support of its recommendations is conceptually sound, multiple biases in the analysis result in an overall over estimate of the risk and hence an over estimate of the potential benefits.

Well, if their science is so good, let us take time while we are still cleaning the air, and I remind you again I cannot say it enough that the folks at EPA, including Miss Browner, agree with me, we are still cleaning the air. No matter what we do, the air is going to get cleaner. So let us make sure we are doing it right. Let us make sure that something good is happening.

And I would say to the administration sit down and talk with us. Do not

meander into this. You are taking on this Nation. You are taking on these State legislators, these Governors, these industries, these labor unions. This is a government of the people, by the people, for the people. We want clean air, we are getting clean air. You are ignoring us. You are saying you do not have to sit down and talk to us.

And I am saying we have waited patiently long enough. Now it is time for us to take matters into our hands so that we have a fallback position. We cannot depend on the fact that you are going to talk to us. We cannot depend on the fact that you are going to say to us the industries in your state will be fine because we are going to be realistic about dealing with this. We have to go back to that centralized emission system that you forced Pennsylvania to go to that cost us \$145 million to settle with that Envirotech company from Arizona that did not clean up any of the air.

Now that \$145 million, they will take it kind of personally because that money came out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It was money we could of used to educate our children. We could have used it for mass transit improvements that would have certainly cleaned up the air. We could have used it for so many things, for Medicare or Medicaid payments to take care of the needs of our citizens. But we had to use it because EPA said, whoops. Now I am afraid what they did to Pennsylvania they may be on the brink of doing to the entire United States of America.

And there are other complications. You see, a corporation could take this as an excuse and say you know we really got this agreement called NAFTA which gives us an ability to move south of the border or north of the border and sell our goods in the United States just as if we were located there and we do not have pollution standards like we have in the United States, but of course that air is going to blow across the border to Texas and across the border to the northern States from Canada, but companies would be able to do that. They would have that option.

This issue does not stand unto itself. There are other issues that come into play as to whether or not these jobs will still be American jobs, these plants will still be American plants.

So we are concerned. We have some very grave concerns about whether or not we are headed in the correct direction.

I want to just mention again something that I think is extremely important, and that is this issue of the slower cleanup, and I mentioned this before, and I know that Mr. DINGELL talked about it. This, I think, and the reason I repeat it is because it is probably the most important issue; we are, Mr. Speaker, going to continue to make progress in seeing the air get cleaner. Regardless of whether we have a new ozone standard or new particulate standard, we are cleaning up our

air as it pertains directly to ozone though. For the next 5 years we know that the air is going to continue to get cleaner through the continued implementation of the existing ozone provisions of the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments. However EPA has stated now that the existing attainment deadlines for ozone are not going to be enforced.

You understand this; we have got a rule right now that says this is the standard, .12 parts per million over a 1-hour period. They want to go to .08 parts per million over an 8-hour period, and I will admit an 8-hour period makes sense, but why from .12 to .08 throwing hundreds of counties out of attainment because when you do that the EPA said that they will not enforce the deadline at which those standards must be reached.

So now you have said, as I said in the very beginning, as Mr. DINGELL reiterated, to that child who is 8 or 9 years old who is on the playground having problems breathing, you said to the location where they are located if 1999 is the deadline that you have to reach .12 parts per million, forget about it, we have got a new standard, and we are going to give you 10 or 12 years longer to reach that deadline.

In addition, the States that have implementation plans are going to stop right now. They are going to quit because now we have moved the target. This is bad policy. We need to know more about the science. We have to do more studying. The ramifications are hard for all of us to grasp, but we know they will not be good. This new standard is going to disrupt the clean air progress that we could make under existing ozone standards, and we do not have to do it. There is no reason that we should be taking this on.

Let me reiterate again about these PM-2.5 monitors, 50 of them exist. We have to manufacture more, we have to get them implemented, get them located, rather, around this country, gather the information. That also is going to cause a long delay in knowing where we stand with PM-2.5.

Is there a combination of PM-2.5 molecules that is worse than others?

We have other questions. Why in the Pittsburgh region and other regions across this country as we clean up the air have we seen increased incidences of asthma?

There are more asthma cases as the air has gotten cleaner. Why is that? Well, there is speculation it may have to do in poorer areas with the fact that we have insect infestations in homes. There is speculation it could have to do with the fact at one time we had hardwood floors and now we have gone to wall to wall carpeting and there is dust mites and all kinds of particles like this in carpeting. But we do not have the answer. Without having that answer, without understanding why we are seeing more asthma as the air is cleaned up, we have got this rush to judgment on behalf of the EPA.

It is a bad policy. It is going to hurt the country, and it is not going to ben-

efit the children and other asthmatics across this country. That is the problem that we have. The EPA is charging forward without the ability to implement the new PM standard. They are charging forward on ozone without really having to do that, without really having the answers to many of these questions.

Again, I know the White House has heard from us, the White House has heard from local officials, from State officials, from State legislators. They have heard from people in the administration that have the same concerns that RON KLINK has, that the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. DINGELL] has, and thus far the silence from the White House has been deafening.

I will say one more time we have lost enough jobs in southwestern Pennsylvania and other industrial regions of this country. We have felt the implications of those job losses. Families have been ruined, lives have been ruined, individuals have been ruined, communities have been ruined. We now have one of the largest populations percentagewise of senior citizens in the entire Nation because many of our youngest and best and brightest had to move away. We are finally getting to the point where we are regrowing our industries and what we are saying to our children and grandchildren: Come back to Pennsylvania. Jobs exist again. And now the EPA wants to bring all of that crashing down around our ears.

If we must go to war on this issue, then, Mr. Speaker, we will go to war on this issue. We have done it before. I have been involved in some battles that I have lost, but I have been involved in some that I have won. I hope that we still have time to sit down and to work this matter out and that cooler heads and calmer minds and good science and the best interests of the people, the workers across this country, will prevail.

But I am preparing a piece of legislation that will keep the standards as they are, maintain the status quo and continue to clean the air at the rate we are cleaning it, and we are ready to move that. We have got Republicans working with us, Democrats working with us, and we will move that legislation, and I think that we can get it moved through the House. I think there is enough interest in it.

Let us make those on the other side tell us why they want to delay cleaning up the air, why they want children to be gasping longer, why they want to cost people their jobs, why they want to shut down industries in this Nation.

As for me, let us continue the progress that we have made in rebuilding the industrial base of this Nation, the industrial might of this Nation, and let us keep making the progress that we have done on cleaning the air and seeing the health improvements that we have seen across this country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TURNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family business.

Ms. MCKINNEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) after 5 p.m. today on account of official business.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending son's school graduation.

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 Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, on June 6.

Ms. GRANGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRADY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ARMEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, 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. LANTOS.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. ROTHMAN.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. ORTIZ.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. KLINK.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

Mr. HINCHEY.

Mr. FORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. KING.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

Mr. LARGENT.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. KASICH.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. RADANOVICH.

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. COMBEST.

Mr. MCINTOSH.

Mr. POMBO.
Mr. COBLE.
Mr. PAUL.
Mr. HUNTER.
Mr. PAPPAS.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
Mr. SPENCE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLINK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey in two instances.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
Ms. WATERS.
Mr. DOYLE.
Ms. ESHOO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 6, 1997, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3641. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Regulation Governing the Fresh Irish Potato Diversion Program, 1996 Crop [FV-97-80-01] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3642. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Limes Grown in Florida and Imported Limes; Change in Regulatory Period [Docket No. FV-97-911-1A IFR] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3643. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Quality Control Provisions of the Mickey Leland Childhood Hunger Relief Act [Workplan Number 93-018] (RIN: 0584-AB75) received May 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3644. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Environment), Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of the Secretary's intent to study a commercial or industrial type function performed by 45 or more civilian employees for possible outsourcing, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on National Security.

3645. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Eighty-Third Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during calendar year 1996, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 247; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3646. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—State Energy Program (Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy) [Docket No. EE-RM-96-402] (RIN: 1904-AA81) received June 3, 1997,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3647. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection; Child Restraint Systems (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket No. 74-14; Notice 119] (RIN: 2127-AG82) received June 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3648. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; Standards of Performance for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants; Amendments [IL-64-2-5807; FRL-5836-2] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3649. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Arizona—Maricopa County Ozone Nonattainment Area [AZ 68-0011; FRL-5835-8] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3650. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Approval of Source-Specific VOC and NOx RACT Determinations [PA83-4062a; FRL-5835-2] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3651. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Approval of VOC and NOx RACT Determinations for Individual Sources [SIPTRAX No. PA-4057a; FRL-5835-4] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3652. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Regulations of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of the Reformulated Gasoline Program to the Phoenix, Arizona Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Area [FRL-5834-4] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3653. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Emissions: Group IV Polymers and Resins [AD-FRL-5836-6] (RIN: 2060-AE37) received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3654. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Final Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions from Wood Furniture Manufacturing Operations [AD-FRL-5836-8] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3655. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Des Arc, Arkansas) [MM Docket No. 97-31, RM-8930] re-

ceived June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3656. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Idaho Falls, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97-14, RM-8916] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3657. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Driggs, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97-39, RM-8927] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3658. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Homedale, Idaho) [MM Docket No. 97-15, RM-8927] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3659. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 96F-0370] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3660. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by David J. Scheffer, of Virginia, to be Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

3661. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by John Christian Kornblum, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Federal Republic of Germany, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

3662. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter notifying Congress that on May 29 and May 30, due to the uncertain security situation and the possible threat to American citizens and the American Embassy in Sierra Leone, approximately 200 U.S. military personnel, including an 11-member special forces detachment, were positioned in Freetown to prepare for the evacuation of certain U.S. Government employees and private U.S. citizens (H. Doc. No. 105-93); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

3663. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996 through March 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3664. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the semiannual report to Congress on Audit Follow-up for the period October 1, 1996, through March 31, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3665. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National Service, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1996, through March

31, 1997; and the semiannual management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3666. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on the valuation of the U.S. Coast Guard Military Retirement System for plan year ending 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3667. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Provisions, Definitions: Change in Organizational Title from Field Director and Field Area to Regional Director and Region (National Park Service) (RIN: 1024-AC60) received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3668. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 052897B] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3669. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shortraker and Rougheye Rockfish in the Aleutian Islands Subarea [Docket No. 961107312-7021-02; I.D. 052897A] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3670. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Whiting Closure for the Mothership Sector [Docket No. 970403076-7114-02; I.D. 053097A] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3671. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish of the Gulf of Alaska; Pollock in the Western Regulatory Area [Docket No. 961126334-7025-02; I.D. 053097B] received June 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3672. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of public lands to certain California Indian Tribes; to the Committee on Resources.

3673. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Big Sandy River, mile 2.1 to mile 3.1 (Coast Guard) (RIN: 2115-AA97) received June 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3674. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Elizabeth River, Norfolk, VA (Coast Guard) [CGD 05-97-032] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received June 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3675. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulation: Fireworks Displays within the

First Coast Guard District (Coast Guard) [CGD01-97-009] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received June 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3676. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 97-33] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3677. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Information Reporting on Transactions with Foreign Trusts and on Large Foreign Gifts [Notice 97-34] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3678. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner (Examination), Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Investment Credit on Transition Property [Utilities Industry Coordinated Issue] received June 3, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3679. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, transmitting the report of the 1994-1995 Advisory Council on Social Security, Volumes I and II, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 907(d); 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. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 162. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-120). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CANADY: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 54. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States (Rept. 105-121). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1277. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than June 9, 1997.

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. GILMAN:

H.R. 1795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to remove the dollar limitation on payment of benefits from a defined benefit plan maintained by a State or local government for the benefit of employees of

the police department or fire department; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 1796. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. ARMEY (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TALENT, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. BILLEY, and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 1797. A bill to provide scholarship assistance for District of Columbia elementary and secondary school students; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1798. A bill to reform the program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for disposition of single family properties in the inventory of the Department for use for the homeless; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BARCIA of Michigan (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 1799. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for greater local input in transportation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BALDACCINI, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude gain or loss from the sale of livestock from the computation of capital gain net income for purposes of the earned income credit; to the Committee of Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1801. A bill to authorize the United States Man and the Biosphere Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 1802. A bill to suspend United States development assistance for India unless the President certifies to Congress that the Government of India has taken certain steps to prevent human rights abuses in India; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 1803. A bill to assist State and secondary and postsecondary schools to develop, implement, and improve career preparation education so that every student has an opportunity to acquire academic and technical knowledge and skills needed for postsecondary education, further learning, and a wide range of opportunities in high-skill, high-wage careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 1804. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 210 Seminary Street in Florence, AL, as the "John McKinley Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 1805. A bill to amend the Auburn Indian Restoration Act to establish restrictions related to gaming on and use of land held in trust for the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. NEY, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 1806. A bill to provide for the consolidation of the Office of Fossil Energy and the Office of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 1807. A bill to impose a limitation on lifetime aggregate limits imposed by health plans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. FILNER:

H.R. 1808. A bill to prohibit the relocation of certain Marine Corps helicopter aircraft to Naval Air Station Miramar, CA; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1809. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit for a portion of the expenses of providing dependent care services to employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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 Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. PITTS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. WELLER, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BRADY, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1810. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. HILL):

H.R. 1811. A bill to ensure the long-term protection of the resources of the portion of the Columbia River known as the Hanford Reach; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 1812. A bill to provide for the elimination of the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STARK, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FROST, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1813. A bill to protect the privacy of the individual with respect to the social security number and other personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, and the Judiciary, 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. LUTHER (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1814. A bill to provide for the termination of further production of the Trident II (D-5) missile; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FROST, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. TORRES):

H.R. 1815. A bill to protect the privacy of health information in the age of genetic and other new technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for tuition and related expenses for public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 1817. A bill to require that employers offering benefits to associates of its employees who are not spouses or dependents of the employees not discriminate on the basis of the nature of the relationship between the employee and the designated associates; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RIGGS (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 1818. A bill to Amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. FROST, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN):

H.R. 1819. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the establishment of lifetime learning accounts for the purpose of accumulating funds to pay the qualified expenses related to higher education and job training of the taxpayer and the taxpayer's family; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. STUPAK (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 1820. A bill to delay the application of the substantiation requirements to reimbursement arrangements of certain loggers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1821. A bill to require the Attorney General to add to schedule III of the Controlled Substances Act, the "club" drugs ketamine hydrochloride and gamma hydroxybutyrate; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FROST, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BOYD, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MINGE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 1822. A bill to establish State infrastructure banks for education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WEYGAND:

H.R. 1823. A bill to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. FROST, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. BALDACCI):

H.R. 1824. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the annual Government-wide goal from 20 percent to 25 percent for procurement contracts awarded to small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, and small business concerns owned and controlled by women; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA):

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution to recognize the value of continued friendly relations between the United States and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution concerning the Palestinian Authority and the sale of land to Israel; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution condemning the military coup d'etat of May 26, 1997, in Sierra Leone; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

116. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to Resolution No. 2 memorializing the President, Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to design and implement adjustments to the Federal milk marketing order system that are equitable to Minnesota's family dairy farmers;

including reassessment of the use of wholesale price indicators derived from trade on the Green Bay Cheese Exchange; to the Committee on Agriculture.

117. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 107 memorializing the United States Department of State to adopt a guarantee of unimpeded access to orphaned and abandoned children by Americans as a tenet of foreign policy when negotiating treaties; to the Committee on International Relations.

118. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 9 urging the United States Congress to pass legislation to open the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska, to oil and gas exploration, development, and production; to the Committee on Resources.

119. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution 8 requesting the United States Congress to enact legislation requiring out-of-state mail order sellers to collect and submit use taxes on goods delivered in those states that impose them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

120. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to Resolution No. 1 memorializing Congress to support legislative initiatives to mitigate the economic competition among the states that has resulted from the adoption of targeted business incentive programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

121. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 23 requesting that the Congress of the United States maintain and renew its commitment to America's corn growers and this Nation's ethanol industry by supporting a tax exemption and by taking other actions to increase this Nation's commitment to the production and use of ethanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

122. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution 177 urging the United States Congress to adopt a local purchase requirement for the purchase of cigarettes by military and Coast Guard facilities in Alaska and Hawaii; jointly to the Committees on National Security and Transportation and Infrastructure.

123. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate Resolution 97-S 971 memorializing the President and the Congress to improve funding for Federal assistance programs for legal aliens; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Agriculture.

124. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 242 urging Hawaii's Congressional Delegation to support Federal proposals to redirect revenues from the Federal motor fuels tax increases into the Highway Trust Fund; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Budget, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Ms. KAPTUR introduced a bill (H.R. 1825) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Mighty John III*; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. SNYDER.
 H.R. 18: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 45: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 66: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 76: Mr. WAMP, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. STARK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 123: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. COOK, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
 H.R. 158: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. TURNER, Mr. REYES, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. FAZIO of California.
 H.R. 159: Ms. DUNN of Washington.
 H.R. 160: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.
 H.R. 176: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. EHLERS, and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 195: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 197: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 198: Mr. BAKER and Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 218: Mr. CHAMBLISS and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 222: Mr. PORTER and Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 404: Mr. PACKARD.
 H.R. 409: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COOK, and Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 411: Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 465: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 484: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. STUMP.
 H.R. 536: Ms. MOLINARI.
 H.R. 586: Mr. BUNNING and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 588: Mr. GOODLATTE and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
 H.R. 611: Mr. STOKES, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. KLINK, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 612: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. BALDACCI.
 H.R. 674: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 712: Mr. WISE.
 H.R. 768: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. CANADY of Florida.
 H.R. 807: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 836: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 840: Mr. ENSIGN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 883: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
 H.R. 901: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. BRADY, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
 H.R. 939: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 955: Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 978: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. GIBBONS.
 H.R. 981: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. YATES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
 H.R. 982: Mr. CANADY of Florida.
 H.R. 1010: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.
 H.R. 1022: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 1031: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 1032: Mr. KOLBE.
 H.R. 1068: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1070: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 1077: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1104: Mr. RUSH, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Ms. STABENOW.
 H.R. 1126: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. Bentsen, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1129: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. GILCHREST.
 H.R. 1146: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H.R. 1151: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1153: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 1160: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1165: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1169: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. OLVER, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 1176: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 1219: Mr. VENTO and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1220: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 1231: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 1247: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. CRAPO.
 H.R. 1288: Mr. LINDER.
 H.R. 1290: Mr. EHLERS.
 H.R. 1298: Mr. ENSIGN and Mr. NORWOOD.
 H.R. 1299: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 H.R. 1320: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. KIND of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1355: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BLILEY.
 H.R. 1357: Mr. CANADY of Florida.
 H.R. 1373: Mr. MOAKLEY.
 H.R. 1375: Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. LAFALCE, and Ms. MOLINARI.
 H.R. 1380: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SCHUMER.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 1437: Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. HULSHOF.
 H.R. 1442: Ms. WATERS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1456: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1474: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 1504: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 1506: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 1507: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. WISE.
 H.R. 1519: Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. JACKSON.
 H.R. 1524: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. DICKEY.
 H.R. 1525: Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.R. 1532: Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. EWING, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAXON, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. HORN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr.

KINGSTON, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. POMBO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 1565: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1572: Mr. CLEMENT and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 1573: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 1580: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1583: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1596: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. BONO.

H.R. 1620: Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1682: Mr. FROST and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1683: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1711: Mr. REYES, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 1719: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1737: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1765: Mr. SNYDER and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1766: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 1776: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CAPPS.

H.R. 1777: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. CAPPS.

H.R. 1783: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1789: Mr. POMBO.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. RODRIGUEZ and Mr. CASTLE.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.J. Res. 67: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. GOODE.

H.J. Res. 76: Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. CRAPO.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BASS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FILNER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. KAPTUR,

Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. GORDON.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 139: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BALLENGER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1525: Mr. PASCRELL.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

16. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Directors, Federation of Asian People on Guam, relative to Resolution No. 97-1 commending and supporting Representative George Miller on his legislation to strip CNMI of many of its immigration and labor powers; to the Committee on Resources.