



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1997

No. 114

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12 noon.

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

We know, gracious God, how we plan our lives and how we anticipate the fullness of all the days ahead, and we also know that our plans are not our own and that we experience broken dreams and shattered hearts. We remember this day all those whose lives are broken by pain and sadness and we look to Your word for comfort and solace. O God, creator of the world and author of salvation, from whom we have come and to whom we shall return, bless all who mourn and experience the uncertainty of life. May all Your people, O God, be strengthened in the knowledge of Your eternal hope and receive that peace that passes all human understanding, now and forevermore. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JONES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed

with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2160. An act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2160) "An Act making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. INOUE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 797. An act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize the design and construction of additions to the parking garage and certain site improvements, and for other purposes;

S. 910. An act to authorize appropriations for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes;

S. 996. An act to provide for the authorization of appropriations in each fiscal year for arbitration in United States district courts; and

S. 1120. An act to provide for a consultant for the President pro tempore.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Sen-

ator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID].

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe—the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM].

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
Washington, DC, August 1, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, August 1, 1997 at 12:00 p.m.: that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 584, that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1198, that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1944.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,  
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Friday, August 1, 1997:

H.R. 408, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes;

H.R. 584, for the relief of John Wesley Davis;

□ 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

H6717

H.R. 1198, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Grants Pass, OR;

H.R. 1585, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued U.S. postage stamps, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1944, to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon ski area and other land in the State of Oregon;

H.R. 2014, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998; and

H.R. 2015, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 157 and the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, the Speaker on Thursday, August 7, 1997 announced the following Members of the House as members of the delegation attending the 50th anniversary of the independence of India and Pakistan: Messrs. GILMAN of New York; ACKERMAN of New York; HASTINGS of Florida; ENGEL of New York; and FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
Washington, DC, August 1, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 4 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I herewith designate Mr. Jeff Trandahl, Deputy Clerk, along with Ms. Julie Perrier, Assistant Clerk and Mr. Ray Strong, Assistant Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which they would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 105th Congress or until modified by me.

Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

#### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, August 4, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House, The Capitol, H-232,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This missive comes as an official announcement of my resignation

from the U.S. House of Representatives, effective October 15, 1997.

My duties and responsibilities as pastor of the Allen A.M.E. Church in Jamaica, New York, has grown to such a level that I am needed there on a more consistent basis. I have enjoyed the opportunities that you have given me to converse with you regarding my ideas for community, educational, and economic development. I hope that my leaving does not preclude our ability to, in some way, continue these discussions in the future.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

FLOYD H. FLAKE,  
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, August 1, 1997.

Hon. GEORGE E. PATAKI,  
State of New York,

Office of the Governor, Albany, NY

DEAR GOVERNOR PATAKI: This missive comes as an official announcement of my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives, effective October 15, 1997.

My duties and responsibilities as pastor of Allen A.M.E. Church have grown to a level which necessitates my presence on a more consistent basis.

I have called your office, and hope to be able to speak with you in the near future.

With warmest regards, I am

Sincerely,

FLOYD H. FLAKE,  
Member of Congress.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, August 11, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives. I have the honor to transmit correspondence received from the White House on August 11, 1997 at 3:12 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President pursuant to the Line Item Veto Act (P.L. 104-130) transmitting one cancellation with respect to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (P.L. 105-33).

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

#### CANCELLATION OF ITEM OF DIRECT SPENDING WITH RESPECT TO BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-115)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, pursuant to section 1025(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, referred to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, August 11, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel one item of new direct spending, as specified in the attached report, contained in the "Balanced Budget Act of 1997" (Public Law 105-33; H.R. 2015). I have determined that this cancellation will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachment, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, August 11, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit correspondence received from the White House on August 11, 1997 at 3:12 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President pursuant to the Line Item Veto Act (P.L. 104-130) transmitting two cancellations with respect to the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (P.L. 105-34).

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,  
Clerk, House of Representatives.

#### CANCELLATION OF TWO LIMITED TAX BENEFITS WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYER RELIEF ACT OF 1997—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-116)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, pursuant to section 1025(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, August 11, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with the Line Item Veto Act, I hereby cancel two limited tax benefits, as specified in the attached reports, contained in the "Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997" (Public Law 105-34; H.R. 2014). I have determined that each of these cancellations will reduce the Federal budget deficit, will not impair any essential Government functions, and will not harm the national interest. This letter, together with its attachments, constitutes a special message under section 1022 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN  
OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 25, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted on July 23, 1997 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Copies of the resolutions are being transmitted to the Department of the Army.

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

Enclosures.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2532—NEUSE RIVER BASIN,  
NORTH CAROLINA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Neuse River Basin, North Carolina, published as House Document 175, 89th Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood control, environmental protection and restoration, and related purposes.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2533—TAMPA HARBOR,  
FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Tampa Harbor, Florida, published as House Document 401, 91st Congress, 2nd Session and other pertinent reports, with a view of determining if the authorized project should be modified in any way at this time, with particular reference to deep draft anchorage.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2534—OWASCO LAKE  
SEAWALL, NEW YORK

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Owasco Lake Seawall, New York, published as Senate Document 133, 84th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine if modifications to the authorized project as contained therein, should include the rehabilitation of the seawalls to prevent flooding and control water flows along the outlet, are appropriate at this time.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2535—ALEXANDRIA TO THE  
GULF, LOUISIANA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project, published as House Document 308, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood control, navigation, wetland con-

servation and restoration, wildlife habitat, commercial and recreational fishing, salt-water intrusion, fresh water and sediment diversion, and other purposes in the area drained by the intercepted drainage system of the West Atchafalaya Basin Protection Levee, from Alexandria, Louisiana, to the Gulf of Mexico.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2536—SUSQUEHANNA  
RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Susquehanna River in Sunbury, Pennsylvania, published as House Document 366, 76th Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time to construct conduits for the Susquehanna River in Sunbury, Pennsylvania in the interest of flood control and public safety.

RESOLUTION: DOCKET 2537—MASSACHUSETTS &  
CAPE COD BAYS, MASSACHUSETTS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Massachusetts and Cape Cod Bays, Massachusetts, published as Senate Document 14, 85th Congress, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable in the interest of environmental restoration and other allied purposes along the Massachusetts and Cape Cod Bay, coastal shoreline and associated waters.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN  
OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION  
AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, August 13, 1997.

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

DEAR NEWT: Enclosed please find copies of resolutions approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on July 23, 1997, in accordance with 40 U.S.C. Sec. 606. With warm regards, I remain

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

Enclosures.

DESIGN: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EXPANSION BUILDING, DENVER, COLORADO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations in the amount of \$4,671,000 are authorized for the design of a 350,500 gross square foot expansion building, including 125 inside parking spaces, and connecting tunnel to the existing Byron G. Rogers Federal Building-Courthouse in Denver, Colorado, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with ef-

ficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 U.S. Courts Design Guide including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

DESIGN: UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, MIAMI,  
FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized in the amount of \$6,100,000 for the design of a 498,912 gross square foot United States courthouse, including 50 inside parking spaces, in Miami, Florida, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 U.S. Courts Design Guide including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

DESIGN: FRANK E. MOSS COURTHOUSE/ANNEX,  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized in the amount of \$4,918,000 for the design of a 229,300 gross square foot annex building including 78 inside parking spaces, in Salt Lake City, Utah, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 U.S. Courts Design Guide including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

DESIGN: FEDERAL BUILDING—UNITED STATES  
COURTHOUSE, FRESNO, CALIFORNIA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized in the amount of \$4,775,000 for the design of a 360,000 gross square foot Federal building—United States courthouse, including 112 inside parking spaces, in Fresno, California, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

Provided, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

Provided further, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 U.S. Courts Design Guide including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

DESIGN: UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE ANNEX,  
WASHINGTON, DC

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives, That pursuant to section 7 of the

Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized in the amount of \$5,703,000 for the design of a 351,500 gross square foot United States courthouse annex, including 250 inside parking spaces, in Washington, D.C., a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

*Provided*, That any design shall, to the maximum extent possible, incorporate shared or collegial space, consistent with efficient court operations that will minimize the size and cost of the building to be constructed.

*Provided further*, That any design shall incorporate changes to the 1994 and 1997 *U.S. Courts Design Guide* including the implementation of a policy on shared facilities for senior judges.

SITE ACQUISITION AMENDMENT: UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, ORLANDO, FLORIDA

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), additional appropriations are authorized in the amount of \$748,000 for the acquisition of a site of approximately 3 acres for the construction of 235,050 gross square foot United States courthouse plus 35 inside and 200 surface parking spaces to be located directly across from the existing Federal Building and United States courthouse in Orlando, Florida. This resolution amends the Committee resolution dated May 17, 1994, which authorized size acquisition at a cost of \$7,724,000.

REPAIR AND ALTERATION AMENDMENT: INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—UNITED STATES CUSTOMS, WASHINGTON, DC

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), additional appropriations in the amount of \$3,722,000 are authorized for the repair and alteration of the 1,200,000 gross square foot Interstate Commerce Commission-United States Customs connecting wing, with 28 inside parking spaces, in Washington, D.C. This resolution amends the Committee resolution of November 16, 1995, which authorized repair and alteration at a total estimated cost of \$138,512,000.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to Section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §610), the Administrator of General Services shall investigate the feasibility and need to construct or acquire a facility to house the United States District Court for Western Pennsylvania, in Erie, Pennsylvania. The analysis shall include a full and complete evaluation including, but not limited to: (i) the identification and cost of potential sites and (ii) 30 year present value evaluations of all options; including lease, purchase, and Federal construction, and the purchase options of lease with an option to purchase or purchase contract. The Administrator shall submit a report to Congress within 120 days.

CONSTRUCTION: BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND FIREARMS, SUBURBAN MARYLAND

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized for management and inspection at a cost of \$3,330,000, and construction at an estimated cost of \$52,536,000, for a 207,821 gross square foot Fed-

eral building to house the National Laboratory Center and a Fire Investigation Research and Education facility for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; plus 113 surface parking spaces at a site in suburban Maryland, for a combined authority of \$55,866,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

CONSTRUCTION: UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE, BELTSVILLE, MARYLAND

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized for design at a cost of \$645,000, management and inspection at a cost of \$821,000, and construction at an estimated cost of \$6,734,000, for a 45,979 gross square foot classroom building for the United States Secret Service, plus 265 surface parking spaces, at the United States Secret Service Training Center in Beltsville, Maryland, for a combined authority of \$8,200,000, a prospectus for which is attached to, and included in, this resolution.

*In addition*, That this authority may be combined with the authority provided in the Committee Resolution dated May 9, 1996, authorizing \$2,400,000 for the construction of a 16,700 gross square foot administrative building for the United States Secret Service, plus 50 surface parking spaces, at the United States Secret Service Training Center in Beltsville, Maryland.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to Section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. §610), the Administrator of General Services shall investigate the feasibility and need to construct or acquire an annex facility for the United States District Court for Southern Florida, in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. The analysis shall include a full and complete evaluation including, but not limited to: (i) the identification and cost of potential sites and (ii) 30 year present value evaluations of all options; including lease, purchase, and Federal construction, and the purchase options of lease with an option to purchase or purchase contract. The Administrator shall submit a report to Congress within 120 days.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION: SITE, DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HEADQUARTERS, WASHINGTON, DC

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives*, That pursuant to Section 7 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, (40 U.S.C. §606), appropriations are authorized for the construction of a headquarters building (or buildings) for the Department of Transportation of approximately 1,100,000 net usable square feet (1,350,000 rentable square feet) of space plus 145 official parking spaces at an estimated design cost of \$14,105,000, an estimated management and inspection cost of \$10,541,000 and an estimated construction cost of \$269,778,000, as set forth in a report pursuant to Section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, which is attached to and included in this resolution. The Administrator may use the South East Federal Center as the site for this headquarters, or may exchange land at the South East Federal Center, or other Federally owned property, for suitable land for the site or sites in the central employment area of the District of Columbia, under authority of Section 3 and Section 5 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. §§602 and 604).

*Provided*, That in the event that Federal funding is not available for construction of a

headquarters building or buildings, the Administrator is authorized to enter into an operating lease not to exceed 20 years, and renewal options, plus options to purchase, for approximately 1,100,000 net usable square feet of space (1,350,000 rentable square feet), plus 145 official parking spaces, at an estimated annual cost of \$57,375,000, plus escalations.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JAMES V. HANSEN, chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,  
Washington, DC, July 31, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has been served with a subpoena (for documents) issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts and directed to the "Keeper of the Records."

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, the Committee will make the determinations required by Rule L.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. HANSEN,  
Chairman.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, August 6, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a subpoena (for documents and testimony) issued by the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in the matter of *Oxycal Laboratories, Inc., et al. v. Patrick, et al., No. SA CV-96-1119 AHS (EEx)*. The subpoena was directed to "The Office of Congressman John D. Dingell."

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that the subpoena appears not to be consistent with the rights and privileges of the House and, therefore, should be resisted.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BUD SHUSTER, chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND  
INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REP-  
RESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, August 7, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been served with a subpoena (for documents) issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts and directed to the "Keeper of Records."

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, the Committee will make the determination required by Rule L.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,  
Chairman.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRA-  
TIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REP-  
RESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, August 8, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer ("CAO") has been served with a subpoena (for documents) issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts and directed to the "Keeper of Records."

After consulting with the Office of the General Counsel, the CAO will make the determinations required by Rule L.

Sincerely,

JAY EAGEN,  
Chief Administrative Officer.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON- ORABLE LYNN N. RIVERS, MEM- BER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable LYNN N. RIVERS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
August 18, 1997.

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

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the Third Judicial Circuit Court of the State of Michigan in the case of *Marcus Management, Inc. v. Robert Marquess, et al.*, Case No. 97-715508 CK.

After consultation with the Office of the General Counsel, I have determined that the subpoena relates to my official duties, and that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

LYNN N. RIVERS.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) laid before the House the

following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, August 12, 1997.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 2702(a)(1)(B)(vi) of Public Law 101-509, I hereby appoint as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress the following person: Mr. Roger Davidson, 3510 Edmunds Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007.

With warm regards,  
ROBIN H. CARLE, Clerk.

□ 1215

#### HONORING AND REMEMBERING PRINCESS DIANA

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with the House, that on Thursday, the House will be voting on a resolution honoring and remembering Princess Diana. I think every Member of the House joins literally millions of people across the planet in grief for the Princess, for her family, for the others who were killed in the accident and their families, and for the unnecessary tragedy that ended her life.

She had been a leader, not only in charming everyone who met her, but in working on key charitable causes, working on helping those with AIDS, working on banning land mines, working with the Red Cross, working with the homeless, and working on breast cancer.

I think across the world people have been drawn together in a sense of grief and sadness at this absolutely unnecessary tragedy, and the House tomorrow will extend formally by resolution the feelings of the American people as represented by this body to her family and to the people of Britain.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER A MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1119, NA- TIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZA- TION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule XXVIII, clause 1(c), I am announcing that tomorrow I will offer a motion to instruct the House conferees on the bill, H.R. 1119, to insist upon the provisions of section 1032 of the House bill relating to the assignment of Department of Defense personnel to border patrol and control.

#### JOIN THE MISSING AND EX- PLOITED CHILDREN'S CAUCUS— THERE IS MUCH WORK TO BE DONE

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues how I spent part of my August recess. I spent several days searching in the woods of Galveston County, TX, looking for a young woman who was abducted. Seventeen-year-old Jessica Lee Cain was driving home from a party in the early morning hours on Sunday, August 16. She never made it home, though her truck was found by the side of the road with her wallet still sitting on the front seat.

Well, Jessica is still missing. Last week, she would have begun her studies at Sam Houston State College, just a few days after her 18th birthday. We pray that whoever is responsible for her disappearance will return Jessica unharmed.

Mr. Speaker, I founded the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus this past spring when 12-year-old Laura Smither, also from my district, was found abducted and found murdered. That we could have two such tragedies in the same area within months is beyond comprehension. However, on behalf of the Smither and Cain families, we must work harder to protect our precious children.

I ask my colleagues to pray for Jessica and the Cain family and to join me in the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus. There is much work to be done.

#### THE TIME FOR TALK IS OVER ON EDUCATION REFORM AND BET- TER SCHOOLS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, politicians love to make a lot of noise about education reform and better schools. Ever since the report, "A Nation At Risk," came out in 1983, calls for education reform have been part of every politician's repertoire, but nothing seems to change, and parents with children in bad schools have the impression that reformers are more interested in rearranging the deck chairs than they are about serious changes.

Mr. Speaker, that is about to change. That is because more and more parents are insisting on real changes in the educational opportunities available to their children.

Two ideas that will not go away are school choice and education savings accounts. They will not go away because both ideas are as American as apple pie, freedom to choose and savings for the children's future, and because it is awfully hard to argue with the results. With Milwaukee and Cleveland leading the way, school choice is the wave of the future, and education savings accounts will become part of that movement for greater educational opportunities.

The time for talk is over; now is the time for real change.

#### HOUSE NEEDS TO CONDUCT HEARINGS TO EXAMINE ELEMENTS OF PROPOSED TOBACCO SETTLEMENT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, Congress should not rubber stamp the recently proposed tobacco settlement that benefits the tobacco industry more than the public. As I understand it, the settlement will give tobacco companies immunity from liability, enable companies to prevent disclosure of potentially revealing documents, provide a financial windfall for company executives through increased stock options, restrict future Food and Drug Administration regulation, and not adequately accomplish the goal of reducing teenage smoking.

Mr. Speaker, today my Senator from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, launched a campaign to gain access to tobacco industry documents that could remain under wraps if the agreement gains the approval of Congress. I support that effort, and I think the House also should support that effort.

Much work needs to be done, and I think that Congress, and particularly the House, needs to move forward with hearings to further examine the elements of this tobacco settlement. As it stands now, the settlement is a winner for the tobacco industry and a loser for our children. Let us work to change that outcome.

#### SUPPORT SCHOOL CHOICE AND EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, education funding has been on the rise for years, but we have not seen improvement in our public schools. SAT scores are down, and dissatisfaction is growing among teachers, parents, and students. Still we just keep throwing money at a broken wheel. It is time to fix the wheel and stop putting taxpayers' dollars in a bottomless pit.

Two reform measures, school choice and education savings accounts, can help get America's education system back on track. These ideas give parents the freedom to choose the best schools for their children's education and to save for their children's future. School choice and education savings accounts are the reforms we need to finally begin to fix education in America.

Mr. Speaker, these ideas are the free-market solution to a very serious problem. These solutions are right for parents and children throughout our Nation. For the sake of education in America, I urge my colleagues to support school choice and education savings accounts.

#### RIGHT ON, MRS. BARRON

(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, on the advice of their accountant, the Barrons of New Hampshire took an \$80,000 investment loss. Years later, the IRS came in, they said no, and they hit the Barrons with a \$330,000 tag in penalties and interest; \$330,000, unbelievable. The pressure was so great Bruce Barron killed himself. After the death, the IRS took the home, took everything they had.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

Under a new law, Mrs. Barron is suing the IRS, and I say, right on. I hope the IRS gets their assets kicked all the way up to their gestapo tactics. The IRS, after all, has deserved it; the IRS has earned it.

Think about it, Congress, and I yield back all the rest of that IRS loan sharking and ripoffs of interest and penalties.

#### OPPOSE H.R. 1270, THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT

(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, while Members of this House were in their districts during the August recess, ABC News reported to a national television audience just what I have been saying in this very well for the past 8 months, that despite numerous scientific evidence to the contrary, the Federal Government is going to find Yucca Mountain, NV, as a suitable site for nuclear waste storage.

The news report highlighted that despite problems with fragile rock formation, migrating groundwater, volcanoes, and active earthquakes, Federal agencies always find a way to ignore them first by lowering the standards and then by lowering the safety standards to the site suitability. More than \$3 billion has already been spent on Yucca Mountain, and the site has been found to be scientifically unsuitable.

Later this year, Congress will consider a bill that proposes we spend billions more of taxpayer dollars to fund another study that will tell Washington bureaucrats just what they want to hear. This is not just a Nevada issue; this is an issue of safety for all Americans. I urge my colleagues to get the true facts and oppose the H.R. 1270.

#### KOREAN AIR FLIGHT 801 TRAGEDY

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the Nation has turned its attention to other matters, we on Guam are still reeling from the worst air disaster of our island's history. On August 6, 1997, a Korean Air 747 en route from Seoul crashed into a hill 3 miles short of the runway of the Won

Pat International Airport on Guam. The jet carried 254 people, with 227 having perished.

I rise today to express the condolences of the people of Guam to the victims' families. We share their pain most intimately not because the crash occurred on Guam, but also because the people on that plane were not entirely strangers. Amongst the dead, eight were returning Guam residents of Korean descent. Amongst the survivors, there were four returning home.

I would also like to draw this body's attention not only to the grieving families, but also to the men and women who spent countless hours in search and rescue efforts as well as family assisting actions. The NTSB's efficient investigation of the airline's crash is exemplary. However, a tragedy of this magnitude leaves many questions unanswered. I strongly urge a public hearing on the crash of KAL 801 to be held on Guam.

#### URGING CORRECTION OF FEDERAL JUDGE'S DECISION REGARDING FORESTS IN EAST TEXAS

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

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, during the district work period this August, my wife and I spent a few days among the beautiful forests in our national parks, but I am deeply disturbed by a decision, another out test decision by a Federal judge in Beaumont, who decreed because he disagreed with how our Forest Service is managing parts of the lands in Texas, he called and ordered an injunction, halted all logging among our east Texas forests.

This action, irresponsible and damaging, not only causes the Federal Government to fault on our contracts to small businesses, it has stopped our small businesses in Texas affiliated with lumber and timber. It is hurting the counties, 12 east Texas counties. They rely upon that \$4 million to help balance their budget every year. And, in fact, it is an impediment to those of us who seek a balance among our environmental assets, who seek to have a forest and parks and lands in our country that is properly managed. It is a disturbing action by a Federal judge and one we ought to take action to correct.

#### THE FAMOUS AVOIDANCE GAME ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM IS NO LONGER ACCEPTABLE

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no more important issue for this Congress to address in the waning hours than the need to reform our corrupt campaign finance laws.

As my colleagues will recall, many of us have called upon Speaker GINGRICH to schedule a vote this month on legislation to ban the large, unregulated financial contributions to political parties known as soft money. These contributions of \$25,000, \$100,000, and even \$1 million from a single individual representing some particular special interest have helped to ruin our electoral and legislative process. Despite our repeated requests for a vote and despite the Speaker's own pledge of support, there has been no vote scheduled on a soft money ban or any other campaign finance reform.

My colleagues and our Speaker should be aware that we are prepared to use all our means at our disposal to force a vote this month. No more business as usual, Mr. Speaker. The famous avoidance game on this issue is no longer acceptable. Our ability to honestly represent our constituents depends on our success and reforming the campaign finance laws.

Already there is talk of adjourning the Congress as soon as possible to avoid addressing this issue. Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable. We will not accept such a cowardice position and the protectionism of special interests.

---

#### LEGISLATION TO ENSURE NO GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, very shortly now, September 30, the fiscal year, the current fiscal year, will end. For a decade now, I have been proposing legislation that when such an event occurs, and it has occurred too often without new appropriations taking their place, a new budget in place, a Government shutdown is in the foreseeable future.

The legislation that I have proposed would end that phenomenon by saying when at the end of the fiscal year no budget has been put in place, then last year's appropriations will automatically go into effect until a new budget takes effect.

We have had the Congress of the United States just a few months ago pass such legislation only to be vetoed by the President. It is now time to say, "I told you so; we're facing another Government shutdown."

The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations will do all in his power, I am sure, to prevent such an event, but my legislation would provide insurance that no Government shutdown would occur.

---

□ 1230

#### RETURN POLITICAL POWER WHERE IT BELONGS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in the first half of 1996, the tobacco industry donated over \$1 million to the Republican Party. Last month Speaker GINGRICH and his Republican colleagues returned the favor. Republican Members snuck into the balanced budget bill a \$50 billion credit provision for tobacco companies, my friends, not a bad return on their \$1 million donation.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal reported from the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids that 83 percent of the Members from the other body took tobacco money last year, and they voted against increasing funding to crack down on illegal sales of tobacco to minors.

It is no wonder the American people have lost faith in their political system. It is time for Congress to ban soft money contributions to political parties and restore some integrity to our campaign finance system.

Democrats are asking Speaker GINGRICH to schedule a vote this month to ban soft money. The American people should not have to wait any longer.

We need to take this important first step. Let us take the influence out of the hands of the wealthy and the special interests. We need to return political power in this Nation to where it rightly belongs, in the hands of average working Americans.

---

#### BRING ABOUT CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM NOW

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the unexplained delay in considering campaign finance reform, I am forced to ask myself the same question over and over again: Why is it taking so long to do what we promised the American people in 1996?

It is obvious that the American people want campaign finance reform. The President and the Speaker shook hands over 2 years ago committing themselves to reforming the system and, according to the rhetoric in Congress, many of my colleagues want the same thing. Yet, no campaign finance reform legislation is on the agenda, and many news reports indicate that after the consideration of the remaining appropriation acts, as early as October 11, the House will adjourn for the year. Roll Call says it will be the fastest session since 1965.

I think we still have time to consider this important issue. What we need is the commitment of the Republican leadership of the House. We can no longer tolerate the rhetoric without action on this issue.

The Speaker has left us no choice: We have declared September Ban Soft Money Month, and we will do everything in our power to raise this issue on the floor. We must do it before the 1998 election.

#### CLOSE SOFT MONEY LOOPHOLE

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed to read in Tuesday's Congress Daily the top Republican lawmakers were not going to make passing campaign finance reform a priority this session.

It is time to recognize there are no more legitimate excuses why this body has not acted on this issue. The American people want it, the political process needs it, and we have a good legislative vehicle to make it happen, thanks to a recently introduced bill by a bipartisan freshman task force.

Our Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act would take an important first step toward reforming the political process by banning soft money contributions. Soft money contributions allow individuals, corporations, and other organizations to give unlimited amounts of money to influence Federal elections.

It is time to close the soft money loophole and pass meaningful campaign finance reform.

---

#### TIME TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT BANNING SOFT MONEY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before Congress departed for the August recess, I joined with 25 of my House colleagues in writing to Speaker GINGRICH demanding a vote this month on banning soft money contributions to political parties. In our letter, we warned that failure to schedule such a vote would cause us to use every tool at our disposal to force consideration of this all-important campaign finance reform.

Mr. Speaker, it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that our current campaign finance system is broken and needs to be fixed. Every day the newspapers are filled with stories detailing how unregulated soft money contributions have corrupted our political system and are threatening to undermine the very essence of our democracy.

Clearly, we need real, comprehensive campaign finance reform, and we need it now, but Speaker Gingrich has refused to give us a day to vote even on this most basic of reforms.

Mr. Speaker, give us a vote on real campaign finance reform, or at least give us a vote to ban soft money. It is the right thing to do; it is what the American people want.

---

#### LIVE BY LAWS PRESENTLY ON THE BOOKS

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I hear this call for campaign finance reform. We can pass all the laws in the world, but if some people are not going to live by the laws on the books, what point is it to change the law?

Now, it was not the Republicans that invited people into the White House at \$50,000 a pop for the Lincoln Bedroom. It was not Republicans who dealt with arms merchants, foreign agents, and narcotics dealers, and had their pictures taken for massive amounts of money. All of those things are against the law. It was not Republicans that made phone calls out of the White House, against the advice of the counsel to the White House.

And yet they say they want to change the law. For what purpose? It is time they obeyed the law on the books.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2016, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2016) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. HEFNER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HEFNER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2016, be instructed to insist on the House position with respect to funding for Family Housing, Dormitories and Barracks for military personnel serving worldwide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. Speaker, when the House passed the military construction bill, it included funding for many important projects for family housing, barracks, and dormitories. By a vote of 395 to 134, we agreed to place a high priority on the quality of life of our men and women in the military and their families as they serve us around the world.

The other body, however, does not seem to feel as we do; \$145 million was cut for family housing and \$65 million was cut from barracks. We give them the best training in the world, but with

the lack of decent housing, we cannot get them to reenlist in the services.

These young men and women are sent to the far corners of the world, but we cannot provide proper care and a proper place for them to live. Whether it is a base near your district or in Korea or Germany, these people deserve adequate housing.

My motion, Mr. Speaker, provides specific direction to the conferees to make certain that in resolving the differences between the House and the other body, a high priority is given to the quality of life of the men and women serving us in the military.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2016, and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, on the motion to instruct, I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER]. We have made a very, very significant step forward in the House bill to emphasize quality-of-life issues, housing, barracks, day care centers, hospitals, dental centers, and a variety of other areas to make life more pleasant and agreeable for our men and women in the services. So we have built our bill, the House bill, around these basic concepts of emphasizing quality of life.

This motion to instruct simply restates what we agreed to do in our committee as we wrote and marked up our bill to this point. I deeply appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] to continue to emphasize these quality-of-life principles as we go to conference. I hope the Senate will agree with our concepts of what is important.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with the motion to instruct and recommend that it pass.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs: PACKARD, PORTER, HOBSON, WICKER, KINGSTON, PARKER, TIAHRT, WAMP, LIVINGSTON, HEFNER, OLVER, EDWARDS, DICKS, HOYER, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2158, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the managers on the part of the House be instructed to insist on the position of the House regarding the total funding level provided for the Environmental Protection Agency's 'Hazardous Substance Superfund' account.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, nearly one person in four in this country lives close to a Superfund site. We know all too well what the result of that fact is: too many reported cases of cancer and other diseases caused by breathing, eating, and drinking too many hazardous contaminants.

This motion is pretty simple. If you want to be on record for doing as much as possible to clean up Superfund sites around the country and reduce the amounts of hazardous pollutants to which your constituents are exposed, you vote for this motion.

Supporting this motion does not bust the budget. Although the budget resolution assumed funding for the Superfund program at the enhanced level of \$2.1 billion, the level called for by the administration as part of the so-called Kalamazoo initiative, the House level is still \$600 million below that.

The total Superfund spending in the House-passed bill is \$1.5 billion, compared with \$1.4 billion in the Senate. The House amount is definitely superior to the Senate's recommendation in several ways: The House version provides \$28 million, or 14 percent more,

for Superfund enhancement activities, \$5 million more for research activities, and \$12 million more for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

Mr. Speaker, much criticism has been lodged against the operation of the Superfund program since its inception. I think most Members would agree that reforms are needed. However, until the authorization committees are able to reach agreement on what these reforms should be, we should still be trying to do all we can to get Superfund sites cleaned up.

This administration has made good progress in getting Superfund appropriations spent on actual cleanup and not on litigation and administrative costs.

I strongly urge an "aye" vote to keep Superfund moneys flowing at as high a level as possible to clean up as many sites as quickly as we can.

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

□ 1245

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not going to object to this suggestion by my colleague. By way of commentary, however, I must say that it was at least 15 years ago as a member of this committee I traveled to the northern part of the State of New York, and during that trip I visited a place called Love Canal. At that point in time we knew that the Superfund program had many a problem. The new Administrator indicated to us that this was a program and project that was very, very important but which was broken.

I certainly do hope that between now and the time we go to conference that my colleague will join with me one more time in asking the administration for their suggestion as to how we fix this program, for she has been talking about it publicly a lot, but I have seen no recommendation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEWIS of California, DELAY, WALSH, HOBSON, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, NEUMANN, WICKER, LIVINGSTON, STOKES, MOLLOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2169, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2169) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that in resolving the differences between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2169, be instructed to insist on the House position with respect to providing \$200 million for operating assistance under the transit formula grants program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. This motion simply instructs the conferees to insist on the \$200 million included in the House bill for transit operating assistance.

In my judgment, we have cut operating assistance too much already over the years. Unfortunately, the Senate has no funding for operating assistance, and this motion simply insists that the conferees stay with the decision adopted by the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's concern with regard to the operating assistance, and wish it could be higher, but I think that \$200 million is certainly the bottom we should go. I think it is a good motion, and we certainly accept it. I commend the gentleman for offering it.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLF, DELAY, REGULA, ROGERS, PACKARD, CALLAHAN, TIAHRT, ADERHOLT, LIVINGSTON, SABO, FOGLIETTA, TORRES, OLVER, PASTOR, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2203, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998 and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FAZIO of California moves that in resolving the differences between House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2203, be instructed to recede to the Senate on funding levels provided for nonproliferation and arms control programs under the Department of Energy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for offering this motion to instruct conferees is simply that I believe the House would be advised to support the Senate figures on nuclear nonproliferation so we do no damage to our efforts to verify nuclear testing. The research and development account, which is very important to the Department, shows that we have taken a \$20 million reduction in excess of what the Senate provided in this area. It seems to me these are very important funds to meet established milestones for the demonstration and delivery of state-of-the-art nuclear detection technologies.

In addition, the legislation that the House passed could well be determined to be inadequate in terms of funding the Department's threat assessment program, which is a core program which provides for our Government's full capability to assess nuclear-related domestic threats.

It also provides a central traffic point for DOE's nuclear agency and critical message traffic from overseas embassies. It would be, I think, something that all Members of this House could join together on. We are not anxious to restrict our capabilities to monitor potential proliferation of nuclear activities in countries, particularly in third-world countries, where we think the threat is most likely to occur.

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2203.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and I have discussed this issue. We are, as we so often are, in accord. I support the motion and I urge its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MCDADE, ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, PARKER, CALLAHAN, DICKEY, LIVINGSTON, FAZIO of California, VISCLOSKEY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2159, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 27, 1997, 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. 2159.

□ 1302

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. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 30, 1997, the bill had been read through page 93, line 15.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, no other amendment shall be in order, except pro forma amendments offered for the purpose of debate, unless printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before Friday, August 1, 1997.

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

Mr. Chairman, just to bring the Members up to date, we are resuming our debate on the Foreign Operations bill, H.R. 2159. Just to refresh Members' memories, this bill was well under the allocation that was given to the subcommittee. In fact, it is some \$87,000 under last year's appropriation and nearly \$4.5 billion less than the Senate bill and the President's request.

So once again, as we continue this debate, we would like for our colleagues to keep in mind that final passage on this measure will actually mean another reduction in foreign aid, and I think it is very important that Members of the House understand this.

Once again, the American people are requesting that we be frugal in our efforts to assist the President and the executive branch in their efforts to have an effective foreign policy. But under the circumstances, the committee felt, and I feel, that the reduction is in order. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I will continue the effort.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California, the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, once again, I, too, want to remind our colleagues of the great leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] in bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor. This is a difficult bill and there are many contentious areas that are covered in it.

We began the debate, as Members may recall, before the August district

work period. At that time, I said that the gentleman from Alabama had resolved many of the contentious issues. One area of agreement that I have with the gentleman on the bill, of course, is the funding level. I hope to work on that in conference. But, again, in terms of the issue-by-issue consideration of the bill, I think a great deal was accomplished because of the gentleman's openness, accessibility, and spirit of bipartisanship.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman once again for his leadership and once again separate from the remarks about, yes, we must be frugal and prudent in all of our spending, subject all of it to the harshest scrutiny, but I support the larger number of the administration, a minor disagreement with the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her kind remarks, and it has been a pleasure working with the gentleman in her first year as ranking Democrat on our subcommittee. The gentleman has been a pleasure to work with, as has been her entire staff.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a joint effort, both Republicans and Democrats joining together, to bring to the floor what I consider a responsible bill. I know the gentleman is concerned that it is not sufficient, but nevertheless, under the circumstances, I certainly feel that it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE TO TURKEY

SEC. 571. (a) Not more than \$40,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading "Economic Support Fund" may be made available for Turkey.

(b) Of the funds made available under the heading "Economic Support Fund" for Turkey, not less than fifty percent of these funds shall be made available for the purpose of supporting private nongovernmental organizations engaged in strengthening democratic institutions in Turkey, providing economic assistance for individuals and communities affected by civil unrest, and supporting and promoting peaceful solutions and economic development which will contribute to the settlement of regional problems in Turkey.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 76 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 572. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND", and increasing the amount made available for "CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND" (as authorized by Section 526(c) Public Law 103-306; 108 Stat. 1632), by \$25,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allocate 25 million additional dollars to the African Development Fund. The amendment is revenue neutral, budget neutral, and is

scored by CBO as neutral on all relevant points for budgetary purposes. It takes the \$25 million that we would like to give to the African Development Fund from the Economic Support Fund.

The Economic Support Fund is the generic fund that is one of the largest components of this bill and is already funded at \$57 million above the fiscal year 1997 enacted level.

So, there is no question that this money would not add to the size of the bill, the cost of the bill, or the size of the burden on the U.S. taxpayers from the deficit.

Why is it necessary to dedicate \$25 million more into the African Development Fund? The United States investment of time, compassion, and dollars in Africa, in my view, brings the greatest return from the point of view of our national interests, our sense of compassion, and what we can do for people who are most in need.

The people who live in sub-Saharan Africa have the lowest life expectancy of any people on Earth. Americans on average live 48 percent longer, almost half a lifetime longer than the average person living in sub-Saharan Africa.

International relief organizations characterize sub-Saharan Africa as having one half of its population living in absolute poverty.

What does the African Development Fund do? Well, in combination with the African Development Bank, it assists those individuals, entrepreneurs, small businesses, who are able and interested in helping themselves to create the conditions for economic growth from which the alleviation of poverty will come in a permanent way.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a handout. It is an assist in becoming economically self-sufficient so that some day when we speak of these issues again on the House floor, we will not be referring to a life expectancy so short and infant mortality rate so high and absence of inoculation for childhood diseases that is so sadly widespread.

The United States has in the past funded the African Development Bank and the African Development Fund. The African Development Bank offers assistance for the more creditworthy borrowers. That is an important area, but it is not the subject of this amendment.

The African Development Fund offers assistance for the poorest of the poor. It offers loans on concessional bases. In the past, the United States has had some concern about the management of the African Development Fund and, for that reason, has not been putting any money into this for several of the last years. However, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the Committee on International Relations, the State Department, AID, have all been studying the progress made by the African Development Fund and have come to the conclusion that it is appropriate to recommit United States re-

sources to this very important area. The only issue now is the amount.

Mr. Chairman, here is why that additional \$25 million is so important. Presently, the Senate bill, the other body's bill, has zero. The President has requested \$50 million. The committee's bill requests \$25 million.

If we can go to conference with a full \$50 million, I would be very hopeful and prayerful that we could actually get \$50 million, which is what the President has requested. It certainly puts us in a better bargaining position than if we go to the conference with \$25 million, which is in the bill.

Several Members of the European Community have announced that their willingness to assist will be conditional upon the United States putting forward its commitment. Because whereas we have committed to assist with the African Development Fund, we have, in fact, not contributed for the last 2 years, when we said we would. The amount that is already overdue is \$132 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for that today. I am asking for the additional \$25 million so that we can make a good down payment on getting this fund started again and thereby engage our European allies in this most worthy project.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues out of compassion to care for those who are the most needy in the world, please to support this amendment. I am proud to say that it is supported by many colleagues, including the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Mr. Chairman, I conclude by saying for those concerned about our friends in the Middle East, that AIPAC has allowed me to say they do not oppose this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise, first of all, to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], chairman of this fine subcommittee, for his effort and his work, including his work with me over the years on many issues dealing with human rights, particularly in Africa.

I also thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her forthright and open presentation and commitment on human rights and issues dealing with foreign affairs in this world. I am proud to be associated with both of these fine colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, the effort of the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] today is one that I proudly support, and I join the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] to be able to stand today for what I think is a vital change and recognition in the

policy of teaching someone to fish, rather than giving them a fish.

Interestingly enough, as the world mourns one of the most dynamic ambassadors that committed herself to the idea of helping those less fortunate, Princess Diana, who visited Africa on several occasions and was not fearful of working with the heads of State, but as well as the people of those nations in helping them to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, that we would come today to be able to support legislation that adds \$25 million to the African Development fund.

Mr. Chairman, this does not cause for any increase in spending in this particular bill, but helps to raise the funding to a level of \$50 million; a request made by the President and one that we have not met at this time.

It is extremely important to recognize what the African Development Fund stands for. It makes loans on market-based terms to creditworthy borrowers.

□ 1315

That is, while the AFDF lends to the poorest members on highly concessional terms, that means that what happens is those poorest nations, those poorest individuals, those poorest nongovernmental agencies are able to receive money that will help lift them and their constituents up by the bootstraps.

The interesting thing that we should note is that in fact this money does go to the poorest nations in sub-Saharan Africa. The African Development Bank concentrates its loans on smaller projects than the International Development Association, the concessional lending arm of the World Bank, in areas such as microenterprise, primary education, preventative health care, agriculture and basic infrastructure.

In fact, as I visited South Africa just a few months ago, I was delighted to see some of the very examples of what the African Development Fund is engaged in, complementing those participants in ideas and programs of which they initiated, which they were the idea persons for, and which they were able to draw from the very basis of their soul and see the success that was brought about by these matching funds.

The AFDF account is funded at 25 million, half of what the President requested. Interestingly enough, the ESF account is as a full 57 million above fiscal year 1997 enacted levels, which is good, but yet this does not answer the question when we find that countries like sub-Saharan Africa or in sub-Saharan Africa, India, and Latin America receive the lowest United States foreign aid per capita of any recipients in the world. This is particularly striking because these regions have the lowest GNP per capita in the world and the lowest life expectancy on earth. Sub-Saharan Africans die younger than anyone else by a huge margin.

I believe that there have been great strides in AFDF, particularly, as has been noted by this committee, that the

new management of the African Development Bank and Fund have made great strides in restructuring the whole infrastructure of the organization so that they have drawn confidence in the way that they handle the dollars that they were given.

Additionally, I think it is important that the moneys, such as the ESF funds, that they will not impact Israel or Egypt. This shows a true combined effort in those seeking to help sub-Saharan Africa to provide a grass-roots initiative, to enhance those grass-roots organizations who can show themselves proud and be able to draw in others who would draw with them and work on infrastructure and education and health needs. This is the kind of money that the United States can be most proud of rendering.

I believe that this Congress would do well to support this increase because this is worth 1,000 times what it is in actual dollars. This is worth people realizing that I can do something. This is worth people understanding that I do not have to ask for fish because I can learn to fish.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I rise to support this funding amendment and would ask my colleagues to join enthusiastically to help sub-Saharan Africa stand on its own feet.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment I am sure is well-intended, but it ignores the history of the institution that they are trying to help. Just to refresh the Members' memories as to the history of the African Development Fund, just 2 years ago this Congress rescinded the \$60 million included in the bill for the African Development Fund because it was unneeded. There was no objection whatsoever 2 years ago.

Now, under new management, we feel like the fund is back on its feet, that they indeed are moving in a progressive manner by which to help the very people that the proponents of this bill wish to help. So we as a committee did insert \$25 million to reestablish our confirmation that they are moving in the correct direction. And now for an amendment to come to the floor increasing the \$25 to \$50 million plays havoc with the entire bill.

The gentlewoman from Texas mentioned that this does not impact Israel nor Egypt, but she is wrong because it does impact Israel and Egypt because if we deplete the funds which are very limited in the economic support fund, we are going to deny the administration the opportunity to assist Jordan. And if Jordan is not assisted, then Israel and Egypt both will suffer. So it indeed does impact the Middle East, and I take issue with her indication that it does not impact either Israel or Egypt.

The Senate, we understand, has nothing in the bill. The proponents of this

fund came to me early on and requested our assistance, and out of deference to them, we did include the \$25 million to reestablish the fund. But to come at this moment and to say, let us double what the committee, I think very prudently and wisely has given, in my opinion, does great harm to our bill.

So it does impact Israel. It does impact Egypt. It denies Jordan the full funding that the administration has requested because it subtracts from a very, very small residue that remains after we give the moneys to Israel and Egypt. So I would respectfully request that the committee consider what we did in the Appropriations Committee. I would like for the proponents of this amendment to recognize that we came a giant step forward in trying to be of assistance to them. I would like to also remind the proponents of this measure that we included another \$50 million in the Child Survival Fund which will indeed help the needy people in the country of Africa.

I respectfully request that the Members vote against this amendment because it just disrupts many portions of our bill and at the same time sends an indication that we are going to give a fund who just 2 years ago was deemed unacceptable by this Congress, that indeed we are going to fully fund it at \$50 million instead of the \$25 million.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the chairman and, as I said, his hard work on this issue. I think it is important to at least understand my commitment and my thrust behind supporting this increase.

Frankly, this \$25 million increase provides the appropriation that was requested by the President of the United States. Under the President's discretion, it is clear that Egypt and Israel and Jordan, I might add, would not have to be impacted and the advocacy groups for Israel have conceded and feel very comfortable that this would be the right direction to go. It is worth noting that this is a full \$57 million above the fiscal year 1997 enacted level, but I think the argument is strongest by noting how poor sub-Saharan Africa is and how low its GNP is and how it is, in the world's economy, the poorest, almost the poorest area, along with India and other parts of Latin America.

This infusion of capital under a newly managed African Development Bank would clearly be the right direction that this Nation should take in its new policies, or at least its stated policies of making sure that foreign affairs dollars have a return; that is, foreign affairs dollars are appropriately invested so that we get the full return. Investing in sub-Saharan Africa by giving to these nongovernmental agencies, these agencies that deal with the poorest of the poor, helping in infrastruc-

ture, health care, helping in education, has to be an investment for the 21st century.

With all due respect to the chairman's opposition, I might say that Egypt and Israel and Jordan would be protected. These additional moneys would be appropriately invested and we would get a return on our foreign affairs dollars that we could be very proud of in helping sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Michigan for his kindness.

Please, let us focus for a moment on this question. AIPAC, the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee, has informed me they do not oppose this amendment. It took goodwill on all sides and that is the position. It is not correct to say that this amendment would jeopardize the U.S. interest or the interests of our friends in the Middle East.

I would like, with my friend's permission, to call on the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, if he would be kind enough to engage me in a colloquy right now, if the chairman of the subcommittee would be kind enough to engage me in a colloquy.

With all respect and recognizing that we differ on this amendment, it is imperative that I lay out that there is no opposition from the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee to this amendment.

May I kindly ask if the gentleman has any information to the contrary.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, no, and I would not expect that they would be involved in any appropriation we make to any other country for any other purpose. It is not the role of AIPAC to be that involved.

My point is that we have a very limited amount in the economic support fund over and above what we traditionally have given to Israel and Egypt. If we allow the appropriation to Egypt and to Israel, then indeed it jeopardizes the possibility of Jordan getting the \$100 million they have requested and the administration supports.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, an additional question, if I am laboring, it is only at pains to make it clear that the gentleman is expressing his understanding and not that of anyone else, but his own understanding of the impact.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I wrote the bill, and we know how much money is in the economic support fund.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I have one additional question, if I may. If the amendment to be offered later regarding funds for Cambodia is adopted, it is my understanding that will

free up \$37 million presently allocated to Cambodia in the ESF account.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Let me correct the gentleman there. There is nothing earmarked in this bill. We do not earmark money for Israel. We do not earmark money for Egypt or Cambodia or any place else. There is nothing earmarked in the bill. We give to the administration a designated amount of money for the economic support fund. If the administration wants to give this money to the African Development Fund, they have that prerogative.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my last question, is it not the gentleman's understanding and that of his committee that the total amount would include money adequate to spend for Cambodia? I completely grant no earmark and, hence, if today we restrict the amount of money that is going to Cambodia, that amount of money which was anticipated in the gentleman's total amount for ESF would be available to go to the Africa Development Fund without jeopardizing any other recipients?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the administration were to desire to do that, since there are no earmarks, we do not earmark money for Cambodia, we do not earmark money for anybody.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful to the gentleman. And to the gentleman from Michigan, deep thanks for allowing me the chance to rebut.

Let me conclude, the clarity is apparent that we are not jeopardizing any of the U.S. objectives in the Middle East, that the total amount of ESF funds is more than enough to fund this very small amount of \$25 million, that it will be even more so if the amendment to restrict spending in Cambodia is adopted at \$37 million.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the Campbell amendment to increase the United States contribution to the Africa Development Fund [ADF] from \$25 to \$50 million.

With the exception of the World Bank the ADF is the largest source of capital for 39 of Africa's poorest countries. The fund, supporting largely the agricultural, health care, education and economic reform sectors, reaches the poorest levels of society by supporting macro-economic development, thereby staving off natural and man-made disasters.

The ADF has undergone necessary and significant internal reforms to make the organizations more efficient. Staff has been reduced by 30 percent the net income has increased by \$150 million, and procurement reforms have increased transparency and decreased abuses.

The ADF is a success story. Please support this vital organization by passing the Campbell Amendment. Thank you.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the sponsorship of this important amendment to H.R. 2159, the foreign operations appropriations bill before the House today.

This amendment would appropriate an additional \$25 million to the African Development

Fund. This amendment is budget neutral and will provide the much needed support to the development of stable democracies on the continent of Africa.

It is important as we grapple with how best to assist the former republics of the Soviet Union to also provide assistance for the sustained development of Africa.

The African Development Fund is the largest source of capital for the 39 poorest countries, outside of the World Bank. It is the largest co-financing partner for IDA in Africa, and in 1997, the fund will lend 4 times more assistance than USAID.

This amendment would reduce the Economic Support Fund by \$25 million in order to provide the level of support that Africa needs in critical areas of agriculture, primary health care, basic education and economic reform.

The help offered by United States taxpayers—not to dictatorships, but to non-governmental organizations like CARE and multilateral financial institutions under sound management like the African Development Fund—will go farther in sub-Saharan Africa than anywhere else on Earth.

As a supporter of this amendment I am interested in helping the poorest people in the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important amendment.

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

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1330

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. YATES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. YATES:

At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION OF ASSISTANCE TO THE  
GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia if that government relocates the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, who participated during the Holocaust in the mass murder of Jews, Serbs, and Gypsies, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of the House for whom I have higher regard and greater respect than the chairman of the subcommittee and for the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the ranking member. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our chairman, has con-

ducted our hearings in an outstandingly fair and rational manner. It is not easy to disagree with him on any subject, and there are not many that I disagree with him upon and I am sure that he and I do not disagree upon the purpose of our amendment.

Croatia's role during the Holocaust was a most despicable one. The Ustashe, Croatia's soldiers, were Hitler's shock troops to exterminate the Jews, with whom they came in contact in Croatia. Literally hundreds of Jews were killed and their remains were buried in the cemetery at Jasenovac in Croatia. Now the government has indicated that it will bury Ustashe killers with their victims in the cemetery at Jasenovac.

Why is this such an important issue? Elie Weisel has put it very well, and I quote. "Such an act," he says, "will kill the victims twice. The first time was when they were murdered. The second time was when we murder their memory." That is exactly what the Government of Croatia would do in the event that it undertook to bury the Ustashe in the cemetery with its victims.

The victims and their killers in death would be used to eradicate the crimes that were committed during World War II. All that we have to receive from the Government of Croatia is the absolute assurance that the Ustashe will not be buried with their victims in this cemetery. As I indicated, we have asked for such assurances from President Tudjman and we have not received them. All that we have received is a statement as vague as we do not plan to bury them together at this time. That is today, Mr. Chairman. Tomorrow they may decide to do so.

The amendment that I offer will hold up payments to the Government of Croatia until such time as it gives our Government the assurances that the Ustashe will not be buried in that cemetery. I urge support for my amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that the gentleman from Alabama was on his feet seeking recognition when the gentleman from Illinois embarked upon debate. The Chair did not interrupt the debate from the gentleman from Illinois.

Without objection the gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. CALLAHAN. My point of order I think can be resolved, Mr. Chairman, and indeed the gentleman I think is going to ask for unanimous consent to amend his amendment. The original amendment that was introduced I think would create a point of order, but it is my understanding the gentleman from Illinois has an amendment that he is going to request unanimous consent to submit.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is correct. I concede the gentleman's point of order, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT NO. 51, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY  
MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amended version of the amendment I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51, as modified, offered by Mr. YATES:

At the end of the bill, insert the following after the last section (preceding the short title):

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE  
GOVERNMENT OF CROATIA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title II of this Act may be made available to the Government of Croatia to relocate the remains of Croatian Ustashe soldiers, at the site of the World War II concentration camp at Jasenovac, Croatia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Without objection, the modification is agreed to and the point of order reserved by the gentleman from Alabama is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken in connection with my previous amendment. The statement that I made on the previous amendment I now ask unanimous consent to be made available for this amendment.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for their cooperation.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 33 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON PROCUREMENT OUTSIDE THE  
UNITED STATES

SEC. 572. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for procurement outside the United States or less developed countries only if—

(1) such funds are used for the procurement of commodities or services, or defense articles or defense services, produced in the country in which the assistance is to be provided, except that this paragraph only applies if procurement in that country would cost less than procurement in the United States or less developed countries;

(2) the provision of such assistance requires commodities or services, or defense articles or defense services, of a type that are not produced in, and available for purchase from, the United States, less developed countries, or the country in which the assistance is to be provided; or

(3) the President determines on a case-by-case basis that procurement outside the

United States or less developed countries would result in the more efficient use of United States foreign assistance resources.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this was placed in the legislation the last several years. The essence of this is just simple, common sense. I was under the impression that we had an agreement worked out with the appropriators on it. It basically says that we give money to these foreign countries basically to help them in the form of aid, and they do make purchases with this American money that our taxpayers work hard to send here to Washington. The amendment says that, "Look, we give you that money. If you produce a product in your country and you need some farm equipment and you have farm equipment, go ahead and buy from your own people. But when you do not produce a product and you have to go outside your country to make a purchase and you're using American taxpayer dollars," this amendment says to purchase items made in America unless they would be so prohibitively costly it would negate the purpose of our foreign aid to this country in the first place.

The appropriators allowed the amendment the last time it was offered. I thought we had an agreement on it. I believe that it is absolute madness that we continue to write checks and give money away and then they take our money and buy products from other countries. It makes no sense. We talk about authorizing, but we have not had a reasonable authorization bill that spoke to any merit or substance at all, and this is a limitation on the use of American taxpayer dollars when these countries buy a product that they do not make themselves.

This is eminent common sense. This is reasonable appropriation policy, it is a reasonable appropriation measure, and I would ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee, if this amendment has been approved several times.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. This amendment has been approved several times. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio and I have talked about this amendment. I am not sure that we talked about the language as it is written, but conceptually I think that I and the committee agree with the gentleman, that in every instance where we are providing

aid to any foreign country and they are going to purchase some commodity, then they ought to give preference to U.S. firms. That is the purpose of it.

My reserving the point of order was simply to give me the opportunity to read the gentleman's language which, as he and I discussed, was one-sentence, buy American language. This one is a little bit more complex. I am willing to withdraw my point of order but must advise the gentleman that we may have to work on the language that has been drafted in conference, but at the same time to preserve the meaning of the gentleman's amendment. We do insist that these countries that receive American aid ought to be, without us making it into law, buying American goods, anyway. As a matter of fact, it is already in the bill; the sense of the Congress is already in the bill. It says it is the sense of the Congress that to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this act should be American made.

I have not had time to thoroughly analyze the page-long amendment that the gentleman has presented and thus the reason I had voiced some concern.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to the distinguished ranking member, let me say this. That sense of the Congress speaks to some basic intent, but it does not really do that which should be done after all these years of foreign aid. I have a number of other amendments that I feel very strong about, but I have talked with the gentleman about authorizing and appropriating and I am pulling back all of those. But I have one sincere effort here in the Congress, I really do, and that is this type of language. I would be willing to have the gentleman work on this language. This makes certain specifications that go a little bit beyond that sense of the Congress, but I would urge the gentleman, knowing his record, in lieu of that, to accept this language in general and to tailor where he may need it but leave it to the point where it is more than that sense of Congress.

I appreciate his having inserted that through my efforts over the years, but this I think takes us into some policy that appropriators should be taking on a reasonable limitation in the use of our taxpayers' dollars on these expenditures.

Mr. CALLAHAN. If the gentleman will further yield, the appropriate place for this language would be in some authorization bill, not in an appropriation bill and thus my argument. I or anyone on my committee that I am aware of has any objection to the destination he is trying to reach. We all agree with him. Thus, we insert in our bill language that was a sense of the Congress. But as I have said, we are going to have to take a look at the language.

I withdraw my point of order, but with the understanding that in conference we are going to have to work

with the Senate to get language that is more compatible with an appropriation bill rather than an authorization bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has expired.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I support the statement of our chairman about the clarification of the language in conference but support the spirit of the amendment that is put forth by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and once again call to the attention of our colleagues the refinement of the amendment, that the bill may be used for procurement outside the United States or in less developed countries only if such funds are used for purchases in the country receiving assistance and such purchases would cost less than procurement in the United States or less developed countries, and if such purchases are not available in the United States or less developed countries, and this is the important point that I think we will work on in conference, if the President determines that such purchases would result in a more efficient use of U.S. foreign assistance resources. The waiver language as well I think is a smart approach to the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Again, I associate myself with the comments of our chairman.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement. Just let me close by saying this. These authorization bills sometimes never get an opportunity to see the light of day. This limitation is very important. I really thank the chairman for withdrawing his point of order, and I plan to work with and lean on and grab ahold of the chairman and see what I can do because he has done a great job.

□ 1345

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if we would keep the spirit and the intent in the bill.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order against section 539 of the bill found on page 66, line 15, through page 67, line 22, on the grounds that it violates 5(b) of rule XXI of the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, clause 5(b) of rule XXI states that it shall not be in the order of the House to consider a measure carrying a tax or

a trade provision not reported by the committee of jurisdiction.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the measure on the floor would preclude the President from waiving certain import sanctions against Serbia-Montenegro which are imposed pursuant to certain codified Executive orders. The provision imposes a new requirement on the President that an Executive order lifting these import sanctions cannot be issued until the President certifies to the Congress that certain democratic reforms have occurred in Kosova. This change of authority over import restrictions falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and clearly constitutes a tariff measure for purposes of rule XXI 5(b) of the rules of the House.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the point of order applies, and I urge the Chair to sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, section 539 of the pending bill would prohibit the termination of sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro until certain conditions are met. This provision was included in the fiscal year 1996 Appropriation Act as a result of an amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] on July 11, 1995.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I oppose the amendment; however, it was made in order under a rule approved by the House on that very same day by a vote of 236 to 162, and for the RECORD I might remind the Members that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means voted for that rule.

I agree with the gentleman that this provision does not belong in this bill. I would say the same thing about a number of other provisions. However, lack of an authorization act for many years has resulted in this bill being used for purposes other than the appropriation of funds. Since the House has specifically approved this provision in the past, I believe that it was my duty to include it in this appropriation bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means does not agree and believes this is a violation of the House rule, and the Parliamentarian agrees, and I will, of course, defer to them on this matter, and I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other Member wishes to be heard on the point of order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] makes a point of order against section 539 of the bill on the grounds that it carries a tariff measure in a bill reported by committee, Committee on Appropriations, not having jurisdiction to report tariff matters in violation of clause 5(b) of rule XXI.

Under clause 5(b) of rule XXI, this point of order may be raised at any time during consideration of the bill for amendment in the Committee of the Whole even after section 539 has been passed in the reading for amendment.

In this respect, the standard of timeliness, this point of order is unlike those arising under clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI.

Current law authorized the President to waive application of certain sanctions to Serbia-Montenegro. Among these sanctions are import prohibitions which affect tariff collections. Section 539 of the bill constrains the authority of the President on these matters. It, thereby, carries a tariff measure within the meaning of clause 5(b) of rule XXI, and the point of order is sustained, and section 539 is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 32 offered by Mr. PAUL:

After the last section (preceding the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR ABORTION, FAMILY PLANNING, OR POPULATION CONTROL EFFORTS

SEC. 572. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for—

- (1) population control or population planning programs;
- (2) family planning activities; or
- (3) abortion procedures.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is very clear. If the amendment passes, no funds in this bill could be used for population control, family planning, or abortion procedures. That will take in about \$385 million that we could save by passing this amendment.

The most important part of this amendment would be that we would absolutely assure that none of the funding would ever be used for abortion. One of the ways that the funds get to abortion, to the use of abortion, is that the funds are granted for birth control, and then the funds elsewhere can be saved, and those other funds can be used for abortion. In other words, it can be the funds are fungible.

It is claimed that people have a need for birth control, and this may be true, but we have not been well received around the world. I am not quite sure exactly when the U.S. Government and the American taxpayer got involved in the birth control business overseas, but we have been doing it now probably for several decades. But there is a lot of resentment toward America imposing our will on other people.

For instance, we have sent over the use of Norplant, a very controversial medical procedure. I am a gynecologist, and I can attest to it. It is very controversial, yet it was used on hundreds of thousands of women overseas. When that procedure was finally brought to the United States, it was rejected by the American people.

I, as a gynecologist, spent more time taking these Norplants out than putting them in because of the severe complications with them, but nevertheless we, as taxpayers, have continuously sent more funding overseas to support these procedures.

But there is no moral justification for us in the U.S. Congress to go and

tax poor people in America, to go over and impose our ideas and our beliefs on other people's culture, and we have been doing this now for several decades, and a lot of resentment has been building up. There is no constitutional authority for programs like this. There is nowhere in the Constitution where we can find any justification for us imposing our will on other people in this manner.

But worst of all, if funds are used for birth control and other funds are saved and then they are used on abortion, it is in a way indirectly supporting abortion.

Later on we will vote on another amendment to curtail the use of funds for abortion, and I will support the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in this regard because we hope that that would at least help, but one way where we can assure and not worry about it would be to pass this amendment and not send any money over in the first place because it is not authorized, it is not permissible, it is not moral, and there is a lot of resentment toward us for these very, very reasons.

The issue that always comes up is that the people need help, but there are a lot of voluntary associations in this country that are willing to help. If we feel compelled to help poor nations in their birth control effort, it can be done through voluntary means, not through coercion, not taking by force money from people who have philosophic and religious and social beliefs against these programs that we are imposing on others.

So this is a program that should be just abolished. It should be stopped. We should not send any funds over there. This argument that we can control the way funds are being spent once they are overseas, we are kidding ourselves when we use that argument. We really lose control of these funds once they get into the hands of other governments or agencies that are dealing with these problems overseas.

Typically, programs that are run by governments and international governments do not work very well, and these programs have done very poorly. At the same time, there are poor countries around the world that have car loads, millions, of condoms sitting around that are not used. They cannot get surgical gloves to do surgical procedures. There are countries reported in Africa where they do not have penicillin, and yet they have all the birth control pills that they want.

So I argue that this program is unnecessary, unconstitutional, it is an abuse of the rights and beliefs of so many Americans, and it is not well received overseas. The best thing we can do is just take the money away from these programs, take the \$385 million and return it to the American taxpayers. This would be a far better way to use this money other than aggravating, antagonizing people in other countries.

What would we think if some foreign government came over and decided that our inner cities were overpopulated and they wanted to impose some population controls and some birth control methods on the inner cities? I am sure there would be a strong objection to that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment, as proposed, by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL]. If enacted, the Paul amendment would cause death and suffering for millions of women and children whose lives and well-being depend on the availability of family planning and health service supported under USAID's population assistance program. Over 580,000 women die annually, 1 woman every minute, of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth. Family planning can prevent 25 percent of all maternal and infant deaths by avoiding unintended pregnancies and spacing births.

The Paul amendment would close the most effective avenue to prevent abortions. Certainly we all consider abortion a failure, and if we want to reduce the number of abortions, we should support family planning.

The World Health Organization estimates that 40 percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion. That is a tragedy. Family planning enables couples to prevent unintended pregnancies. Large declines in numbers of abortions have occurred due to the expansion of family planning services in many countries across the globe, including South Korea, Chile, Hungary, Russia, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, Colombia, and Mexico. This amendment would end a 30-year program that is recognized as one of the most successful components of U.S. foreign assistance.

And this is not about the United States going to another country and forcing anything on anyone. This is a voluntary program that the countries asked for. And again, to reference the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL], we are not later going to be voting on any amendment that will curtail funds for abortion. The discussion in this bill is about curtailing funding for family planning.

More than 50 million couples in the developing world use family planning as a direct result of this program, and the average number of children per family has declined more than one-third since the 1960's. Three out of four Americans surveyed in 1995 wanted to increase or maintain spending on family planning for poor countries.

I urge our colleagues to reject overwhelmingly the ill-advised Paul amendment and to support international family planning.

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

Mr. Chairman, while I have every respect for the philosophy of the gentleman from Texas, and I share his views on abortion, I do not think that is what this debate or this amendment

addresses. Indeed, I feel like I have made a giant and major impact on the elimination of AID funds for abortion anywhere in the world. As a matter of fact, my bill says that none of the funds of this bill may be used for an abortion, period.

So this is not an abortion issue; this is a family planning issue, because some feel like that if they go into a country and through educational processes they will eliminate the need for abortions, and they well may be right.

So do not imply to anyone in this body or anyone in this audience watching today that the bill that I wrote permits abortion in any fashion because it absolutely restricts it. Abortions for family planning purposes cannot be performed with any of the money anywhere in this bill, period, flat no.

Now when I took this committee over as chairman several years ago, Mr. Chairman, if I had come to you and said to you and the proponents of the right to life, said, I am going to cut funding for family planning by up to half, then I would have been heralded as a hero.

□ 1400

Now I have done that, only to be addressed on the floor as a proponent of abortion, which I am not.

So I would submit to this Congress and to the gentleman from Texas, while I agree with his views with respect to the right to life, he is absolutely wrong in his allegation that any of this money for family planning purposes can be used for abortion. It does not, it cannot, it will not, and never will as long as I am chairman of this committee.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would oppose the gentleman's amendment, indicating to the Members that the restriction is already there and that we have cut family planning significantly over the period of time that I have used. If you use 1995 figures, we have cut \$518 million from family planning activities.

So I think we have done an outstanding job, and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to imply that the gentleman has permitted or endorsed or encouraged or the bill says directly there are funds here for abortion. I will concede that.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would answer my question, is there anything in this bill that leads the gentleman to believe that any of this money can be used for abortion anywhere in the world?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I am addressing the fungibility argument.

Mr. CALLAHAN. The fungibility and the tangibility of what is in this bill, you cannot use any of this money for abortions anywhere in the world. If the

gentleman would concede to that point, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, that is true directly, but indirectly the fungibility argument is very important. If you use funds for other things, you say the governments and agencies can use them for abortion. So you do it indirectly.

Yes, it might be a little harder to comprehend the fungibility argument, but it is there. If we support a country or a government or an agency that does permit and endorse abortion and they can use these funds for birth control pills, they can use their other funds to do the abortion.

So, yes, the gentleman is correct that directly there are no funds in this bill that will provide for abortion. But indirectly it opens up some funds and makes them available for abortion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, will the gentleman admit that we have done a very favorable job in moving in the same direction the gentleman would like us to move? Would the gentleman not admit that since when I took over this committee we have saved \$518 million? And now we have reduced it, we have reduced it to a level of \$385 million. I think we have made significant inroads and yet preserved the ability of agencies to go into a country with limited educational opportunities to give them advice.

Maybe it can be through a church, maybe it can be through abstinence programs, but I do think education in that manner actually denies the probability of abortions even being presented. But if they were presented, none of this money could ever be used under any circumstance for an abortion anywhere in the world for family planning purposes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, the efficiency of the programs are to be questioned. If you look at the Norplant program, they put this Norplant in hundreds of thousands of women. It is not a good medication. I have personal experience from it. Then they use that as an example of the reason to promote it in the United States.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I once again reiterate my opposition to the Paul amendment and support the statement of our chairman, Mr. CALLAHAN.

As this Congress should know by now, because it has been reiterated on this floor, no money in this bill can be used for abortion. That is the Helms language. That is the law of the land. Let us be clear.

So we want to take it to a fungibility place. I hope that Mr. PAUL will sup-

port the Gilman-Pelosi-Campbell Lowey-DeLauro-Slaughter-Greenwood proposal on the floor tomorrow, which addresses the fungibility issue very directly.

First of all, I do not think it needs to be addressed. But for those who need that comfort and clarification, I am pleased to be a supporter of that amendment. In that amendment it says that none of the funds would go to organizations that do not promote abortion as a method of family planning and that utilize these funds to prevent abortion as a method of family planning. It puts these conditions on receiving the funds; also, it says, except in the case of organizations that do not promote abortion as a method of family planning.

So there is nothing about fungibility here. This is about organizations that promote family planning and discourage the use of abortion for family planning. So fungibility is not a principle that applies here.

But if we are going to use the principles of fungibility, we are opening a door for many issues across the board in this bill and every other bill that comes along. I do not know that this Congress wants to go down that path.

But I am pleased to say that the amendment that will be offered tomorrow as an amendment to the Smith amendment will clarify, once and for all, this is not about fungibility. It is about family planning, and none of the money goes to any organization, unless they are promoting family planning and discouraging abortion as a tool for that.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would also go on record opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. I want to reiterate, as the gentleman from California has said, that I will support her amendment tomorrow.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

There are so many reasons to support this amendment, an amendment whose time has come. This amendment will eliminate funding for all population control activities overseas. We have spent hour upon hour in this Chamber debating the many issues surrounding foreign aid, which includes the funding for international family planning.

There are many problems with the U.S. taxpayer spending nearly \$400 million every year for international population control activities. One very obvious and practical problem that cannot be ignored is that the taxpayer simply cannot afford this type of program any longer.

I wish I could count the number of times I have come to the floor to speak out in one way or another against excessive Federal spending and Government intervention. Every time I implore Members of this body to consider

how we are sabotaging our children's futures, how we slowly but surely chip away at any prospects for a solid financial foundation every time we vote to spend more and more tax dollars on inappropriate and unconstitutional programs without any regard to the reality of our Federal Government's financial situation.

But there is an even bigger problem than one simply associated with dollars. This problem is more fundamental to the appropriate role of the Federal Government as defined by the Constitution.

Some might say that many provisions of this appropriations bill fall outside of the guidelines given to us by the Constitution. Some might say that a debate of that nature goes beyond the scope of this amendment.

I think we should talk about the Constitution more. I think that every time we consider a bill, an amendment, a motion to instruct conferees, every time we take any legislative action, we should remember our oath to uphold the Constitution. This means that sometimes, even when things sound like a great idea or the perfect solution to a problem facing our constituents back home, or faceless and nameless individuals suffering thousands of miles away, we have to show some restraint, if only because we are not empowered to act outside the legislative walls erected for us by our Founding Fathers.

Furthermore, I believe that international population control funding is not even a good idea. What concerns me greatly is that it appears that many of my colleagues have simply accepted the assertions of the population control lobby when they constantly and unflinchingly contend that overpopulation is the cause of nearly all of the world's human suffering.

For decades, we have heard doomsday predictions that the Earth's population is growing so much, to the point that we will soon be unable to sustain this rate of growth. Make no mistake about it and do not be misled. This is not an overcrowded planet. Too many people are not the problem.

I would assert, however, that those more interested in redistributing wealth and power have everything to lose if the myth of an unsustainable population explosion is debunked. I would further contend that sound public, policy based on real science, not misguided public and political maneuvers and schemes based on radical environmentalism, is the answer to the world's hunger and environmental problems. Flooding Third World developing and developed countries with potentially harmful contraceptives and family planning information, while appearing to meet a very humanitarian need, is such a misguided policy.

There have been numerous reports about the atrocities many women have suffered, all under the auspices of family planning. We have seen women in the slums of Bangladesh and Haiti who

are part of experimentation with Norplant. We have heard accounts of women in Turkey who were told by volunteers that "family planning" is more important than husbands, tradition, culture or God, and that sterilization is better than children.

Surely even those who advocate dollars for responsible population control policy would be alarmed at this information. Surely we should not force our constituents to contribute to these programs that undermine the cultures of our neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply conclude by expressing once again that we need to reevaluate our priorities, our financial situation, and most importantly, our constitutional obligations, and support this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which will eliminate USAID funding for international family planning.

The need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent and the aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile. Last February, both the House and the Senate showed their commitment to the USAID International Family Planning Program by voting for the early release of the funds for this program.

Eliminating family planning will deeply hurt millions of women and children.

Nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth; 99 percent of these women live in developing countries. In many countries, women are the primary caregivers of children and a mother's survival is crucial to the survival and well-being of her children. Our international family planning programs are working to reduce maternal deaths and illness due to childbirth.

The ability to control the timing and spacing of childbearing helps mothers, infants, and children thrive. Infants born less than 2 years after a sibling are more likely to have low birth weight, making them more vulnerable to illness and death. One in five infant deaths alone could be averted by the better spacing of births.

In addition, the health of the mother is also put at risk when couples cannot control the number and timing of births. For example, very young women and women who have births very close together are at greater risk for postpartum hemorrhage, a leading cause of maternal death. And for every woman who dies during childbirth, many more face injuries and infections, leaving them permanently disabled or infertile.

This amendment will prevent us from eliminating these tragedies. Simply put—this amendment will end our family planning programs. Period.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. We cannot let them eliminate international family planning—there is too much at stake. I urge you to continue this vital investment in the reproductive health and safety of women and children.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PAUL] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. FOX OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. Fox of Pennsylvania:

Page 94, after line 3, insert the following:

Sec. 572. None of the funds made available under the heading "DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE" may be used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Fox-Miller amendment, which would restrict funding of the CAMPFIRE program used to directly support or promote trophy hunting or the international commercial trade in elephant ivory, elephant hides, or rhinoceros horns.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 8 years, the Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources, otherwise known as CAMPFIRE, has implemented many valuable programs which have helped improve the quality of life for the people of Zimbabwe. Our amendment would do nothing to interfere with these beneficial programs.

Unfortunately, too much of the funding, however, from the U.S. Agency for International Development is used to promote the killing of the African elephant, which remains on the endangered species list.

The organizations to my left, over 200, have supported our amendment, as well as over 20 newspapers from around the country.

The CAMPFIRE program, instead of becoming more sustainable, has become increasingly dependent on foreign subsidies from USAID other international sources. In 1989, USAID spent an average of \$1.3 million per year over 6 years on CAMPFIRE, whereas in 1995, USAID pledged to spend an average of \$5.12 million per year over 4 years on the program.

Additionally, CAMPFIRE relied on funds from countries such as Japan, the Netherlands, Germany, Norway, Great Britain, the European Commission, Sweden, and Canada, which in 1995 totaled in excess of \$1.4 million and which has no ban on its use for the promotion of trophy hunts.

We are very concerned that U.S. taxpayer dollars have been used by CAMPFIRE implementing agencies to lobby the U.S. Congress in an ongoing effort to advocate the ivory trade and the weakening of the foreign species provision of the Endangered Species Act.

We believe it is inappropriate for the U.S. Government to supply funds to foreign entities which then use those funds to launch special-interest lobbying efforts to Members of Congress.

□ 1415

American taxpayers have footed the bill for these agencies to open and maintain offices in Washington, London, Brussels, and Johannesburg in support of these lobbying efforts.

American tax dollars were used to help CAMPFIRE agencies overturn the ivory trade ban, which undermined the U.S. negotiating position at the June 1997 Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.

Since 1989, the United States has officially opposed the resumption of international trade in any elephant parts, including ivory. At the same CITES convention, the elephant was downlisted from appendix I to appendix II.

The American position has been so resolute because the devastation of the elephant during the 1980's was so severe. There were 70,000 to 100,000 elephants slaughtered a year by poachers feeding the international demand for ivory. The continent-wide population dropped from 1.3 million to 60,000 in just a decade's time.

Elephants are still in peril throughout much of their range, and the resumption of the ivory trade is a grave threat. The Fox-Miller amendment is pro-CAMPFIRE, maintaining existing funding levels and allowing USAID to invest in a wider range of revenue-generating activities that have thus far received insufficient attention. USAID has provided funds for CAMPFIRE implementing organizations for more than 9 years. More than \$25 million American tax dollars have been used to a very significant degree to promote trophy hunting and the international trade in ivory.

Our amendment places a restriction on the use of taxpayer funds for the 10th and final year of funding. It is past time that a greater share of USAID funds be used to promote other revenue-generating activities such as ecologically-sensitive wildlife tourism.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for offering this amendment. I think this is an important amendment. I rise in strong support of this legislation to prohibit the use of taxpayer funds to promote or support the African elephant ivory trade or trophy hunting.

Contrary to what Members may have heard, this amendment does not prohibit and will not prohibit trophy hunting within the Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources, known as the CAMPFIRE Program. Nor is the Fox-Miller amendment in any way inconsistent with the recent decision of the Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora to permit the limited resumption of the ivory trade.

The issue here is whether or not United States tax dollars should be used by organizations and agencies implementing the CAMPFIRE program in

Zimbabwe to Promote activities that are clearly opposed by the vast majority of people who pay taxes, our constituents.

A poll completed earlier this year found that 88 percent of Americans opposed the resumption of the ivory trade. That was also the position of this administration. That is nearly 9 out of 10 Americans who oppose the activities that are funded in the bill as it currently exists. That is why we need this amendment.

This amendment is not aimed at CAMPFIRE, whose programs I have visited in Zimbabwe and whose mission of rural economic development is highly admirable. To this point, much of the revenue that CAMPFIRE has generated for local economic development has come from trophy hunting. Very wealthy hunters pay \$12,000 or more for a permit to shoot elephants and other exotic animals, and much of that money is repatriated to these villages for economic development.

CAMPFIRE officials told me over and over again that they are committed to moving away from trophy hunting as a major source of revenue for the Program. These officials recognize that while trophy hunting may provide large amounts of quick money in the start-up phase of CAMPFIRE, that we are now beyond that stage and a more diverse program of economic development is needed.

Moreover, there is no need to use U.S. taxpayer money to promote trophy hunting. That is already done through international hunting groups, magazines, and others. There has been no difficulty in attracting a sufficient number of hunters to satisfy the annual quota of elephants. We certainly do not need to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to convince hunters to do that which they are already prepared to journey halfway around the world and pay \$12,000 plus all of their expenses to do; that is, to hunt elephants.

Some might suggest withholding all U.S. aid from the CAMPFIRE program. I think that would be unwise. I think it would be an unfortunate action and would deprive the program of critical funds to assist rural development in Africa.

Instead, what we should do is we should assist the development of a more diversified economic program promised by CAMPFIRE involving non-hunting activities such as camping, photo safaris, local craft sales, lodges, and much, much more. We should target our U.S. tax dollars to these meritorious and noncontroversial efforts, rather than to continue to squander our constituents' tax dollars on promoting big game hunting by very wealthy individuals. That is the goal of this amendment, to diversify and to stabilize the CAMPFIRE Program.

Our amendment would also end the unacceptable practice of using United States tax dollars to fund organizations like the British-based Africa Resources Trust, that lobbies CITES to

overturn the ban on the international ivory trade, that lobbies Congress to weaken the Endangered Species Act. We should not be sending taxpayer dollars to these organizations to lobby against positions of the U.S. Government and to lobby within this Congress for those tax dollars.

Do not let anyone tell you that this amendment would injure CAMPFIRE or the struggling villages and populations for whom the program holds so much promise. This amendment puts our tax dollars exactly where CAMPFIRE is headed, in economic diversification, not a program heavily dependent upon shooting elephants to generate revenues.

Do not let anyone tell you that the Fox-Miller amendment will interfere with the recovery of the African elephant promoted by CAMPFIRE; 8 out of 10 elephants in Zimbabwe do not live in the CAMPFIRE areas. It is not trophy hunting and culling that has allowed for the growth in the African elephant herds; it is the international ban on hides and ivory, which has been weakened due to the vigorous lobbying of CAMPFIRE and groups it supports with United States taxpayer money.

CAMPFIRE, the local villages, the Zimbabwean Government can all continue their hunting and culling operations as necessary for trophy hunting, species protection, and human safety. CITES can go forward with the limited sale of ivory from existing stockpiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, these limited sales from existing stockpiles can go forward, but not with the dollars that nearly 90 percent of the Americans do not want expended for that purpose.

For 8 years U.S. taxpayers have supported CAMPFIRE, and I would hope that that support would continue. This is a program of merit. But let us not let it jeopardize our participation in the CAMPFIRE Program itself by continuing to fund with American taxpayer dollars those hunting actions that are not acceptable to those very same taxpayers, and that, if continued, will eventually sour the support for the entire CAMPFIRE program.

I want to say to my colleagues that I had an opportunity to visit these programs, and a number of other Members of Congress have visited these programs. It is a very, very exciting program and a program of merit to bring about economic development in incredibly, unbelievably poor rural communities.

This money is being used to develop wells for drinking water, to develop granaries to grind corn into food, and to provide for electrification in some cases of these villages; the bare, bare necessities of any kind of semblance of adequate livelihood.

This program is of merit. But what is not of merit is continuing to use the very few dollars we have to lobby, to come back and to pay for trips to Washington, DC and to Europe, and to set up offices throughout Europe to lobby on behalf of GATT and WTO and weaken the Endangered Species Act; and what is not acceptable is to continue to funnel those monies into activities that the very participants in trophy hunting are fully capable of paying for themselves. These are, for the most part, very wealthy individuals who pay huge amounts of money to go out and to get a trophy elephant or some other animal.

We ought not to be using these moneys. We ought to be using these moneys for economic diversification of the CAMPFIRE Program, so it will have a lasting effect. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Fox-Miller amendment to H.R. 2159. This amendment, which prohibits the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting and promoting the international trade in ivory or rhino horn, is a sensible restriction on activities that many Americans find offensive.

This amendment is modest. It will not stop Zimbabwe or other nations from authorizing or conducting trophy hunting, which is their sovereign right in accordance with international treaties. Our Government has very sensibly opposed the international trade in elephant ivory and hides for many years. This amendment will ensure that taxpayer funds will not be used to undermine that position.

Mr. Chairman, the wildlife of Africa is one of the greatest treasures of our planet. Accordingly, I urge our Members who care about preserving these resources to support the Fox-Miller amendment. More than 80 percent of our constituents throughout the country oppose the hunting of elephants, according to a recent survey. This amendment prevents their hard-earned tax dollars from supporting this practice.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Agency for International Development has been sponsoring a program in Zimbabwe known as the CAMPFIRE Program. This project, implemented in cooperation with the government and local authorities, is designed to help rural farmers and others develop a self-sustaining economy based partly on tourism.

The project helps curb the illegal poaching of African elephants by providing the people of the area with an incentive to conserve these elephants. Part of the incentive is to allow limited legal hunting, although U.S. funds are not used, and let me repeat, U.S. funds are not used for this purpose.

Funds generated from the hunting are used to support economic development.

Concerns have been expressed that the project has promoted efforts to allow international trade in elephant ivory. Although that does not seem to be true, the committee bill includes bill language prohibiting, and I reiterate, prohibiting the use of any funds in contravention of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species.

Concerns have also been raised about possible illegal lobbying activities. The AID general counsel has found no evidence that U.S. funds were used for lobbying activities, and our committee report reiterates the obvious: the use of taxpayer funds for lobbying is prohibited.

We worked with those on the committee, especially the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who had concerns about this program, and I believe we addressed these concerns. I looked to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on this issue due to his vast knowledge of foreign aid issues and due to his position as ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations. We negotiated with him in good faith to produce both a good bill and report language that represented a responsible approach to this issue.

The author of the amendment does not seem to want the U.S. Government to be involved in any way, directly or indirectly, with a program that involves wildlife management. However, the people of Zimbabwe have no choice but to deal with the facts of their existence. Failure to implement a responsible wildlife management program in that country will inevitably lead to an irresponsible program, since the people of Zimbabwe will be forced to deal with the increase in the elephant population.

The end result will be an increase in poaching and further conflicts between subsistence farmers and the elephants. This will lead to more elephant deaths, the exact opposite of what the sponsor of the amendment is seeking.

I reiterate, the bill prohibits any funds from being used to circumvent the prohibition on the illegal trade in elephant ivory. It is a responsible approach. I might add, and we bring this out in the report language on page 11, since this program has been started the elephant population has increased from 43,000 to 67,000 in just a few short years.

□ 1430

I urge the House to support the committee position and to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Fox amendment. Mr. Chairman, I must say at the outset that I have been in this House for over 12 years, and I cannot think of a more important conservation measure than

that which is referred to as the CAMPFIRE Program. And I cannot remember a time when a program has been more grossly and greatly misrepresented than this one has in the last few minutes. Let me explain where this program came from, why it is important, and why it ought to be retained as is.

First, let me say that the point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] that it is funded through the use of funds that the gentleman objects to, in an earlier news release this month, the gentleman indicated that 90 percent of the funding for this program came from the sources that he objects to. Therefore, the gentleman's argument falls of its own weight, because if we are going to remove 90 percent of the funding, there will be no CAMPFIRE Program. It is pretty simple.

Therefore, if we are going to have a CAMPFIRE Program, which the gentleman from Pennsylvania purports to support and at the same time purports to withdraw 90 percent of the funding, it seems like a fairly ridiculous proposal.

Mr. Chairman, in the early 1980's this program was born. It was born because of concern which came to fruition in 1988 with the passage of the African Elephant Conservation Act of that year, and that came about because the population of elephants in the African countries was dropping substantially.

In 1979, for example, there were about 1.3 million elephants in Africa. By 1988, there were less than 750,000. In 1973, there were 130,000 elephants in Kenya, and by 1987, there were only 20,000.

In 1977, in the Selous Game Reserve in the United Republic of Tanzania, there were 109,000 elephants. By 1988, there remained only 55,000.

So the subcommittee which I served on in the old Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife, studied this situation and recommends some changes in law which we thought would be beneficial. And, in fact, the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1988 was passed in that year and it provided broad authority for our country to unilaterally take action to save elephants. We did that under the Bush administration and the same policies have been followed by the Clinton administration.

Also, the Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species, known as CITES, has enacted international regulations which essentially do three things: First, Outlaw the international trade of ivory; second, permit the continuation of trophy hunting as a fund-raiser; and third, the moneys resulting from conservation efforts such as tourism and hunting would be used for conservation by African countries.

Huge successes have come from this program which the gentleman from Pennsylvania would defund. We have seen the African elephant population increase from 4 to 6 percent a year; a huge springback in the years since 1989 when this law became effective.

We have also seen a number of very important conservation groups endorse this program and, in fact, four have written to me, in some cases as late as today, supporting my position. Those organizations include the African Wildlife Foundation, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, the National Wildlife Federation, and the World Wildlife Fund; all support my position and oppose the Fox amendment.

Mr. Chairman, they do so for a number of reasons. For example, 7 million people in southern Africa have directly benefited from programs like CAMPFIRE. In Zimbabwe alone, 5,000 to 10,000 jobs have been created and 33 percent of the land in that country is devoted now to conservation and wildlife management, which benefits African elephants. Mr. Chairman, I am beside myself trying to figure out how the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my friend, wants to defund this program.

The population of African elephants has also increased from 4 to 6 percent, as I said earlier. In Zimbabwe alone, increasing from 45,000 elephants to 66,000 elephants over this same period of time, the program the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to defund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has expired.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, in addition, the number of households participating in CAMPFIRE has grown from 9,000 in 1989 to 105,000 in 1996.

Our Nation's support for the CAMPFIRE Program is without question, and it is a misrepresentation to say that CAMPFIRE moneys were used in opposition to the U.S. position on sport hunting, because our law provides for the recognition of sport hunting and our negotiation position has provided for the recognition of sports hunting.

Our Nation's support for the CAMPFIRE Program allows thousands of people to improve their livelihoods and has created a situation for the comeback of the African elephants. This is not a program that we should be trifling with.

Congress, this Congress, is criticized over and over again for doing things that do not work, and yet this amendment brought to the floor today would defund one of the most successful programs that we have had in the area of conservation.

It is not a coincidence that elephant populations have increased under CAMPFIRE, and it would be a terrible mistake to end the Agency for International Development's essential involvement and investment in this program.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 2 minutes.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, let us make it real clear here. I understand how there may be two sides to the issue, but I want to be very clear. Whether my colleagues embrace the position of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], my friend, that the program is fine and we should allow lobbying money to promote hunting and illegal trade in ivory, the fact is that no one wants to defund this program. To say otherwise is an absolute misrepresentation of my position and those who are advocates for elephants and endangered species across the globe.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that we are all for maintaining the funding of CAMPFIRE. To say otherwise is an absolute misrepresentation and not correct. The fact is we want to make sure the funds get to the people of Zimbabwe, in fact get to the CAMPFIRE Program, and are not used for the purpose of promoting illegal trade of ivory or illegal hunting.

The fact is that funds are being used to lobby and that is what we object to, the lobbying portion, and not to anything else. Because Zimbabwe decides for itself whether there is hunting and whether there is trade.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise in support of the Fox amendment. We should not force the American taxpayer to directly pay for promoting the international ivory trade or elephant trophy hunting. I believe that the Fox-Miller amendment is a very smart approach to this very complicated challenge before the House today.

The Fox amendment bars the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting or promoting the international commercial trade in ivory or rhino horn. The Fox amendment does not stop Zimbabwe, or any other nation, from authorizing or conducting trophy hunting.

The Fox-Miller amendment is pro CAMPFIRE maintaining existing funding levels, allowing USAID to invest in a wide-range of revenue-generating activities that have received insufficient activities in the past. When one U.S. agency, USAID, undermines the work of another U.S. agency, the Department of Interior, taxpayer dollars are wasted and U.S. policy positions are undermined.

The Interior Department has maintained a firm stand against renewing the international trade in elephant ivory and hide since 1989. Again, the Fox amendment bars the use of American tax dollars for the purpose of supporting or promoting trophy hunting.

It does not take the funding away from CAMPFIRE, but directs it away from lobbying efforts and into conservation efforts.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her statement and for her support of this amendment and for her clarification.

The suggestion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] that somehow this is an effort to defund CAMPFIRE is just outrageous in the sense that the gentleman understands, if he reads the amendment, it is a very simple amendment and that is not what it does.

What this amendment suggests is we should not be using taxpayer dollars to fund an activity that over 88 percent of the taxpayers in this country find abhorrent and do not agree with. They would agree with the CAMPFIRE Program, but what they do not agree with is using their dollars to support trophy hunting of big game. That program, that component, that part of CAMPFIRE can stand on its own, because it has centuries of tradition, if you will, and a constituency of people who seek to do it. More people apply to do it than are allowed to do it each and every year.

Mr. Chairman, what we ought to now be taking is this risk capital in USAID and putting it into diversification of these rural economies so that more and more people in these economies can participate and these economies hopefully can prosper and increase the standard of living within those rural economies in Zimbabwe and other countries.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey cannot come here and suggest that somehow this is about defunding CAMPFIRE. That amendment will eventually come if we keep funding trophy hunting, because the American people do not want anything to do with trophy hunting with American taxpayer dollars. Or if CAMPFIRE continues to lobby, then we will have an amendment that will wipe out the whole program.

What we are trying here to do is to preserve the best of this program and the use of taxpayer dollars and let that very strong part, that is a very strong constituency, trophy hunting, stand on its own and then get on with the diversification of the program.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I once again commend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALAHAN], the chairman of our committee, who was very sensitive to the concerns of many of us on the committee. The bill language is an attempt to correct this situation. I think that the Fox-Miller amendment goes the committee one better, and I support the perfecting amendment that my colleagues have put forth.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very wise and smart and addresses the problem appropriately to stop the U.S. taxpayer from funding trophy hunting, from subsidizing lobbying efforts to support trophy hunting, but still maintains the funding for CAMPFIRE. I urge my colleagues to support the Fox-Miller amendment. It is pro-CAMPFIRE and pro-environment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and there are a number of reasons why. I think importantly, if we look at the issue of taxpayer funding and the whole issue of foreign aid, we are in a period of time where we are declining the amount of money that we are going to spend, and I support that. I think that we should spend less money on foreign aid than we currently are.

But then we have to look at, if we are going to spend money, what are we going to spend it on? I would argue that we should spend it on programs that have proven to be successful. This program happens to be one of the few that has proven to be extremely successful.

Mr. Chairman, I recently had the opportunity to visit Africa and to visit one of these CAMPFIRE sites. I was amazed at how little I actually knew about how this CAMPFIRE Program worked, until I was there on the ground and had the opportunity to see it. We get this romantic vision of what it is like from TV, and we think the big game hunter is going out there and hunting elephants and all this stuff.

It is not like that. There are people living in huts who have to erect big fences around their houses to keep the elephants out. They are terrified that these elephants are going to kill them. Some wonder why then we have declining numbers of elephants in Africa. It is because the people did not care about them. They were killing their children, they were destroying their farmland, there was no economic incentive, there was no social incentive for them to maintain a high number of elephants.

So then we had to come up with a program that actually would give them that financial incentive and social incentive to protect those elephants, and this program was devised where a limited number of elephants would be hunted and it would bring money into these communities. Then all of a sudden we saw the numbers, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] said earlier, we saw the numbers go from 44,000 to 67,000 in Zimbabwe alone.

□ 1445

And why? Because there was an economic incentive. There was a social incentive for them to protect these elephants. Now, all of a sudden, instead of looking the other way when a poacher came in and shot an elephant, they went after the poacher. They wanted to

keep them out because these elephants were important to them.

I had the opportunity to visit a school while I was over there. It was a little three-room school, but those people were so proud of that school. How did they pay for it? They do not have any money. The average income is \$400 a year. How did they pay for the school? They paid for it with moneys that came from this CAMPFIRE Program. They paid for it with the help that we were able to give them. We saw wells that were put in, and for the first time these people had fresh drinking water out of a well. These things were important to them. They may seem like everyday life to us, but when we are looking at the outback of Africa, these were very important issues to them.

I want to talk a few minutes about endangered species and about the program that was created. The program that was created in this circumstance created an economic incentive for these people to promote more African elephants. They were hugely successful at it.

If you want to look at our endangered species program, you can see everything that we are doing wrong. We want to look at some of the good ideas that have come out of this program and we look at a way of conserving our wildlife that I think we have something to learn from. It has been hugely successful.

I have also heard Members talk about the CAMPFIRE Program somehow promoting the illegal trade and poaching of elephants and ivory. There is nothing that could be further from the truth because what this has done has stopped the illegal poaching of elephants in these areas, areas where we still have illegal trade, and illegal poaching of elephants and ivory are coming from the areas where they do not have this program. So if we want to do what is right for the wildlife, it is to vote against this amendment because this program has been successful. If we want to do what is right for the people of Africa, we have to vote against this amendment.

We have heard earlier in the debate Members talk about the idea of getting away from hunting and getting into photographic safaris and ecotourism, and they are doing that. In fact, while I was there, I had the opportunity to visit one of the sites where they were conducting the photographic safaris, and in the safaris they had several camps that were set up and it was like a mini hotel that they had to set up. And they had to bring in fresh water and they had to bring in sewer facilities and they had to somehow develop an electrical system, all of this in the name of conducting a photographic safari.

And if you contrast that with the hunters that come in where you pitch a tent out in the middle of nowhere, what is best for the environment? The development of a hotel on the edge of a

river somewhere so people can come in and take pictures of the animals, or a small tent that is set up and the people do not do any destruction to the environment at all?

But they are getting into the photographic safaris and in the future, maybe some day, that will be a major source of income for them. They would like to see it go into that and have a greater income and diversify. But currently that is not there, and 90 percent of the money that is coming in from this is coming in from the hunts. If we do away with that, we have killed the program. And whether our intention is to kill the program or not, that is exactly what we are doing is killing the program.

I think that even though I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] had good intentions going into this, I believe that there were some mistakes made. I believe that this is going in the opposite direction of what we need to do. I think this is the kind of program we need to look at and learn from, of some of the right things to do and the wrong things to do.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I do not claim to know as much as some of the previous speakers, but from what I can tell, this has been a successful program that has encouraged conservation and has actually reduced poaching and improved the situation in Zimbabwe. As I understand it, in Kenya what they have done is, they have eliminated this type of hunting and the poaching has increased and conservation efforts have decreased.

And really, Members need to understand what this is about. This is really about eliminating hunting. It would be the same thing if we said in the United States that we are going to take the Pittman-Robertson money and we are going to take the Dingell-Johnson money and we are going to say that it cannot be used for anything that has to do with hunting.

And what would happen if we did that? Those programs would fall apart. They have been some of the most successful programs that we have ever put together in this country.

Everybody understands that without hunters, without their contribution to conservation in this country, we would not have the kind of wildlife that we have at the present time. If we eliminate hunting in Zimbabwe, which is what we will do with this program, we will have the results that we have seen in Kenya.

I think we should be very clear about what this is about. This is about eliminating hunting. And if Members are for that, I guess they want to vote for this amendment. But if they believe in conservation, if they believe in approaching this the right way and they believe hunting is a good way to manage our natural resources, they will oppose this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this misguided amendment to restrict the ability of the Agency for International Development [AID] to fund the CAMPFIRE program [Communal Area Management Programme For Indigenous Resources].

While I am not normally an advocate of foreign aid, CAMPFIRE has been one of the most successful programs ever funded by the Agency for International Development.

In fact, it has been so successful that the program, which started in Zimbabwe, has been adopted by other African countries, including Botswana, Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia.

What is the CAMPFIRE program? In short, it is an initiative to improve the standard of living among Africa's poorest rural farmers by giving them an economic stake in the wildlife resources of their country. Under CAMPFIRE, villagers receive a direct economic benefit from their wildlife and, therefore, a powerful incentive to conserve those resources.

In some rural areas, CAMPFIRE provides up to 90 percent of the money villagers use to build and maintain their homes, hospitals, and schools. Without CAMPFIRE, many Africans and numerous wildlife species, including elephants, face a bleak future.

Under the CAMPFIRE program, a village receives a percentage of the money collected from the proceeds from wildlife management. For instance, if a sport hunter wants to shoot a Cape buffalo or an African elephant, it will cost him thousands of dollars. Prior to CAMPFIRE, all this money went directly to the central government in Harare. Today, a significant percentage of those funds remains at the local level and the villagers themselves, in a democratic process, decide how this money will be spent. This is the essence of the CAMPFIRE program is local control of wildlife and financial incentives, which result in effective conservation programs.

The CAMPFIRE program is strongly supported by not only the Clinton administration but also such major conservation organizations as the African Wildlife Foundation, International Union for the Conservation of Nature, International Union for Conservation of Nature, National Wildlife Federation, Safari Club International, the World Wildlife Fund, and the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. These entities enthusiastically support this program because they recognize that:

Seven million people in Southern Africa have directly benefited from programs like CAMPFIRE.

In Zimbabwe, 5,000 to 10,000 jobs have been created and 33 percent of the land in that country is now devoted to wildlife management.

The population of African elephants has increased in Zimbabwe from 45,000 to more than 66,000 today and poaching in CAMPFIRE areas has been stopped.

The number of households participating in CAMPFIRE has grown from 9,000 in 1989 to about 105,000 in 1995.

The number of elephants shot in CAMPFIRE areas has decreased since its introduction from 300 per year to 130 in 1996.

Our Nation's support of the CAMPFIRE program allows thousands of people to improve their livelihoods, to provide education and the most basic health care for their children, and to effectively manage their wildlife resources.

In addition, it encourages the growth of democratic ideals.

It is not a coincidence that elephant populations have increased under CAMPFIRE, and it would be a terrible mistake to end AID's essential investment in this innovative program. In the final analysis, CAMPFIRE and programs like it are Africa's best hope for conserving its wildlife resources and providing its population with a bright future.

I urge a no vote on the Fox/Miller amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my strong support for the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] and my distinguished colleague and fellow Californian [Mr. MILLER] to eliminate the use of U.S. taxpayer funds to promote or support the trophy hunting of elephants under the USAID sponsored program called Communal Areas Management Programs for Indigenous Resources [CAMPFIRE]. This amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1997 echoes the sentiment of the American people to eliminate trophy hunting and to prevent the use of taxpayer dollars to lobby for and to promote trophy hunting.

As elected officials, we are duty bound to uphold the will of our constituents, the wishes of the American people. A 1997 Penn & Schoen survey found that 84 percent of Americans oppose trophy hunting, domestically and abroad. Despite this overwhelming opposition to the practice of trophy hunting, the USAID-funded CAMPFIRE program uses trophy hunts to generate funds for the majority of its projects. A recent study of the CAMPFIRE program showed that 90 percent of the funds generated from CAMPFIRE districts intended to help the indigenous populations came from trophy hunting. While CAMPFIRE funds may be used for the development of many successful and positive programs in Africa, we cannot condone the methods which are used to generate these funds.

The U.S. Government has consistently supported the international ban on trade in ivory in order to prevent the destruction of endangered species. United States conservation policy should remain consistent. Our foreign assistance should not be funding elephant hunts for ivory at the same time that we are also supporting an international ban on trade in ivory. Not long ago, our Government rightly spoke out at the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species [CITES] to express strong opposition to the down-listing of the African elephant from appendix I to appendix II of the convention. This down-listing would further dilute the international ban on the ivory trade. The bipartisan Fox-Miller amendment would bring our foreign assistance into line with existing United States conservation policy toward preserving the African elephant.

Mr. Chairman, another disturbing effect of the CAMPFIRE program is the lobbying efforts undertaken in a number of capitals in support of expanding the program. CAMPFIRE plans to expand beyond Zimbabwe and has opened offices in Washington, London, Brussels, and Johannesburg for the principal purpose of lobbying. CAMPFIRE is a sustainable development program and should not be engaging in the process of lobbying on its own behalf with taxpayer dollars.

The argument has been made that the CAMPFIRE program benefits the people of

Zimbabwe, and therefore, we should continue our assistance because it helps the impoverished villagers of that country. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the assistance has limited impact upon the population of rural Zimbabwe. Only 5 cents out of every dollar generated actually benefits rural households in Zimbabwe.

The comments from my constituents in San Francisco and San Mateo County speak volumes about the public's view of this trophy hunting program that is supported by the CAMPFIRE program. Mr. Chairman, I would like to share a few of the comments of my constituents with my colleagues:

The CAMPFIRE program is an outrageous contradiction that flies in the face of a government continually professing its concern for nature and the environment on a global basis.—Carol Kemski, San Bruno, California.

This cruel and destructive government program should not be supported by our tax dollars.—Ron Scheinberg, San Francisco, California.

I am aghast by the fact that the USAID is diverting our tax dollars into CAMPFIRE in order to enable trophy hunting of elephants.—Mary Larkin, San Francisco, California.

Mr. Chairman, the Fox-Miller amendment will not stop trophy hunting in Zimbabwe. The government of that country has the sovereign right to do what it chooses to do in this regard. But this amendment will stop U.S. taxpayer funds from being used to support trophy hunting, which 84 percent of the American people oppose.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and stop the outrage of U.S. taxpayer funding of trophy hunting.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. TORRES: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

SEC. 572. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for programs at the United States Army School of the Americas located at Fort Benning, Georgia.

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface my remarks about this amendment by first thanking the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] for his efforts to work with me on how we address the funding elements that

are provided in this bill for the U.S. Army School of the Americas. And while I do appreciate what has been done on this subject that is reflected in the language in the bill before us, I am compelled to offer this amendment together with my colleagues on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLETTA] which prohibits any of the funds of this bill being used for the school.

I think it is important to note that in last year's bill, this committee directed the Departments of State and Defense to submit a report no later than January 15 on a number of concerns that the Members had expressed about the school, such as the screening process for applicants and monitoring of graduates. This approach was agreed upon at that time despite our inclination to cut off those funds. This year, this report was received at the "eleventh hour" just prior to the subcommittee's markup on June 25, nearly 6 months late.

The report, 3½ pages in length, does not represent what I believe to be, nor the committee, many of the committee Members, a serious effort to be responsive to the issues that were addressed. It merely details how screening is intended to be carried out and contains no evaluation of how this process is carried out.

It further states that the school, that neither the school nor other U.S. personnel have the capacity to monitor graduates. The lateness of the report and its brevity indicate that the school and the Defense Department have failed to take reforms seriously.

I am offering this amendment today because I believe it is time to forge a new relationship with Latin America, to mark a new era in U.S. support for democracy in this hemisphere. The cold war is over, Mr. Chairman. Rooting out Communist insurgents is passe. Human rights violations in the pursuit of eliminating the enemy cannot be condoned.

The School of the Americas cannot deny its dismal connection with the worst human rights violators in the region. The school's graduates who are human rights violators are not just a bunch of bad apples. The list of human rights violators connected with the school is long and is getting longer as names of violators are matched up with those of graduates.

The Salvadoran Truth Commission cited 19 out of 26 officers for the massacre of Jesuit priests; 100 out of 246 Colombian officers cited for war crimes; 6 Peruvian officers involved in the killing of 9 students and a professor; Panamanian dictator Manuel Noriega. The list goes on and on and on and cannot be dismissed as just a few exceptions.

Throughout Latin America, the School of the Americas is seen as a training ground for repressive militaries and dictators; and its record, its

record, I underscore that, cannot be ignored. The recently declassified training manuals used at the school as lesson plans and reading materials show that something indeed was wrong with the school's curriculum. These manuals taught armies to violate human rights, to use physical abuse, to use blackmail, to use blacklists, to use censorship, to spy on civilian organizations like student groups, like trade unions, like community organizations and opposition political parties, to confuse the boundaries between civilians and combatants and to ignore the rule of law.

Over and over again the school has tried to downplay rather than fully acknowledge these problems with its training. It is good that the school has added 4 hours on human rights in its courses, but this hardly makes the School of the Americas a school for human rights. These changes are just far too little, too late.

Let me emphasize that cutting off funds to the school does not prevent the many forms of conduct and cooperation between the United States and Latin American militaries. This year alone, over 60,000 military troops will rotate throughout Latin America on various training missions and assignments. Additionally, the international military education and training program for military personnel will come to the United States and study at many of our U.S. institutions. The School of the Americas is just but one of those.

But it does make an important break with the past. It shows Latin Americans who have worked valiantly for human rights and civilian control over militaries in their countries and U.S. religious orders whose missionaries and priests were killed by militaries trained at the School of the Americas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TORRES was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I repeat again, the priests that were killed by militaries trained at the School of the Americas, and that the United States now is fully determined to chart a new course. We want to do that. The school represents an outdated approach to a fragile region that is struggling with democracy, and we only have to read and watch television every day to see what is happening.

Cutting off funds to the school in this bill sends a clear signal. It is an important step in forging a new relationship with Latin American militaries based first and foremost upon adherence to civilian authority and the respect for human rights.

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

Mr. Chairman, the School of the Americas was established to heighten the professionalism of the military establishments throughout the Americas.

Approximately 60,000 young Latin American and Caribbean officers have graduated from the SOA since its creation in 1946, the vast majority of whom have served their nations honorably and responsibly.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of the School for the Americas focus on the excesses of a few notorious graduates. This Member is the first to acknowledge that some very unsavory characters have managed to attend the school. But such criticism overlooks the overwhelming majority, well over 99 percent, of honest, capable, intelligent officers who study at the School of the Americas. They return to their homes and serve their nations honorably and with distinction. And this Member would remind his colleagues that graduates of the SOA are personally responsible for the return of democracy in nations such as Bolivia and Argentina, and many of the school's graduates have lost their lives while combating drug lords in Colombia and Peru. Focusing on a few bad apples does a disservice to the commissioned and noncommissioned officers who have attended the School for the Americas and who subsequently fought terrorists and narcotraffickers in the jungles of Latin America.

□ 1500

While the early focus of the institution was on combating Soviet-backed insurgencies, in recent years the school's emphasis has shifted toward combating drug trafficking and responding to rural disease and environmental degradation. One very positive result of the recent attention to the school has been a much greater emphasis on human rights. Every student at the school is now exposed to a rigorous formal and informal training program in basic human rights. Specific classes and case studies are used to enhance the training and to make U.S. concerns unambiguously clear. The roles and rights of civilians, clergy and human rights observers and U.N. personnel are integrated into the training program.

While the SOA has rightly increased its emphasis on human rights, this Member believes that there is a basic value in encouraging military officers from Latin America and the Caribbean to study and to train in the United States. An institution such as the SOA, which annually hosts approximately 1,300 students from almost 20 countries, provides a level of professional training that is not otherwise available. Moreover, exposure to the U.S. lifestyle, values, and ideals offers important lessons for the future military leaders of Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, opponents have pointed to three manuals that were for a short time used by the school. It is true that these manuals had short passages, in one instance less than a sentence, that were inconsistent with U.S. Army doctrine. When discovered, these manuals were immediately withdrawn and destroyed. The school now employs

U.S. Army training manuals that are appropriate and which are now being translated, and have been translated into Spanish.

This Member would tell his colleagues that the School of the Americas does not employ confidential torture manuals, nor does the SOA in any way engage in such heinous exercises as training its students to keep their shock victims alive for interrogation as some have alleged. This body should not participate in this wrongful demonization of the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, the training at the School of the Americas does far, far more good in encouraging appropriate human rights practices than any possible harm which could come from even a perversion of such an education program that some former student might practice. It is time to end this misguided attack on the SOA.

This Member wishes he could guarantee to his colleagues that no future graduate of the SOA will ever abuse human rights or undermine civilian government, but obviously this is impossible. What this Member can guarantee is that every effort will continue to be made to fully indoctrinate the students on respect for human rights and democracies. The training at the school undoubtedly does far, far more good than any hypothetical harm which would come from even a perversion of such an educational program some future student might practice.

This Member must say, therefore, that it is time for this body and for certain organizations outside of this body to abandon this misguided attack on the School of the Americas. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and send a message to the organizations, get your facts straight, catch up with reality. It is time to stop and get off this hobby horse. The School of the Americas is an important institution for the United States and for democracy throughout the hemisphere.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give a specific example of how the School of the Americas helps America, the United States of America. The Colombian National Police, which is one of our front-line combatant units against the drug cartels in Colombia, gets a great deal of training from the School of the Americas. The first 40 hours of their training is in the area of human rights. General Serrano and the Colombian police because of that have a stellar human rights record. Our State Department has told us in committee that the Colombian National Police, which is a recipient, a beneficiary of the School of the Americas, has an almost 100 percent human rights record. I believe it is because of the School of the Americas, because of the training they are getting there.

The thing that is interesting about this is these people who are trained in the School of the Americas, the Colombian National Police that are fighting

the war against drugs, against the Colombian drug cartel, lay their lives on the line every single day not just for their people in their country but for our kids in America who are the recipients of the drugs that are coming out of Colombia and Latin America and Central America. For us to close down the School of the Americas and to cut off funding would be a giant step, a giant step in the wrong direction.

The last point I want to make very briefly is this. We know for a fact that the people in Colombia who are suffering human rights abuses go to the Colombian National Police, who have been trained in how to deal with human rights abuses for protection. I think it would be a terrible mistake for us to cut off funding for this very important program if for no other reason because of the Colombian National Police who are fighting so hard every single day to protect our kids from drugs and to stop the flow of drugs coming into America.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. I want to commend the gentleman for focusing attention on the narcotics training that they receive at the School of the Americas. They receive first rate instruction on a variety of subjects, but included very out-front and very positively is their training countering the illegal drug threat. I am pleased to join my colleague in opposition to the gentleman from California's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from General Barry McCaffrey, our drug czar and the former Commander in Chief of the U.S. Southern Command, in support of the School of the Americas, stressing the important role in countering the illegal drug trade, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY,

*Washington, DC, July 16, 1997.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CALLAHAN: My purpose in writing is to ask for your support of the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The Appropriations Bill for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs being considered today contains language that, if enacted, would make this important institution ineffective.

As Commander in Chief of U.S. Southern Command, my responsibilities included furthering the development of professional Latin American armed forces that promoted and protected human rights and that were supportive of democratic governance. The School of the Americas was, and continues to be, the Department of Defense's preeminent military educational institution for accomplishing these goals. The soldiers, sergeants, and officers that come to the School of the Americas interact with our own soldiers. They are systematically exposed to the principles of military subordination to civilian authority and the rule of law. They also receive first rate instruction on a variety of subjects including countering the illegal drug threat.

The School of the Americas is closely supervised by the U.S. Army and U.S. Southern Command. Its curriculum is beyond reproach. Indeed, it has been at the forefront of the effort to incorporate human rights training in all military instruction. It is deserving of your support. Your leadership will be important in ensuring that this important vehicle for effective military-to-military relations remains viable.

Respectfully,

BARRY R. MCCAFFREY,

*Director.*

Mr. Chairman, the war on drugs in Latin America is real. Professional training to fight narcoguerrillas is critical. The School of the Americas helps meet that need. General McCaffrey does point out that the school is closely supervised by the U.S. Army and the U.S. Southern Command. Its curriculum is beyond reproach. Indeed, it has been at the forefront of the effort to incorporate human rights training in all of its military instruction. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Torres amendment, and I wish to speak briefly but from the heart on this issue. I have seen firsthand the work of many of the graduates of the School of the Americas who served as officers in the Salvadoran Armed Forces during the recent conflict in that country. I had the privilege of working with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the honorable dean of our State delegation, on the House investigation of the brutal 1989 murders of six Jesuit priests, their housekeeper, and her 15-year-old daughter. For those unfamiliar with the case, units of the Salvadoran Army surrounded the university where these eight people worked. Soldiers entered their home, forced the six priests out of bed, and then outside into the yard. The soldiers then forced the priests to lay down on the ground, put high-powered rifles to their heads, pulled the triggers, and blew their brains across the grass. These same soldiers then went back inside the house and found and killed the terrified housekeeper and her teenage daughter.

Mr. Chairman, I knew these priests. I was privileged to call them friends. They all had names and family and parishioners, students and colleagues who loved them. When the 26 Salvadoran military personnel cited for these murders were identified, 19 were graduates of the School of the Americas. If this were the only horror story associated with the School of the Americas, we would not be having this debate today. But there are hundreds and hundreds of such stories. And tens of thousands of men, women, and children throughout Latin America have been tortured or have perished on the orders of or at the hands of these graduates.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. The little we do know about actions and

atrocities committed by the School of the Americas graduates does not come from information or surveys carried out by the school itself. It comes from the hard, often dangerous investigations undertaken by human rights groups, U.N.- and government-appointed truth commissions and other dedicated individuals. The school has always taken a posture of denial, that ignorance is better than knowing the truth.

Mr. Chairman, nothing can bring back my friends to life. Nothing can fill the intellectual, spiritual, and visionary void left by their murders. But I have walked on the ground where they died, and I will not support one more single tax dollar being used to keep open a school that helped to shape and train these killers.

I want to thank my fellow colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], and members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations who support this amendment for their leadership on this issue. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Torres amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this debate, but I do have an active interest in this matter and have had occasion in the past to get myself involved in it in one way or another. As a matter of fact, my long history goes back to what we then called Benning School for Boys, which I had the honor of attending in my own training to be a second lieutenant of infantry. It hurts me to see that school associated with the kind of record which we now hear with regard to the School of the Americas. I am not trying to point the finger at everything the school does. I commend the effort to improve the training and improve the sensitivity to human rights of the officer corps of our neighboring nations. But it has not succeeded in accomplishing that goal in the way that I would like.

It is unquestionably true that over these past 50 years of the school's existence, a large, very large number of the graduates have been involved in human rights violations. I would not want to characterize all of the graduates as being some kind of evil persons. I am not sure that if we did not have the school, we still would not have violations of civil rights in those societies which are conducive to or organized in a way that encourages violation of civil rights. We have instances in this country of where commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers are guilty of violating the civil rights of individuals, both within the ranks and outside the ranks. We do not blame the entire establishment for those few cases.

But here is a situation where over 50 years, it is undeniable that the graduates of this school have been involved

in this kind of practice. I would suggest that the time has come to acknowledge that we assisted in perpetrating these atrocities through the training that we gave to these officers. While we should continue to offer assistance and to provide training, if necessary, in other ways, we ought to abolish the school and start with a clean slate. Some of these same officers could be eligible to go to West Point or some of our other academies. We train the elites from many of these countries in our most prestigious universities. We should continue to do that. For those who seek a military career, we could give them the ROTC course at Harvard possibly or some other alternative to what they are getting at the School of the Americas. But we need to put this past behind us. We cannot continue as a nation to condone the fact that graduates have engaged in the sort of practice that have been described here, the slaughter of priests and nuns and the disappearance of thousands of people throughout Latin America.

Let us put that behind us. Let us discontinue the funding of this school. If we feel it necessary to continue to assist in the development of an improved military, let us find improved methods to do that job if it does indeed need to be done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment which amounts to a step backward in the war on drugs and two steps backyard in our support of freedom, democracy, and human rights in our own backyard. In July, both General McCaffrey, the drug czar, and General Shalikashvili, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, highlighted the importance of the School of the Americas in the war on drugs. The frontlines of this war are found throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. Colombia, Panama, and Bolivia serve as prime examples of countries whose drug interdiction strategies would be crippled without the benefit of United States equipment and, most importantly, United States training at the School of the Americas. The school is a key to preserving democracy in our hemisphere.

Since 1946, the U.S. Army has trained the Latin American military leaders who have turned back dictatorship, returning political power to the people and yielding military authority to civilian institutions.

□ 1515

In 1972, there are only six democracies in Latin America. Today, thanks in part to the school's instruction, there are 19.

As civil war in the region has given way to peace, and democracy has taken hold, the U.S. Army School of the Americas has developed a military human rights training program that is unmatched anywhere in the world today.

Just over 1 month ago, I joined almost every other Member in this body in passing legislation congratulating El Salvador, and much has been said about El Salvador during this debate, for recent elections and the country's progress toward full democracy. The resolution passed overwhelmingly, 419 to 3.

What my colleagues probably do not know is that one of the Salvadoran government's top officials, a Minister of Defense, Major General Guzman, is a former School of the Americas instructor. General Guzman is typical of the vast majority of the school's 60,000 graduates and visiting instructors who in one very important way, has returned home to apply his human rights training to remedy his country's problems of the past.

General Guzman institutionalized human rights training in the Salvadoran armed forces. Before his program was initiated, human rights violations numbered more than 2,000 each month, but after 5 years, that number has dropped to less than 20 per month, and today, under General Guzman's zero tolerance program, violations almost never occur.

The School of the Americas is not the answer to all Latin America's problems. There is still work to be done. But I urge my colleagues to consider the lives that the School of the Americas has saved. Every year, the school graduates thousands of men and women who return to their countries to apply the lessons they have learned in a Latin American environment still plagued by instability and violence.

The stories that we do not hear are those heroes. These are the military leaders who fought for democracy and yielded military control to civilian authorities. These are the police officers fighting the drug lords in the street. These are the men and women who have returned control of the governments of Latin America to the people of Latin America.

This is not simply a matter of foreign assistance. It is critical to our own self-interests to maintain democracies in countries so close to our borders. The School of the Americas allows us to do so without deploying our own troops.

The State Department, the Salvadoran and Honduran Ambassadors to the United States, the President of the Committee of Presidents of the Central American Legislative Human Rights Commission, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the acting Commander in Chief of the United States Southern Command, the Under Secretary of the Army, the Director of the National Office of Drug Control Policy, the authorizing committee on both sides of the Capitol, and the last Presidential administration have argued that the school serves vital national interests through its counterdrug operations and its counterdrug cadet leadership development courses, its professional military training program, including

unique peacekeeping instruction, and its one-of-a-kind human rights training initiative. Through these programs, the school allows the United States to support and defend Latin American democracies and to encourage responsible government policies without forward deployments such as those used in Bosnia and in Haiti.

I, for one, am not ready to surrender Latin America and the Caribbean to drug lords and dictators. I urge my colleagues to take responsibility of the human rights leadership by opposing this amendment which would close the School of the Americas, diminishing opportunities for the expansion of democracy in Latin America.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I agree with my distinguished colleague's last words about the necessity to fight against drugs. In Latin America, and around the globe, wherever we find that problem, I think it is important that all of us in this Congress take a stand against the drugs which are infecting this country and the entire world.

So I am glad that there is that kind of support, and it is bipartisan support for fighting drugs. However we are called upon, and looking at the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], to make an assessment of a school that is operated out of Fort Benning, GA, which does more than just train people to deal with drugs, and we all agree that we want drugs dealt with, and there are many ways in which they can be dealt with, but that is not what the School of the Americas is about.

The School of Americas in Fort Benning, GA, has a roster of graduates that reads like a Who's Who of human rights violators:

Nineteen of the twenty-six Salvadoran officers accused in the 1989 massacre of the six Jesuits and their housekeeper and the housekeeper's daughter were graduates of the School of the Americas.

Ten of the twelve cited in the El Mozote massacre where an entire village was wiped out without a trace; men, women and children, wiped out; 10 of the 12 people involved in that were graduates of the School of the Americas.

Two of the three officers cited in Archbishop Romero's assassination were graduates of the School of the Americas.

The School of the Americas; of what America is this the school of? Certainly not the United States of America, because the people of the United States of America do not support murder, do not support rape, do not support torture. Yet this is called the School of the Americas, and its graduates are involved in rape, murder, torture, genocide. The School of the Americas indeed.

The people of the United States do not support the kind of conduct which

has come from this school and which is being done in the name of Americas.

Four churchwomen, including Sister Dorothy Kazel, a nun from Cleveland, OH, and someone who happened to be a friend of mine, were raped and brutally murdered in El Salvador. The U.N. Truth Commission investigating the murders verified that the School of the Americas trained three of the five officers responsible for the churchwomen's deaths.

Now Sister Dorothy was more than a friend to me. She was a friend to humanity. She went to El Salvador to bring about peace and justice for those who desperately need it, and she was brutally murdered for her efforts, along with Jean Donovan and two other nuns. Sister Dorothy Kazel's sister-in-law asked me to deliver this message to my colleagues in the United States Congress, and I quote:

"Congress needs to act now. The women were killed by officers trained at the School of the Americas. I just don't understand why we are training human rights violators on our own soil. Why does this school still operate?"

Mr. Chairman, those who oppose closing the School of the Americas defend it as a haven for human rights protectors. The inversion of meaning is an ongoing problem in political philosophy. It is something that the writer, George Orwell, well understood where wrong becomes right and worse becomes the better reason and where murderers and rapists become human rights protectors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] has expired.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Where wrong becomes right, where worse becomes the better reason and where people who have murdered become human rights protectors.

Well, I think the American people are well aware of the record of the School of the Americas. We owe it to them, and we owe it to the memory of Sister Dorothy Kazel, the other nuns, the Jesuit priests, the civilians who have been murdered, and to everyone else who has ever been terrorized by the School of the Americas, to see that this school be shut once and for all. This is the Congress of the United States of America, and it should not let anyone defile the name "America" in our own name on our own soil with our own tax dollars. Close the School of the Americas.

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

Oh, the outrage is becoming palpable now. The do-gooders are out there. Pass out the rose-colored glasses, Mr. Chairman. The cold war is over; we are hearing that today.

Every American citizen ought to grab up their children, close their doors and take out their weapon, if it has not been taken away every time

the do-gooders get out there and start saying the cold war is over, because we know what is coming next, another piece of legislation, another diatribe that we must cut back, cut back, cut back, cut back.

Well, the cold war may be over in a formal sense, Mr. Chairman, but there are many very good, productive, positive reasons to deny the do-gooders this latest opportunity to prove to the world that we can be more nambypamby than some other country somewhere in the world at some point in time.

Mr. Chairman, one thing that escapes me in this latest round of do-goodism that we are hearing today is what these folks think would happen if the School of the Americas were closed and if we then, as they would have us do, then search out every other program in which we provide some sort of training, control over foreign military officers. Do they think that all of a sudden magically, as they had been anointed with this vision of the universe, that every one of these other officers would all of a sudden adopt their view of the world, their view of so-called human rights, their view of what is right and wrong in the world, their view of what we must do in the world? I do not think so.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the School of the Americas provides a very valuable tool not only for this country to influence foreign officers in a positive way as we have heard from opponents of this measure today already, but it also provides an important outlet for the yearnings that these foreign officers have to learn about this country and what we do that is so good that these other folks herald and then break down.

There are, Mr. Chairman, other countries more than willing to step into the breach should we retreat. Communist China; now there is a country with a stellar human rights record. They are already obtaining a foothold in Latin America. Perhaps they would step into the breach and create a School of the Americas.

Would that make the do-gooders happy? Perhaps, I do not know. Some other country, perhaps Cuba, would step into the breach wanting to increase its influence in Latin America.

The fact of the matter is, though, Mr. Chairman, somebody would be there to step into the vacuum that would be created if we were to suddenly pull out from the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, and even currently, these officers that are out there fighting for our kids on our streets in the United States of America are trained, many of them, both directly and indirectly, through the process of talking with the other graduates who come back to their country, and they do teach and they do talk with their fellow officers. They do learn, and they are equipped, better equipped, with the tools to fight the terrorists.

Now the cold war may be over, but terrorism is not over. The cold war

may be over, but the war against narcotics traffickers is not. The cold war may be over, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, there are narco-terrorists out there in Latin America, and we need to use every legitimate tool at our disposal, and this is a legitimate tool at our disposal and the way that we can reach out and influence for the better these officers.

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

Mr. BARR of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for having to run off the floor to a meeting, but the points that the gentleman are making are so well taken. We are fighting a battle today of terrorism. We are fighting a battle of illegal drugs in this country. These officers that are trained at the School of the Americas are doing a service by going back to their countries and teaching people what it is all about as far as decent human rights for people.

I just wish I had more time to participate in the debate, but I hope everybody comes over here and votes against this ill-conceived amendment.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, who knows whereof he speaks.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me mention the whole process here is rather bizarre. We see the folks on the other side saying, well, because these people went to the School of the Americas and sometime in the future, after that point, they committed these bad acts, therefore we must close the doors of the School of the Americas.

How preposterous. Should we search out and close the doors of every school in the United States of America because one of them may have produced at some point in time a Ted Bundy or somebody else that goes out and commits an act? Blaming the school for the bad acts of its graduates in this instance is ill-conceived.

This is nonsense, Mr. Chairman, and it ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BEREUTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BARR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio just made a very impassioned statement. It is understandable, given his personal knowledge of a victim.

But I just would like the gentleman to think about the fact that the non-commissioned officers and officers that come to this school do not come with a

table that has nothing written on it. They come bringing some values themselves.

What we are attempting to do with the School of the Americas is, in some cases, a very difficult task of changing the whole culture of a military in a government. If you had visited Guatemala or El Salvador like this gentleman in the early 1980's, you would understand about the progress that has been made and the great difficulty we had in getting the right kind of people to come to the school in the first place.

I would just like to suggest we have made dramatic progress, and in the absence this, we are going to have a much deeper problem in the hemisphere.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to get into this debate until I heard the previous speaker's comments, and they compelled me to say what I am going to say now.

I would much rather be a "do-gooder" than a stand-byer, while a school which is supposed to teach American values instead consistently produces graduates who defile the very values that that institution is supposed to support and promote.

I do not mind being called a "do-gooder" at all in comparison to being a do-nothing. I also do not mind being called "namby-pamby" because I happen to be offended by the fact that, time and time again, graduates of the School of the Americas have engaged in conduct that would make every decent American gag.

If being "namby-pamby" is being opposed to instruction manuals on torture, if being "namby-pamby" is being opposed to the consistently failed record of this institution in turning out graduates who understand democratic values, if it is being "namby-pamby" to object to the fact that graduates of this institution have systematically in a number of countries around this hemisphere wiped out innocent women and children, then call me namby-baby. I do not mind it at all.

You are doggone right, we are opposed to this institution continuing. This institution has been given the opportunity year after year after year to demonstrate that it can turn out a different kind of military for Latin America. So far, there is very precious little evidence that in fact it has done so.

The gentleman from Nebraska is right: What this institution is charged with doing is a very difficult thing to do. It is very difficult to take people from the kind of culture which has produced many of them, bring them to this country, and in a very short period of time inculcate the kind of values that we would like to see those graduates represent.

But the fact is that you have to make a judgment sooner or later about whether that institution has succeeded or not, and there are a lot of us in this institution who do not think that it has succeeded.

So I would suggest that to call people "do-gooders" or to call them "namby-pamby" because we happen to object to the fact that thousands of individual innocent civilians have been slaughtered by the graduates of this secondary institution, is, I think, to do something to the dialogue in this House that you ought not to do.

I would say one other thing: For years we have heard every justification dragged up that it is possible to drag up in order to defend the continued funding for this institution. Now the latest argument we hear is, "Oh, they are necessary to prevent the drug traffic from succeeding in this hemisphere."

Well, I just have to tell you that drug program administrators who cannot run an antidrug program without relying on this kind of institution ought to find themselves another line of work.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being recognized to speak in favor of the School of the Americas. Not everything is perfect. Unfortunately, the folks who support this amendment are correct in that in the past there have been graduates of this school who have abused human rights and caused all sorts of pain and suffering.

That has been a very, very small minority of student participants, and the things that they did, they did not learn at the School of the Americas. They certainly were not trained with that intent by the School of the Americas.

That was many, many years ago. Some debates, Mr. Speaker, are timely, and some debates are timeless. This debate seems to be timeless in that once the side who opposes the School of the Americas has got their point across and the changes have been made, it is time to stop. But, instead, we are continuing year after year, rehashing the same ground, regurgitating the same arguments over and over again.

This debate, rather than being timeless, should be timely, and the time to debate it was properly in the early 1990's under Secretary Cheney. Under Secretary Cheney many, many changes were made that threw out some of the offensive materials which the supporters of this amendment keep referring to.

It is not the case any more. What we are doing is we are debating Model T's in the era of 1997 automobiles. It is just that there is a photograph there. We are looking at the moving picture here, and the moving picture has gone on and times have changed.

But to be on the safe side, the committee this year has put in some very strong safeguards. One, the Secretary of Defense must certify that the instruction and training provided by the school are fully consistent with training and doctrine provided to U.S. military personnel, especially, Mr. Chairman, regarding human rights.

Number two, the Departments of Defense and State have improved the

guidelines for screening and admitting students to better avoid students with records of human rights violations or who may have tendencies in that direction.

Number three, the Department of Defense completes a comprehensive report on training activities of the school and an assessment of the performance of the graduates.

These are three things that are in the bill right now. This amendment is not necessary.

The abuses that they are referring to that happened are horrible, and I certainly agree, but they happened many years ago by graduates that would not be admitted to the school today.

Now, let me say this on a personal basis. I have visited the school. It is disturbing, greatly disturbing to me, that most of the supporters of this amendment have not taken the time to visit the school. In fact, I would challenge my colleagues, if you have been to the school and you support the amendment, when you speak, please let folks know, and tell us about the terrorists you saw in the classroom.

I am not going to tell you that I could tell terrorists from a nonterrorist sitting in a classroom, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you this: I talked to young idealistic men and women from South America who had lots of ideas on democracy, lots of enthusiasm about the American system of government, and lots of enthusiasm for freedom and its noble concepts.

I have visited them, and I have talked to the students. It makes a tremendous difference in your opinion of an institution when you have been there and talked to the students.

If you do not go, maybe if you support this amendment, you should make it a priority to visit it. I would be glad to help any of my colleagues who would like to go down to Columbus, Georgia. We could probably get you in and out of there in a day. It would mean so much to the students down there, it would mean so much to the institution, and perhaps it could mean a whole lot to the great cause that we share of freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to please vote against this amendment, and support the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the School of the Americas and in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that most of us here do not oppose international military training in general. The amendment addresses only the military training provided at Fort Benning because of a negative image, or stigma, remaining from a relatively very few problems from the past. This makes this issue a self-feeding problem to a large extent because the negative stigma is perpetuated by the very groups who use it as justification to close the school.

The negative propaganda and baggage that continues to follow the school is just not a valid argument to shut down the only school of this kind in the world with such devoted attention to teaching professionalism, respect for

rule of law and civilian leadership, and human rights to young officers and soldiers of Latin America who would not otherwise get this critical training. In fact, the School of the Americas provides much more of this kind of training to its students than our own military men and women receive.

We also often hear lists of human rights abuses committed by Latin American military personnel who may or may not have received some varying level of training at the School. These cases—while horrible—are very rare when compared to the large number of students trained at the school. To close the school simply because less than one percent of its graduates haven't successfully applied what they've learned is inappropriate, shortsighted, and counterproductive.

Let me just ask everyone: If the United States set up a program to teach Latin American militaries to reject repressive behavior, to respect human rights, and advance the cause of democracy in our own back yard, would you support it? What if it were only 99 percent effective? That's what we're dealing with in plain English. No exaggerations, no distortions, no feel-good hype. Why would we throw away the opportunity to teach hundreds of Latin American military officers to respect human rights just because a few don't get the message?

I challenge all members of this committee to visit the school before you take active action, such as this amendment, to close it. With all due respect, I know very few members here today, including Mr. TORRES himself, have actually visited the School down at Fort Benning. If it's not possible for you to visit, Colonel Trumbel, the School's Commandant, is available to meet with any Member one on one here in Washington to discuss any and all concerns you may have. I ask that you please get the facts, investigate the school for yourself rather than relying on second-hand propaganda, before you vote to close this school.

What can we do here today to improve the school?

The language in the bill regarding the School of the Americas takes major steps to address remaining concerns of Congress. I remind you that the bill as it currently stands denies all funds from the school until: First, the Secretary of Defense certifies the instruction and training provided by the school are fully consistent with training and doctrine provided to U.S. military personnel, especially regarding human rights, second, DOD and State have improved the guidelines for screening and admitting students to better avoid students with records of human rights violations, and third, DoD completes a comprehensive report on training activities of the School and an assessment of the performance of its graduates.

These are very significant steps to improve any remaining problems. I ask that you support the very reasonable compromise language currently in the bill and oppose this amendment.

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

I rise as a do-gooder to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, American values are based on doing good for people. That is the purpose of this bill. This bill proposes to do good for the less fortunate people of the world and for less fortunate nations.

My good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], talked about

reality. Reality is the story told by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN] as to what happened in El Salvador at the hands of graduates from the School of the Americas. Reality is what was described by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] as to what happened to his friends at the hands of graduates of the School of the Americas.

The fact is that graduates of the school went forth to engage in activities that were totally inimical to the values of the people and of the Government of the United States.

Sure, there are some students who are graduates who are good, but they are not the ones who were in power in the countries to which the graduates went.

The impression is given that if you close the school, all training will stop. That is not true. All the universities in this country are available for training, and a course can be set forth that will permit this to be done.

The fact is that this school has failed. Its record is one of failure. The record cannot be dismissed by saying that critics of that record are do-gooders.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here that was received by the National Security Archives, the government library of George Washington University, dated July 17, 1997, fairly current, signed by the current Ambassador from the Embassy of Honduras. This is what he said:

Thank you for your fax regarding the letter that was distributed to Members of Congress quoting four Latin Americans, including myself, on the issue of funding for the School of the Americas.

In that letter I am quoted extemporaneously. My statement was geared toward the need to enhance the school's program to deal with today's challenges, narco-terrorism, violation of human rights, extreme poverty, suitable development, elements I consider valid.

Nevertheless, at the time I made that statement, I wasn't aware of allegations or evidence of the school's programs that led to violation of international human rights. Otherwise, I would have mentioned my government and I deplore any activities undertaken there or anywhere else that would encourage officers to carry out violations of international human rights norms.

The negative effect of the school's academic programs have, unfortunately, been felt in my country, where at least five military officers trained in the school have been requested to come before our courts for violation of human rights.

The Honduran Government clearly does not condone any such activities and is opposed to any academic program the school had or has in that regard. I hope this letter clarifies our position.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. There is still the opportunity for training of worthy students from the Latin American countries, and they should be given that opportunity for training, but not in the School of the Americas.

□ 1545

The record justifies the closing of that school.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment to close the U.S. Army School of the Americas.

I want it to be clear that I do not oppose military to military, or civil military training, but, I believe the school has too many negative implications, baggage—as it were—to be an effective tool of U.S. foreign policy.

I believe the school to be a relic of the cold war. It represents a severely outdated approach to a fragile region struggling to attain real democracy and civilian control of the military and should have been closed years ago.

Some members have told me that the Latin American military respect our Armed Forces because of the work the school has done over the years.

Yes, but what about the civilian population of Central and South America. What about those civilians who refer to the school as the school of assassins. What do they think of the United States and our military assistance? Are we really fulfilling our national security and foreign policy objectives by alienating the civilian population of Latin America?

I am proud of the young men and women serving in our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps. I am proud that their colleagues from Latin America think so highly of them. But, I do not see how closing the School of the Americas will diminish this respect.

Closing the school will not put a halt to military contact between our Armed Forces and those of Latin America.

In fact, I believe closing the school will allow for a more rounded education. One where the soldiers of Central and South American countries participate alongside their counterparts in the U.S. military in the full range of U.S. military training.

Closing the school will allow the students to become exposed to the total American experience instead of being isolated in one region of our country.

Additionally, these future leaders will be better prepared to work with, and more importantly communicate with, our military should we become engaged in joint military operations sometime in the future.

It would send a clear message to the people of Latin America that we care about their civil and human rights and are trying to support their democracies.

In closing, although I have been an opponent of the school for many years, I have attempted to work with the Army and the Departments of State and Defense through the Foreign Operations Subcommittee to resolve the numerous complaints surrounding the curriculum at the school.

I wanted to come to some kind of positive resolution to this matter, but, in just the past year it has become very clear to me that my good faith efforts were to be unrewarded.

The committee previously instructed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to prepare and submit to the Committees on Appropriations no later than January 15, 1997, a report on the School of Americas at Fort Benning, GA.

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

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio started out listing the who's who of human rights violators in the hemisphere, the school's roster of graduates. I would like to continue that for a moment.

One hundred of 246 Columbian officers cited for war crimes by an international human rights tribunal in 1993; six Peruvian officers involved in the killings of 9 students and a professor in 1992; Colonel Julio Alpirez, linked to the cover-ups and the murders of Efraim Bamaca and United States citizen Michael DeVine in Guatemala; ranking officers in notorious Honduran Battalion 3-16; Argentina dictator Leopoldo Galtieri and Panamanian strongman Manuel Noriega.

Let me just stop at this point and say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I am absolutely surprised and appalled at the energy that they are expending to defend the School of the Americas.

I do not know why those who posture themselves as law-and-order policymakers, I do not know why anybody who gets up time and again talking about how tough they are on crime and criminals and human rights violators, would expend so much time and energy defending this U.S. Army School of the Americas.

We know the list of violators who have been the graduates of this school. How can we defend them? It is not enough to say, oh, some of them made mistakes, some of them were not right, some of them killed some people. What are Members talking about? We are talking about people who are trained in the School of the Americas who go back to these countries. They become our direct contacts. These are the ones we support. We support them in the leadership of those nations.

I cannot believe that some of the Members have forgotten about Haiti already. We spent a lot of hours in this body about trying to right the wrongs of Haiti. It took a great threat by the President of the United States, ready to move in with our own military unless we got rid of the graduates of the School of the Americas: General Cedras, have Members forgotten him already? Have they forgotten Mr. Francois in Haiti, who headed the police force, a graduate of the School of the Americas?

These two gentlemen, if they can be called that, in Haiti were the ones who built the airstrip where the drug runners were able to come in and bring their dope into Haiti to be shipped out to America and other places. These places on the globe that we are discussing are the locations for the transshipment of drugs right into the United States.

The Congressional Black Caucus has made it absolutely clear that getting rid of drug trafficking and drugs is our number one priority. We do not take kindly to those who would call us do-gooders because we have decided that there must be, at some point in time, a real war on drugs.

Are Members not tired of the failure of this government to deal with drugs and the drugs that enter this country? Are Members not tired of the relationships we have with the Noriegas of the

world? These become our partners in crime. Whether it is Noriega or Cedras or Francois, they were all supported by our government while they were dealing dope into our communities.

We are sick and tired of you simply going out on the street corners of America locking up these young black and Latino males, and even white, with small amounts of drugs. We want to stop drugs and the big dope dealers, and those who are allowing their countries to be transshipment points to bring drugs into the United States. You cannot defend Noriega and Cedras and these graduates of the School of the Americas. These are dope dealers who we embraced, that we trained and sent back.

What is wrong with the School of the Americas? Once they make the contact in this country they become our leaders. They become the people we rely on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WATERS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, we train them and we send them back. Then we rely on them. We support them. Guess what? Members cannot be concerned about drug dealing and drug trafficking as long as they are supporting the very ones who are dealing the dope back to us.

When are we going to be serious about a war on drugs? Yes, we may be do-gooders over here, but we are do-gooders who are challenging Members to wake up and smell the roses and stop this nonsense, and get about the business of getting rid of drug traffickers. Get rid of the work and manuals and training of the School of the Americas, and that will go a long way toward getting rid of the real dope dealers in this hemisphere.

I challenge Members today to stop the nonsense of defense of a school that you can no longer defend. How can Members get up on the floor year in and year out and say they are going to do better, leave them alone for now, give them the American taxpayers' dollars.

It is shameful, it is unconscionable, and Members need to stop it and support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, while I have great respect for all of the opponents as well as the proponents of this amendment, let me say that most of the debate is not taking place on what the true issue is. I do not think there is anyone in this entire House, this entire body, that condones human rights violations. I do not think there is a single person on either side of this aisle or either side of this debate that agrees with some of the atrocities that took place.

That is not the point. The point is because some people who are opposed

to the School of the Americas today have brought to the attention of this body some misdoings, some wrongdoings that have taken place as a result of some of the graduates returning to their countries and creating some atrocities, no, no, we do not condone that, nor will we ever condone that.

The point is, we are now trying to educate, and this Congress and this subcommittee has dispatched people to the school, to Central America, to South America, to make absolutely certain that they are taught to respect human rights. When these graduates return, the percentile in the high nineties do exactly what we envision that they would do. They go back and they make themselves leaders in their communities. They respect human rights as a result of the education they have received at Fort Benning.

So the debate is not over whether or not we ought to continue teaching people to go back and commit atrocities, because that is not the debate. That is over with. The Secretary of Defense must confirm to the Congress before he can spend one dime that they are not going to teach anybody to go back and to do harm to any individual.

I took our subcommittee to Armenia and to Azerbaijan and to Georgia and to Turkey. On the way back we had conversations about, how fortunate we are in this hemisphere. We have wars that are taking place between Armenia and Azerbaijan, and happily they are at peace right now, trying to work out an agreement. We have problems in Cyprus, we have problems in the Middle East, we have problems in Africa, problems in Bosnia, but not one war is taking place in this entire hemisphere.

So we are working ourselves into a position of a peaceful community, where human rights are respected by all people.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with the gentleman. There is a war going on in this hemisphere. Is the gentleman not aware of what is going on in Mexico? Is he not aware of the drug wars that are going on? Is he not aware of the war that is going on against our young people in our neighborhoods and our American cities?

I want to tell the gentleman, this is the war. The war is drug trafficking in this hemisphere that is killing thousands of people, that is causing our prisons to explode, that is causing people to be shot down on the streets of America.

It may not be, in the gentleman's estimation, sir, a war, but this is the most devastating kind of war. This is the worst kind of war. It is the kind of war that we are going to have to come to grips with and begin to see it as a war. As long as we think we are lucky—

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the

gentlewoman's concern. The definition of war is maybe something we could debate one afternoon when we have more time. The debate that is taking place today is whether or not we are going to fund the School of the Americas.

When we have the President of the United States who sends me a message and tells me, Mr. Chairman, will you please continue to fund this; when we have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who calls me and says, do whatever you can possibly do, because this will help to create a peace, this will help to solve the war on drugs that the gentlewoman is talking about; and when we have Mack McLarty call, all of these very distinguished people that the President of the United States has placed in a position of responsibility, pleading with me, a Republican, "Sonny, go over there and convince your colleagues to continue to fund this school, because we have corrected every problem that they contend existed. They have made great progress. We have done everything this Congress has suggested that we do with respect to this school."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CALLAHAN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have done every conceivable thing we can do to ensure that we do not permit any educational process that would lend to the availability of people going back to their country and creating any human rights violation.

Certainly, God forbid, even the University of Alabama, one of the greatest educational institutions in the world, has graduated some people, probably far below the national standard when we consider Alabama and California, but nevertheless, we, too, have probably graduated some people who have gone on to perform some heinous acts, but we do not close down the university.

Some of our educational institutions that we revere, such as our academies, have had some problems. When they had their problems, did we say, close down the institution? No, we said, correct the problems. That is precisely what the President of the United States has done. That is precisely what the professionals in Georgia have done. They have corrected it. They are not teaching these subjects that these people are referring to. We are doing it in a positive manner.

I know we have not resolved all the wars on poverty, all of the wars on crime, all of the wars on narcotics, but we are moving in the right direction, because we are bringing these people to America, we are teaching them the value of human rights, of civil rights, of free elections. We are instructing them how to go back and be leaders in their community, and we are doing it with the only vehicle we have, and that is the School of the Americas.

Mr. Chairman, I would plead with my colleagues to go along with their Commander in Chief, to go along with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, to go along with all of the people in the administration that have written to us telling us all of these problems have been addressed, we are moving in the right direction. Let us preserve the perceived peace that we have in this hemisphere.

□ 1600

Let us not turn into a hemisphere of wars. Let us educate our allies, our friends in this hemisphere. Let us continue this school, teaching democracy, teaching human rights, teaching men and women how to go back to their respective countries and to be great citizens.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, let me make it absolutely clear that if the President of the United States wrote to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], called, and insisted on funding the School of the Americas, then I am opposed to the President and the President is wrong.

Let me make it abundantly clear that if Mr. McCaffrey called, he should be the first one to understand that it is a war. His life just got threatened when he was down in Mexico among the drug traffickers who sent him a message in no uncertain terms. I think he knows it is a war now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Torres amendment and commend him for his leadership, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his leadership, on this important issue. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] for bringing this amendment to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard all different points of view about versions of the story of our interpretation of what the School of the Americas has accomplished. Whatever good it has done, it seems that it is more than just a coincidence that some of the worst violators of human rights in this hemisphere were educated at that school.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our chairman, has made a very fine effort in the legislation to recognize that there is a problem that still exists at the School of the Americas, and I was very pleased to hear the gentleman say in his remarks that not one dime could be spent on the School of the Americas unless the Secretary of Defense confirmed certain things, which I would like to read into the RECORD, because I believe it is time for us to understand what the choice is before us today.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, just to briefly say that not only is it in the RECORD, but if this bill passes as it is written, it is in the bill, in the bill on page 29 where it requires that before any money can be spent in violation of any of the efforts that my colleagues are contending, that the President must certify that it is not going to be used. It requires further that the Department of Defense do exactly the same thing.

So, we have for the first time in history in our bill, under title II on page 29, implemented into law the prohibitions against the teaching of anything that would lead to any type of atrocity.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman making that statement and for the work that the gentleman did to get that language in the bill. But I repeat again that that language in the bill recognizes that there is a problem. To those who say, "What is the problem?" There is a problem.

Because of the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama, the bill says that,

None of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to support grant-financed military education and training at the School of the Americas unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the instruction and training provided by the School of the Americas is fully consistent with training and doctrine, particularly with respect to the observance of human rights.

Further, that the Secretary of Defense certifies that the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, has developed and issued specific guidelines governing the selection and screening of candidates for the instruction at the School of the Americas; and, further, that the Secretary of Defense submits to the Committee on Appropriations a report detailing the training activities of the School of the Americas and the general assessment regarding the performance of its graduates during 1996.

The reason I part company with my chairman at this point is because we had the request for this study in last year's bill and, unfortunately, it took a great deal of time for us to get the report back to our committee. Indeed, it did not even show up until the day our subcommittee was meeting, and I think that that was long overdue.

We asked for a report on ethics to correct the problems. The report sat in DOD for months and was delivered the day of our subcommittee markup. The report itself failed miserably to address our concerns about the school.

Mr. Chairman, this leaves me no choice but to support this amendment. I say that with a great deal of respect for our colleagues on both sides of this issue. I do want to call to the attention of our colleagues that a problem exists and that this solution that the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] is advancing is a reasonable one. It takes the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] one step further.

Mr. Chairman, I call this to my colleagues's attention. It is a letter from the Jesuit Conference. The Jesuit Conference calls for the closing of the School of the Americas. It does so because it says:

Jesuits know all too personally the violence perpetrated by graduates of the School of the Americas. In 1989 six Jesuits, their housekeeper and her daughter were murdered on the campus of the Jesuit University in El Salvador. Nineteen of the Salvadoran officers whom the United Nations cited for these murders were graduates of the School of the Americas. This is a celebrated case. However, the death and disappearance of hundreds of ordinary civilians, such as those of the village of El Mozote in Salvador—

And I visited that location myself.

Overwhelm our consciences and elicit outrage at the impunity of the School of the Americas graduates. Their families silently know, better than we, the effects of State sanctioned terror.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I agree with the statement in the Jesuits' letter that it is time to send a strong message that the United States will no longer sanction or tolerate militaries which declare war upon their own civilian populations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. PELOSI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the point is that the Jesuits are calling for the closing of the School of the Americas. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is asking for a study, a good faith request for a study and certification. The gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] splits the difference, and I think it is a very wise proposal.

The amendment of the gentleman from California just cuts off the funding that is in this legislation. The School of the Americas receives about \$4 million from the U.S. Congress. As the Chairman knows, \$1.2 million comes out of foreign operations and the rest out of the DOD appropriations bill.

This is not about closing the School of the Americas. This is about cutting off this funding. It is about sending a strong message that when we ask for a report, we want it in a timely fashion and we want it to be appropriate.

I look forward to visiting, at the invitation of Mr. COLLINS and Mr. BISHOP, the School of the Americas to impress upon them that Congress does, as the gentleman from Alabama says, universally support human rights; that we do not associate ourselves with or condone any of the atrocities that have been performed by people who are graduates of the School of the Americas, but that indeed the terms that the chairman put forth in this bill are terms that we expect to be met.

Mr. Chairman, this is what we did last year and they did not come through. That is what made the Torres amendment necessary. So the choice that our colleagues have is the status quo, which I believe is unacceptable

and unsatisfactory in light of the response that we received, or better yet did not receive from the School of the Americas, and even a better solution than calling for the closing of the School of the Americas. This is a compromise. This is a smart approach to it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. And I say in good faith to my colleagues, I look forward to joining them to visit the School of the Americas to help in any way that we can to promote the education of people who will promote human rights in this hemisphere.

Indeed, even if the school were to be closed, there are many other institutions where military can be trained to promote human rights values and other democratic freedoms. Mr. Chairman, with that I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, let's decide here and now what we are going to teach the world.

We have so much to say. For little more than two centuries, we have shown the world the way to true democracy and most of the world has followed. In Denver, last month, our President had the opportunity to show the world's economic leaders the way to the economic boom we are enjoying.

That's the central message that our School of the Americas should be teaching.

I am one who believes that instead of the enduring message of the School of the Americas, we should be helping our Latin American neighbors follow the course of Oscar Arias and Costa Rica, where the people there live safely, securely, and economically prosperous with no military, with no military. I am concerned that this school, as it is constituted, encourages a culture of growing militarism instead of growing economies. Some of the students of nations of this school simply cannot afford its persistent lesson. I am one who believes that, when resources are scarce, we should be making more butter, rather than buying more guns. But I respect our disagreement on this issue.

But of course, our neighbors in Latin America are sovereign nations and it is within their province and power to decide on their own security needs and military training needs. It is good policy, then, to have a modest program to help their militaries professionalize and be respectful of human rights. The School for the Americas is not achieving that policy.

The lessons we taught in the baddest of bad old days of the School of the Americas—terrorism, torture, and strong-arm police tactics—were exactly the wrong ones for our hemisphere. Despite the laudable improvements of our chairman in the bill, I remain convinced that this school has no place in the Americas.

Yes, there have been improvements, but not enough.

The school still holds 47 weeks of courses on things like psychological operations, commando missions, and battle tactics, but added only two 2-hour lectures on human rights. When our subcommittee asked for a report on how the school screens applicants and monitors graduates, the school showed its disrespect with a meager 3-page report that was 6 months late.

The Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment proposes to delete the bill's \$815 million for the

school. If we want to teach the right message to help professionalize their militaries, let's focus on that mission, and also help them grow their economies and fortify their democracies and teach the sanctity of human rights.

So, as I said at the beginning, we can decide today what America will teach the world, what message our people have to send to our neighbors. The mission of this school has flunked. Support the Torres-Yates-Foglietta amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, many of the abuses in Latin America can be traced back to graduates of the School of the Americas.

The opposition has circulated dear colleagues highlighting quotes from several Latin American officials, but we have also heard from the people. Their voices are smaller and their speeches not as polished, but these are the people who have suffered from this scandalous school and they deserve to be heard.

The fact that there are provisions that call for the Secretary of Defense's approval should not make us feel secure but suspect.

I would hope that we would only fund 50-year-old programs that have already proven themselves, not ones that need special scrutiny.

We spend billions of dollars on our defense interests, and when that money is used to keep our military strong and our troops safe, it is money well spent. But we mock our brave men and women in uniform who work for peace and justice in our world when we spend even one penny on this scandal.

The school is not a creative solution to downsizing our military and it is more than just a waste of taxpayer dollars. Many graduates have been involved in some of the most brutal atrocities in Latin America and it is a national disgrace and a blotch on our military history.

If we are to support democracy we must stop the killing of those people whose welfare we claim to support and the School of the Americas must fall into the oblivion it so richly deserves.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, 50 years ago, the U.S. Army School of the Americas opened its doors in Panama to a class of Latin American and Caribbean military officers to receive training in the art of war.

Half a century later it's time to shut the school down.

Last September, the Pentagon revealed what activists opposed to the school have been alleging for years—that foreign military officers were taught to torture and murder to achieve their political objectives.

According to the Pentagon's own excerpts, School of the Americas students were advised to imprison those from whom they were seeking information; to "involuntarily" obtain information from those sources—in other words, torture them; to arrest their parents; to use "motivation by fear"; pay bounties for enemy dead; execute opponents; subvert the press; and use torture, blackmail, and even injections of truth serum to obtain information.

These tactics come right out of an SS manual and have no place in a civilized society. They certainly have no place in any course taught with taxpayer dollars on U.S. soil by members of our own military.

These practices, which as we know too well have, in fact, been used by graduates of the School of the Americas, are part of a totalitarian playbook. They show complete disregard for the rule of human law and violate every tenet of basic human rights.

Yet nowhere in this report was there any apology for the horrific misdeeds tied to this training.

Nor was there any mention of the poor—all mention of all those who have suffered so much at the hands of those who were taught to torture and murder by elements within our own Government.

What about Archbishop Oscar Romero, gunned down in cold blood by SOA graduates because he stood up for the powerless against the powerful? What about the Jesuit priests and their housekeeper and her daughter, murdered in El Salvador because their hope for the poor clashed with the interests of dictators? What about the four Ursuline nuns, ravaged and mutilated and thrown into a ditch for the crime of teaching children to read? What about the children at El Mozote—machine gunned by School of Americas alumni for the sin of living in the wrong place at the wrong time?

These manuals are the smoking gun. They provide direct evidence that the school has not only failed to serve its mission, but has subverted its mission.

It's time to close down the School of the Americas.

Ms. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Torres amendment, which would help us close the U.S. Army School of the Americas once and for all.

The School of the Americas has taught some of the most ruthless dictators in Latin America to torture their opponents, censor the press, and intimidate their citizens. It must be shut down. But the issue of what to do with the School of the Americas goes well beyond the deplorable actions of the school, and right to the heart of U.S. foreign policy.

The question before us today is whether the United States has the moral responsibility to encourage other governments to respect human rights and democracy. Are human rights and democracy just catch phrases we use, or are they basic principles that we demand of every nation?

We must demand human rights and democracy—in name and in practice—from our own military and all of our neighbors. That is why the School of the Americas is an affront to everything that U.S. foreign policy should be about. That is why we must close this school.

Fifty years ago, the School of the Americas was opened with the goal of improving U.S. ties to Latin American militaries. The idea was to educate our neighbors to the South about democratic civilian control of the military. But over the last few decades, we started to hear reports of what was actually being taught there. Words like torture, beating, and execution were increasingly being associated with the school's courses.

Then some of the school's more distinguished graduates started to turn up in high positions in Latin American governments. People like Panama's drug-dealing dictator Manuel Noriega—now serving time in a United States prison on a drug conviction—and Roberto D'Aubuisson, who organized many of El Salvador's notorious death squads.

In response, many of us have been calling for the school to be shut down and for disclosure of the school's curriculum. Well, we got our second wish last year. In September 1996, the U.S. Army released portions of a training manual used at the school during the 1980's. The manual revealed what we have suspected

all along: Latin American military officers were taught to intimidate, torture, and kill to achieve their political objectives.

According to the Pentagon itself, School of the Americas students were taught to imprison and execute their opponents. To use motivation by fear. To subvert the press. And to use torture, blackmail, and truth serum to obtain information.

This is unacceptable. U.S. foreign policy should not promote these tactics. And they have no place in a school funded by our tax dollars and taught by U.S. instructors on U.S. soil.

The United States stands for democracy and respect for individual rights. Its foreign policy must always be conducted with a commitment to these principles. The School of the Americas violated this fundamental tenet. It is time to close down the school for good.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

**SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING COSTS OF THE PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE PROGRAM AND NATO EXPANSION**

SEC. 572. It is the sense of the Congress that all member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should contribute their proportionate share to pay for the costs of the Partnership for Peace program and for any future costs attributable to the expansion of NATO.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that simply, frankly, expresses the sense of Congress that all member countries of NATO should be responsible for paying their fair share for the cost of the Partnership for Peace Program and to future NATO expansion.

Mr. Chairman, let me read my amendment specifically just for those Members who wish it to be clarified. It says that, "It is the sense of Congress that all member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should contribute their proportionate share to pay for the costs of the Part-

nership for Peace program and for any future costs attributable to the expansion of NATO."

Mr. Chairman, many of us are concerned with recent statements by Mr. Chirac of France that his nation would be unwilling to contribute to the expansion of NATO. Now, as all my colleagues know, NATO agreed to invite Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic into the organization last week in Spain. Mr. Chirac is apparently upset that the nations of Romania and Slovenia will not yet be admitted into NATO and is, therefore, threatening not to pay for this current expansion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is our responsibility to send Mr. Chirac and our NATO allies in Europe a strong message that they must pay their proportionate share of the defense of Europe. If they do not, the Congress must look at various options in response. One option would be refusing the reentry of France into NATO's unified military command structure, from which France unilaterally withdrew in 1966.

Or perhaps we should adhere to a cap in spending on NATO expansion, as other Members have suggested. Congress may even debate whether we should force nations that do not pay for the current expansion to incur all the costs for the next round of NATO expansion.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, whatever we choose to do in the future, I believe this is a good amendment for right now that will send a clear message to certain European allies in NATO that Congress will not allow the United States to continue paying a larger share of Europe's defense, while other nations opt out of contributing their fair share.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be a coauthor with the gentleman from Florida on this amendment. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, the American taxpayers have been paying for the protection of the free world and there was a time when that was absolutely necessary. But we have rebuilt most of Europe; we brought Japan back to its feet. Every time there is a problem, there is a phone call, 9-1-1 and America sends our young people over to fight and our dollars and our American Express card.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Europe and NATO members in this expansion should not only pay their fair share, they should be paying the bulk of it. We are the major support for freedom and we, in fact, ensure that freedom through a tremendous military appropriation.

So I stand strong for this, but I just want to tell my colleagues that it is the sense of the Congress.

Now, at some point I am going to offer a very simple amendment that will either be stricken by a point of

order or it will have to be defeated. But the amendment that I plan to offer in conjunction with the efforts here of the gentleman from Florida will say that none of the funds in this act may be used to pay for NATO expansion not authorized by law.

Unless there would be some existing law that would authorize the use of the funds, there could not be an appropriation account that could be created to provide NATO expansion funds.

Mr. Chairman, that could be a little controversial and I do not want to do that. But my people have paid taxes all these years and we keep having all of these accounts, billions and billions of dollars. I think it is time that these countries who benefit from our taxpayers' commitments start to pay their fair share.

So, Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Florida, and I am proud to be associated with the gentleman.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the substance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS]. I would note, however, that this authorization language should not even be in our bill. But since the amendment was made in order under the rule, I will accept his amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

□ 1615

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 24, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds in this Act may be used to pay for NATO Expansion not authorized by law.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is the exact language that was placed in the defense appropriations bill. There is not a chairman of the House that I have any more respect for. And when I offered this amendment originally, the bill was to have been scheduled on a particular day and it had not been printed in the RECORD at that time. I printed it in the RECORD in a timely manner, and it was printed in the RECORD, and I guess we will have to now debate the germaneness and whether or not it is subject to a point of order.

It is straightforward, as it was in the defense appropriations bill. It should not be controversial. This appropriations bill has taken pains to try and remove authorization from, in fact, its line item.

The Trafficant amendment basically says none of the funds in this bill may be used to pay for NATO expansion not authorized by law. This does not tie the hands of the appropriators. The appropriators could provide whatever money is necessary, but that money that is provided must have been authorized by law. If it was not authorized by law, that appropriation cannot appear.

I would like to talk some business about NATO here. We talk a good game about NATO. Members go home and campaign about all the money our taxpayers are putting into NATO and how we have got to stop that and let everybody else pay their own way. But when we come down to the real fine print of the law, we continue to leave open an opportunity for funds to go for NATO expansion.

This is, in my opinion, a strict appropriations bill. It is germane. It is the right thing to do. If it is authorized by law, we can give it all the money that you want.

I want to say one other thing: We collect taxes from hard-working people. We are paying for troops that are stationed all over the world, falling out of chairs without armrests, regarding borders in Bosnia and the Middle East.

We just had a debate on the war on drugs. We have got open borders in America. We have yet to in fact have a reasonable military program and a responsible drug program in this country. But when we are talking about NATO expansion, I will go along with what the rule of Congress is, but I would say this to the distinguished chairman of the authorizing committee: What Congress authorizes for NATO expansion should be what is appropriated for NATO expansion.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order, and I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] with-

draws his reservation of a point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE IN INDIA

SEC. 572. Not more than \$41,775,000 of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act under the heading "Development Assistance" may be made available for assistance in India.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes, divided between an opponent and proponent.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have several speakers on this side who would like to speak for 5 minutes each. We think we have three. So we think we need 15 minutes on this side.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I will amend my request to say 30 minutes divided 15 minutes for proponents, 15 minutes for opponents.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding there are two amendments or one?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this unanimous consent is on this first amendment, 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. ACKERMAN. We have three speakers on this side. We have two Members on the gentleman's side who would like to speak on our time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, may I suggest to the gentleman, could not the Members take 4 minutes each instead of 5?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, does that apply to the gentleman from Indiana as well?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the time limitation applies to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] as well. If he wants to take all of it, he can take all of it.

Mr. PALLONE. My question, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is whether the speakers who are speaking against the gentleman from Indiana's amendment would be taking up the time on our

side as opposed to the time on the gentleman's side?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it would determine who yielded time to them.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, what we need on our side for our Members is 15 minutes on each amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in light of that and in light of the congressional schedule with the House going in at 5 p.m., I think that it is only appropriate that we take up one of the Burton amendments today if we are going to have a time constraint at 15 minutes, half an hour or 15 minutes; or why do we not just go under the 5-minute rule until 5 p.m. and end at a time certain?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of it is in order that we could get through today with the debate on the Burton amendments, then leave tomorrow only the Smith and the Gilman amendments for debate.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's goal and I think that is a good try, but clearly there is more interest in the Burton amendments, and it appears that with the interest we are only going to be able to get through one amendment if we are going to abide by the House schedule of going back in at 5 p.m., so we will have one more amendment tomorrow if Mr. BURTON decides to offer it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, my unanimous consent is then 20 minutes on each side, and then if there is an objection, there is an objection.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, 20 minutes on each side on each amendment, 20 minutes on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York continue to reserve the right to object or does he withdraw his reservation?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman says "on our side," I understand there are several Republican Members who want to speak against the amendment. If that 20 minutes is limited to everyone who wants to speak against the amendment, we probably do not have enough time, unless I am missing something.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, we have two on this side that I know of. How many does the gentleman have on that side?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have three that we know of.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, so we could do it in 25 minutes, 4 minutes each. We could do it in 20 minutes.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Would the gentleman from Indiana Mr. BURTON be limited by those same restraints as the rest of the Members of the House of Representatives?

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

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think the Rules of the House on division of time, like this is, the proponents and the opponents have an equal amount of time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to work it out equitably so that we can accommodate everybody who would like to speak.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has five Members against one. I think that is fair odds. But I do not want to give up time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there are others who would like to agree with the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has withdrawn the request.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I read *Cyrano de Bergerac* as a boy. And when I read *Cyrano de Bergerac*, at one point in the play he is challenged by what he thought were 100 of the opponents. He was in the bakery shop and his friends came in. There were 100 of the enemy trying to kill his friends. And he said he thought the lovely Roxanne was in love with him. And he pulled out his sword and he ran to the door and said, only a 100. I do not mind if it is five or ten of my colleagues against me, as long as we have a fair distribution of the time. I feel kind of honored that I would be put in the same category as *Cyrano de Bergerac*.

Let me get to the point of the debate, talking about on this particular issue.

Mr. Chairman, we talk about tragedies and human rights violations all over the world. Right now, in the news today, they were talking about digging up possibly hundreds, maybe thousands of bodies in Bosnia. And that is a tragedy. That is something we should be very concerned about because human rights violations, wherever they occur, should be brought to the attention of the world and should be stopped.

We reprimand China for its draconian abortion policies and we threaten to stop international military and educational training, IMET, from Indonesia for abuses in East Timor. We talk about the struggles in Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia that I just alluded to. We even criticize longstanding allies like Turkey for its treatment of its Kurdish citizens without addressing the brutal murders carried out by the PKK, a Kurdish Marxist terrorist organization.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is one human rights issue that contin-

ues to escape the attention of this administration and this country and some Members of the Congress and especially the media. And that issue involves India and its human rights abuses and the violations against the Sikhs and the Kashmiris and the Christians in Nagaland and the plight of the untouchables, the lowest caste in India's caste system.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Government is one of the world's worst human rights abusers. You may ask, if that is true, why does not the world know? It is because Amnesty International and the International Red Cross is not allowed into the places where they are perpetrating these atrocities.

□ 1630

In Punjab, in Kashmir, in Nagaland. Let me just tell my colleagues, since 1947, over 200,000 Christians have been killed in Nagaland. I know it is horrible what is going on in Bosnia, and what has gone on in Bosnia. But 200,000 Christians have been killed since 1947 by the Indian Government and their troops in Nagaland since 1947. A quarter of a million, 250,000 Sikhs, have been killed in Punjab between 1984 and 1992, and more since then. Those are the latest numbers we have that we think are accurate. Fifty-three thousand Muslims have been killed in Kashmir since 1988.

For the past 15 years, I have been coming to this well to call attention to Punjab, where the Indian military receives cash bounties for the slaughter of innocent children and, to justify their action, these people are labeled terrorists, these kids. According to our own State Department, the United States State Department, India paid over 41,000 cash bounties to police for killing innocent people from 1991 to 1993 alone. Also in Punjab, Sikhs are picked up in the middle of the night only to be found floating dead in canals with their hands and feet bound together, and there is documentation to that fact, and many are never found.

Recently India's Central Bureau of Investigation, the CBI, told the Supreme Court that it had confirmed nearly 1,000 cases of unidentified bodies that were cremated by their military. They just happened to find 1,000 bodies and burned them up. Where did they come from? I submit they came from the same source that I was talking about just a moment ago, from the Indian troops in Kashmir and Punjab and Nagaland.

It does not get any better in Kashmir. Women, because of their Muslim beliefs, are taken out of their homes in the middle of the night and are gang-raped by Indian troops while their husbands are forced to stay in the House at gunpoint. This is a fact. This is not just me talking. It is a fact.

It was hoped that the new government in Delhi and Punjab would stop the repression which the Indian Supreme Court describes as worse than a genocide. The Indian Supreme Court

describes what is going on as worse than a genocide.

Mr. Chairman, opponents will say that the recent election in Punjab of a Sikh-dominated coalition and the fact that an untouchable is now the President of India is evidence of the new democratic process. But I can tell my colleagues that this new government in Punjab is closely aligned with the authoritarian Prime Minister Gujral of India and India's untouchable President is merely a figurehead.

Mr. Chairman, would democracies continue the rampant campaign of genocide? There are 550,000 troops, Indian troops in Punjab and 550,000 Indian troops in Kashmir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURTON of Indiana was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, people are afraid to go outside at night and they worry about that knock on the door that we remember back during the horrible perils of Hitler in World War II when the Jews were taken out in the middle of the night, never to be seen again. That is going on today in Punjab and Kashmir and Nagaland in India. It is not the Indian people. We are not taking issue with the Indian people. It is the repressive policies of the Indian military and the Indian government.

On July 12, 1997, just about a month ago, a month and a half, in Bombay, 33 Dalits, those are called black untouchables that I would say to my friends in the Black Caucus, they ought to listen to this, black untouchables, were killed by the Indian police during demonstrations. Thirty-three of them were killed. On July 8, 1997, 36 people were killed in a train bombing in Punjab and 2 ministers of the Punjab government have blamed the Punjab police. The bombing occurred a day after 9 policemen were convicted of murder. Nine policemen were convicted of murder a day after this bombing occurred.

On March 15, 1997, a death squad picked up Kashmir Singh, an opposition party member. He was thrown in a van, tortured and murdered. Finally his bullet ridden body was dumped on the roadside. These military forces operate beyond the law and with complete impunity and the world does not know because they will not let human rights groups in there, they will not let the international Red Cross in there, they will not let TV in there because they do not want the world to see. We heard about Bosnia, we heard about Somalia, we heard about Ethiopia when Mengistu was there, but we do not hear about what is going on over there because they will not let us in.

The Indian lobby has a lot of friends in the Congress who are going to be their spokesmen today and they will be speaking up for them. I presume I will be the only one speaking for the people in Kashmir, Punjab and Nagaland, but

I do not mind that. We should not support a government that condones widespread abuses with our tax dollars. All I am asking for is to send a signal. Cut 25 percent of the development aid we are sending to India. We probably should not be sending it there anyhow, any of it. But at least cut 25 percent to send a very strong signal that we do not support a government that allows those human rights abuses to take place.

Mr. Chairman, the Sikhs, the Muslims, the Christians, the untouchables, and the women of India are desperately looking to this Congress for help. The time has come for action. It is time for America to take a stand and to pass this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Clinton administration has requested \$56 million this year for development aid to India. India already receives \$51 million. That means a \$4.5 to \$5 million increase from last year. My amendment would not allow more than \$42 million to go. That is a 25-percent cut. That is a fair figure, and it sends a strong signal.

I would like to point out one more thing. We have here a picture, and this is the latest picture of what is going on in India. This is the tortured body of an unidentified Sikh. The Indian police have literally scalped this man. It is a young fellow, the police have seared his body with a hot iron rod and they cut off his fingers. That is what is going on today and that is what my colleagues are going to be saying does not occur. But I am telling Members it is here, it is happening. Women are being gang-raped in Kashmir because they are Muslim and they know if they are defiled, they will not be married, because of their religion and they take them out and gang-rape them and hold their husbands inside. It is a horrible thing that is going on over there and we keep giving aid to this country. This country has not been a friend of the United States in the past. During the cold war they supported the Soviet Union. They do not vote with us in the United Nations. Yet we continue to give them support. We ought to send a signal to them, at least on this one issue. Human rights violations, for God's sake, should not be tolerated anywhere in the world, and it is going on by the hundreds of thousands over there. We need to send them a signal.

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

Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker, the gentleman from Indiana, asked the question, who will speak for the people who are the victims of violence in Punjab and Kashmir and other places. Let me assure the gentleman that I do and we all do because we decry violence and we decry the abuses of human beings anywhere for any reason. But what the gentleman seeks to do is to punish an entire nation, the largest democracy in the world collectively, for random acts of a few that take place. He brings us one picture and cites hundreds of thousands. How do we condemn a whole na-

tion because of that? That is nothing but India bashing, Mr. Chairman. Do we condemn our own Government because people put a bounty on people's heads in Arizona and people moved in and murdered them? Is that the fault of the whole American Government and the American people?

I would like to cite an article that appeared in the Hill newspaper. It is a quote by a gentleman of the House who shows an unbelievable amount of understanding when talking about the Government of Turkey and he says, "When you have military conflicts," and the gentleman here is talking about insurgencies taking place against existing governments, he says, "When you have military conflicts, you're bound to have unfortunate things happen," he said. Continuing the quote, "People get killed, they're bombed and shot. These things happen," he said understandingly and justified, "incidental and anecdotal things that happen during these times of conflict." Who was the gentleman who said that, so understanding of the Government of Turkey? It is the very same gentleman from Indiana who just took the well and offered this amendment. How can he justify it in the case of one country and oppose it when it comes to another country?

The gentleman offers up four amendments. Dr. Alukh mysteriously appears in the Halls of the House, in the gallery, it happens each and every time, and the India bashing begins. This, Mr. Chairman, is totally unacceptable. This is not the way two great democracies view each other or treat each other. The gentleman complains of human rights abuses, but he ignores the genuine progress that India has made on this question. According to the State Department report which he only quotes in part, it says "India made further progress in resolving human rights problems." The same report notes that newspapers and magazines "regularly publish investigative reports and allegations of government wrongdoing, and the press as a whole champions human rights and criticizes" whenever there is a government lapse. Beyond this, the Indian Government has appointed a National Human Rights Commission with powers to investigate and to recommend policy changes and punishment and compensation in cases of incidental police abuse wherever it might happen to take place. Again in the State Department report that the gentleman quoted only in part, "The NHRC continued to enlarge its useful role in addressing the patterns of abuse, as well as specific abuses."

In particular, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is concerned about human rights in the states of Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir. Last year there was an election in Punjab where 65 percent of the eligible voters turned out in a Sikh-dominated government. This is the very minority that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]

claims the Indian Government oppresses. There were also elections in Kashmir which restored elected government there for the first time in 6 years.

I think, Mr. Chairman, what we have discovered, with the unwitting help of the gentleman from Indiana, is that India is a fully functioning, mature democracy with a free press, with civilian control of the military, with an independent judiciary, and very active political parties and civic associations. It seems to me that the oldest democracy in the world should not be sanctioning the largest. That is not the way democracies treat each other.

In addition to India's thriving democratic institutions, the current united front government led by Prime Minister Gudjaral has pledged, as has the finance minister with whom the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and myself met with only a week ago, has pledged to continue the economic reforms of the past 6 years. These reforms have provided enormous opportunities for United States business and, in fact, the United States is now India's largest overseas investor, its biggest trading partner and its preferred source of high-technology.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a deliberate and specific attempt to stigmatize India at a point where the relationship between the world's two great democracies has flowered. I urge all of my colleagues to stand and to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the comments by the gentleman from Indiana. I do not know if he is going to be the only speaker in favor of the amendment. I certainly hope he is. But if he is the only one, it is because he is basically giving the House outdated, exaggerated, and inaccurate information about the situation in India. He said that India is not a friend of the United States. Just the opposite is true. India is the world's largest democracy. India, last year, had the largest democratic election, the largest number of people participating in a democratic process in the history of the world as far as we know. He talks about the signal that this might send. What signal is sent by this body if we were to pass an amendment that chastises the world's largest democracy, a country that seeks every day to be our friend more and more, and which at the same time over the last few years has established a National Human Rights Commission that has been seeking out any violations of human rights, that has brought people to trial, that probably now sets an example not only for South Asia and for Asia but for the rest of the world in terms of its going after and fettering out human rights violations. It would send a terrible signal to the rest of the world if this body, the greatest democracy in the world, if this House of Representatives, were to chastise India for the things that it has accomplished in the last few years.

I just want to say, in the past the gentleman from Indiana has criticized India on human rights. Let me give my colleagues some information. The independent National Human Rights Commission with unprecedented powers has been in operation now for 3 years. Some of the members have been here to talk to us as Members of our House of Representatives. The commission has been lauded by many international agencies, including our own State Department, for its aggressiveness and independence. The chairman of India's National Human Rights Commission has met with representatives of Asia Watch, Amnesty International and the International Red Cross. The steps taken by India to remedy human rights problems is far superior to any of the efforts of India's neighbors, in particular, Pakistan and China which I think the gentleman from Indiana mentioned.

□ 1645

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana is suggesting that his amendment would put pressure on the Government of India to improve its record on human rights. In fact, if this amendment were to become law, it would greatly reduce America's ability to positively influence the Indian Government in any way. Punitive measures like this amendment only serve to isolate the Indian Government, give aid and comfort to political forces in India who oppose closer ties with the United States, and ultimately set back the process of political and economic reform in India.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that this debate over human rights in India is focusing entirely on one side of the issue, and what is lost is the fact that terrorist organizations operating within India's borders pose a constant ongoing threat to peace, stability and, yes, to human rights.

Militant separatist groups often operate with no accountability. Calling themselves freedom fighters, these organizations reserve onto themselves the right to strike at civilian targets in India with impunity. Furthermore, many of the militant organizations receive support, both moral and financial, as well as arms and training, from other nations, specifically Pakistan which has frequently been linked to terrorist organizations in India in a direct attempt to destabilize its neighbor, and under these conditions imposing punishment by this House on the Government of India will have the unmistakable effect of encouraging and emboldening these groups which seek by violent means to pursue their separatist agenda. This is not the type of behavior that this House of Representatives should be condoning.

I visited India earlier this year, Mr. Chairman, and I had the opportunity to see firsthand why this amendment would be a disaster. First, my colleague from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] talked about the situation in the In-

dian State of Punjab. Earlier this year the people of Punjab held elections in which the Sikh-dominated Akali Dal Party was swept into power. Voter turnout was 67 percent, better than we generally do here in the United States in most of our elections.

In the Punjabi capital of Chandigarh, I met with the newly elected Chief Minister of the State of Punjab, Mr. Prakash Singh Badal. He is a staunch defender of the Sikh people, but he is also deeply committed to working within India's democratic political system to advocate the political, economic, and social interests of his state and of the Sikh people.

He expressed his rejection of the separatist movement which has caused so much violence in recent years. His governing coalition includes a predominantly Hindu party, an indication that the Indian people want to work across ethnic and religious lines for the betterment of their entire society. This is the reality in today's Punjab. This is the reality in today's India. Everyone is working together to try to improve the situation. Human rights violations are being fettered out.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana's statements are not based on the accurate information of India today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the people of India have just celebrated their 50th anniversary of independence and democracy. It takes a special effort for Americans to imagine when our democracy was only 50 years old and the great hurdles we had to overcome to perfect our legal, political, economic, and social system.

India today is the world's largest democracy—950 million people. India is a multireligious, multiethnic society actively seeking to build a common national identity and overcome religious and ethnic conflict. In that half century India has struggled to overcome the legacy of feudalism followed by colonialism and all of the problems of underdevelopment and unequal development, including problems of population growth, capital formation, technology development, and infrastructure. They have shaped all of the basic institutions of a democratic system including, perhaps most significantly, many independent, nongovernmental institutions and organizations dedicated to involving and empowering people.

I rise here today in support of aid to India. Throughout my public career, I have worked with the Asian-Indian community.

My strong relationship with the Asian-Indian community in Chicago has afforded me the opportunity to meet with Indian officials who have visited Chicago and this interaction has helped me to understand how important democracy, economic development, and human rights are to India.

While the cold war no longer exists, our relations with South Asia must not be tainted by the cold war legacy.

There is a constant state of tension with neighbors like China and Pakistan—who have large and powerful militaries. Several states in India including Punjab and Kashmir have, in essence, been involved in a low-intensity war involving terrorism with foreign support as evidenced by the recent bombing of a train in Punjab resulting in 36 deaths. Despite the difficulties, India has proven that she will not tolerate violations of democracy and has acted to punish those guilty of violations of law and to reduce any such violations in the future.

The United States has become India's largest trading partner—now approaching \$9.5 billion per year—and her largest investor. India has adjusted her tax policies to further encourage trade and has become a significant player in many fields including computer science.

Yet India is still a country in need of assistance and development especially in the most underdeveloped regions needing assistance with health and educational programs. These programs involve financial and technical support from the United States which is matched by volunteer equity on the part of the people of India. These programs have proven themselves to be successful in addressing the problems of underdevelopment and also as powerful instrument of international understanding, communication, and trust.

It makes sense to continue our commitment to India. India is proving a success in its economic development and is a role model for other developing countries. We can take this opportunity now to improve our foreign policy relations with India. We can illustrate how the United States is a reliable friend and model.

A vote against India in this House, is not in the best interest of the United States and its reputation as a world leader. Therefore, I urge that we oppose any and all amendments that would single out India for a limitation on development assistance.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Burton amendment.

Since its independence 50 years ago, India has made tremendous progress in a number of key areas of United States foreign policy interest. First of all, it shares with the United States the values and institutions of free and democratic nations. Just last year, India held the largest democratic election in world history, an election that was universally regarded as free and fair, was contested by multiple political parties, and was scrutinized by an extensive free press.

Since the end of the cold war, India has embarked on an ambitious program of economic liberalization and market reforms. These reforms have helped bring the United States and India closer together in a cooperative spirit and have helped the United States to become India's largest trading partner.

In addition to progress at home, India also continues to improve its relations with its neighbors. Over the past year, Prime Minister Gujral, in an outreach effort begun during his

tenure as Minister for External Affairs, has been at the forefront of initiatives to improve bilateral relations between India and its neighbors Bangladesh, Nepal, and Sri Lanka.

There also has been an important breakthrough this year in improving bilateral relations between India and Pakistan, a major goal of United States foreign policy in South Asia. In March, the Prime Minister of each country agreed to resume high-level talks which had been cut off since 1994. I was pleased that Prime Minister Gujral took the initiative to embark on such discussions so soon after assuming office. The two Prime Ministers met during the Asian summit in May of this year and agreement has already been reached on the establishment of working groups to explore solutions to the outstanding disputes between the two countries. Instead of undermining this important progress, U.S. foreign policy ought to be aimed at extending support for and encouraging the efforts being made by the prime minister of each nation to seek solutions to longstanding bilateral disputes.

Far from withdrawing from our growing cooperation and increasingly improving relations with India, as the Burton amendment would have us do, now is the time for the United States to deepen its commitment to strengthening relations between our two countries. As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of India's independence this year, United States relations with India should move forward, not backward. I urge all Members to vote against this amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Burton amendment, which would limit development assistance to India.

Mr. Speaker, it is 1 year later and we are still fighting the same fight. We defeated a similar amendment last year by an overwhelming margin—296 to 127.

I am proud to be a member of the Congressional India Caucus, and was pleased to travel to India recently.

On August 15, we celebrated India's 50th anniversary of democratic self rule. Passage of this amendment will have a devastating effect on the growing relationship between India and the United States.

The United States is now India's largest overseas investor and its biggest trading partner.

Since 1991, major Fortune 500 companies have invested in India. The Commerce Department has designated India as one of the most important "Big Emerging Markets."

Mr. Speaker, American businesses recognize the importance of a strong relationship with India.

The gentleman from Indiana appears to have a noble purpose—to focus the attention of the House on human rights abuses. But despite his intentions, the amendment will do great harm to the very people it purports to help.

Yes, India has had problems with human rights in the past. But this nation—this great democracy—has taken exceptionally strong steps forward.

In fact, India's Human Rights Commission, headed by a former Supreme Court Justice, has been hailed by the State Department for its "significant progress in resolving human rights problems."

Freezing developmental assistance would hurt the poorest of the poor in India. The

amendment would directly undermine the stated objectives of India's democratically elected Prime Minister to improve the living conditions of the country's poorest citizens. And finally, this amendment would be an enormous blow to United States-Indian relations at the very moment when we should be strengthening ties between our two democracies.

Last year, India held a critical and historic election—300 million people went to the polls in what the New York Times' William Safire called "the most breathtaking example of government by people in the history of the world."

The world's most populous democracy proved that its most powerful weapon is the ballot, not the bullet.

We must not pass a punitive anti-India amendment on the heels of this election.

United States-India relations are strong. American businesses are flourishing in India.

Let's send the world's most populous democracy the right message.

Let's vote for progress in India.

Let's vote for democracy.

I urge a "no" vote on the Burton amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition today to the amendment offered by my colleague from Indiana. I must admit that I fail to understand why this esteemed Member, who has not even taken the time to travel to India to see her progress first hand, insists on demonizing an important ally.

I was fortunate, over the August recess, to join Chairman GILMAN on a House International Relations Committee Codel to Asia. We were in India on the 50th anniversary of her independence. I saw first hand India's thriving democracy, independent, nongovernmental institutions, a raucous free press, an independent judiciary, a welcoming, albeit suspicious economic sector, and a friendly, English-speaking people who are schooled in democratic values and who both value and demand their personal liberties. I saw a country of almost a billion people virtually begging for closer ties and friendship with the United States.

I realize that India is not perfect. I continued to be concerned with India's nuclear proliferation, human rights abuses, strife in Kashmir, and the occasional lack of hospitality toward foreign investment and infrastructure-building projects.

But as I have said many times in the past, we can have more influence using a carrot with the Indians than with a stick. Considering some of the other countries in the region with whom we are seeking better ties, India looks like a bargain to me. Oppose the Burton amendment.

Ms. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rose before this committee over a year ago and I now stand before you today, once again to strongly urge a vote against this amendment.

The Burton amendment, whether it freezes, cuts, or caps foreign assistance to India, is a step in the wrong direction. The new Government of India is moving at a rapid pace to strengthen its ties with the United States and the world.

The economic and diplomatic relationship between the United States, the world's oldest democracy, and India, the world's largest democracy, would receive a harmful blow with successful passage of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Government of India has been on a constant pace of change since

1991. The 1996 election featured the world's largest voter turnout, practically free of violence. The 1997 election featured the victory of Prime Minister I.K. Gujral, who is of Punjabi descent, the very region that Mr. BURTON claims human rights violations are taking place.

On the subject of the State of Punjab, the Sikh minority dominated the ruling party in open democratic elections. Voter turnout was 65 percent.

Prime Minister Gujral, in his first month of leadership, engaged in direct talks with newly elected Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan. A hotline phone system was established in a commitment to bring peace to the two nations.

So let us as Members of Congress not view the Government of India as being callous to these alleged human rights violations. India has made great strides in their battle to bring together the States of Kashmir, Jammu, Nagaland, and Punjab.

Recent reports by the U.S. State Department declare that India has "made further progress in resolving human rights problems."

It would be false and misdirected to say that India is not our friend. U.S. business in India has grown at an astonishing rate of nearly 50 percent a year since 1991, with the United States becoming India's largest trading partner and largest investor.

As India prepares to celebrate its 50th anniversary of democratic self rule, let us not sever the ties that we have so diligently strived to assemble. Vote "no" on the Burton amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. 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. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2159) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER LIMITATION OF AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2159, no further amendments shall be in order in the Committee of the Whole except the amendment Number 1 in House Report 105-184, and the amendment to that amendment, under the terms of the order of the House of July 24, 1997, and the pending amendment, Number 38, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], and the amendment, Number 40, offered by Mr. BURTON.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that under the two Burton amendments there is no limitation on the time? We will be under the 5-minute rule?

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

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

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to double check amendments 38 and 40. Now 38 is the one that we are on?

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the one we are on now, and 40 is the one the gentleman from Indiana indicated he wanted to introduce.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

VACATING REQUEST FOR RECORDED VOTE ON BEREUTER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2159, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the request for a recorded vote on the Bereuter amendment, Number 53, on H.R. 2159.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] prevails by voice vote.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 2209, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SERRANO

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SERRANO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2209, be instructed to agree to the position in Senate amendment numbered 1 with respect to the account "Joint Committee on Taxation" providing not more than a 4.64 percent increase for the Joint Committee on Taxation compared to an 8 percent increase in the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] and the other gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my motion would simply direct the House conferees to do the fiscally responsible thing when we take up the funding level for the Joint Committee on Taxation and agree to the Senate position. The Senate bill would give the Joint Committee on Taxation a tidy 4.6-percent increase over last year. We think that it is more than fair.

The House bill, in my view, was overly generous in providing an 8-percent increase for this office. In comparison, in the name of fiscal discipline, both bills provide increases of only 3.6 percent for the operation of the House and less than 2 percent for such vital agencies as a Congressional Budget Office and the Government Printing Office [GPO]. The House bill actually cuts funding for the General Accounting Office by \$8 million below last year.

In light of these funding levels, it is inappropriate and inconsistent to turn around and reward one office with an 8-percent increase. Moreover, the justification for this increase does not stand up to any reasonable level of scrutiny. I think the American people could question why we would increase the staff of this office the year after work is completed on a major tax bill, especially when at the same time we are cutting GAO whose main purpose is to look for wasteful Federal spending and save taxpayers money. If the existing staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation could operate effectively this year when they worked on what we are told over and over again was a major historic tax bill, one would think they could manage the work load during a more routine year without all this extra staff.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are simply calling on the House to be more consistent in imposing fiscal austerity within the legislative branch. We should treat all offices the same, not give special treatment to a favored few.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion.

The intent of the motion is to eliminate the five additional full-time

equivalent positions the bill provides for the Joint Committee on Taxation. The committee bill has already reduced the budget submitted by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] by seven positions, or \$219,000. Chairman ARCHER, who also chairs the Committee on Ways and Means, testified that he needed 12 more staff positions to do the additional work mandated on the Joint Committee on Taxation's staff.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the Joint Committee on Taxation provides invaluable work for the House and the Senate through the support they give to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee. They do much of the technical work on all revenue bills. They also analyze tax treaties entered into between the U.S. Government and other countries, and they also review all large tax refunds issued by the Treasury Department.

During the past 5 years, the economists, lawyers, and accountants of the Joint Committee on Taxation have averaged over 2,000 revenue estimates requested by Members and committees in connection with the proposed tax legislation. In addition, the staff has reviewed several hundred large tax refunds. Last year, they reviewed 486 refund reports with a dollar value of over \$4.6 billion. They found concerns in 103 of these cases, concerns of over and underfunding or errors that needed to be corrected.

So this committee does a great deal of technical work in support of the congressional revenue and tax treaty process, and they also oversee large tax refund work of the Internal Revenue Service.

In asking for a staffing increase this year, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] outlined additional responsibilities that have been given to the Joint Committee on Taxation. A new requirement imposed by House rule XIII to make dynamic estimates in major tax legislation; determining unfunded mandates contained in revenue legislation; and we saw the President exercise his line-item veto on this most recent tax measure. The Joint Committee on Taxation will be called upon to determine limited tax benefits that are eligible for consideration. He has asked for, the chairman has asked for, 12 more FTE's to do this work; the committee bill only allows 5. We removed 7 FTE's during the full committee consideration of the bill after the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and others indicated their concern for such a large increase. So we have gone more than half way in meeting their concern.

The bill provides funding for an FTE level of 66. It puts the full-time equivalent positions back at the level they were funded at in 1988. This increase would bring them, the Joint Committee on Taxation, up to the level of 1988. All we have done is put them back to where they were 10 years ago.

I heard this concern in the full committee, and I offered an amendment that reduces the subcommittee mark of 12 additional FTE's to 5. The Committee on Appropriations heard this concern, considered the prudence of restraint, and accepted a staff level of a decade ago and reported the bill with those limited resources.

Mr. Speaker, the House has voted on this; the House has taken a position supporting the House's position. This motion would have us agree with the Senate's position, and I strongly urge that the House vote to reject this motion.

The House of Representatives approved a fiscal year 1998 funding level for the Joint Committee on Taxation of \$5,907,000, an increase of \$437,000 over fiscal year 1997. This amount is less than the \$6,126,000 requested by Ways and Means Committee Chairman BILL ARCHER and Senate Finance Committee Chairman BILL ROTH.

The \$437,000 increase in appropriation approved by the House would be allocated as follows:

Cost-of-living adjustments (salaries and equipment): \$161,000 and salaries for new hires: \$276,000.

The increase attributable to cost-of-living adjustments matches the assumed Federal employee cost-of-living adjustment. The salaries for new hires would be used primarily to fill a portion of the increased FTE positions with additional professional staff—2–3 staff economists, 1 attorney, and 1–2 computer specialists or support staff.

The House approved an increase of 5 FTE's for the Joint Committee on Taxation for fiscal year 1998. The Joint Committee has 61 authorized staff positions for fiscal year 1997. Other than fiscal year 1996, in which the authorized staff positions were 63, the authorized staff levels have not, since 1980, been below 66 positions. Thus, the FTE's authorized by the House would provide the Joint Committee with the same number of FTE's as in fiscal year 1980. The attached summary sheet shows that the Joint Committee FTE's remained relatively stable over the fiscal year 1980–1997 period. Thus, when other staffs may have been growing during the 1980's, the Joint Committee did not see the same burgeoning of staff. By way of comparison, the Congressional Budget Office has an appropriation for fiscal year 1997 of \$24,532,000 and 232 authorized FTE's, compared to \$5,470,000 and 61 FTE's for the Joint Committee on Taxation.

The Joint Committee on Taxation needs additional funding to fulfill new responsibilities that have been assigned to it. In addition to the traditional role of the Joint Committee staff in the development, drafting, and estimating of proposed revenue legislation, the Joint Committee staff is now responsible for determining the possible unfunded mandates contained in revenue legislation and identifying the limited tax benefits subject to the Line Item Veto Act. In addition, a new House rule for the 105th Congress requires the staff of the Joint Committee to estimate the possible macroeconomic, or dynamic, scoring effects of major revenue legislation. The Joint Committee staff presently has neither the personnel nor the computer capabilities to satisfy the requirement of this rule.

Since calendar year 1992, the Joint Committee on Taxation has received, on average, over 2,000 requests for revenue estimates a year. The Joint Committee currently has the staff resources to respond to approximately 50% of these requests. Unless the number of Joint Committee personnel are increased, the response rate to Members of Congress will not improve. This is not a question of staff not working to capacity. The Joint Committee staff devote all of their resources to the legitimate needs of the Congress, but they are frankly swamped with requests for assistance from Members of Congress that they cannot possibly satisfy at current staffing levels.

The Congress will require increased services of the Joint Committee on Taxation during fiscal year 1998. During the first part of fiscal year 1998, the Joint Committee staff will be completing its work investigating whether the Internal Revenue Service has exhibited bias in the selection of tax-exempt organizations for audit. In addition, the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation will be involved with the following legislative proposals during fiscal year 1998: (1) Reauthorization of the highway trust fund, (2) Possible Superfund legislation, (3) Legislation relating to the tobacco settlement, (4) Legislation relating to expiring tax provisions, (5) Consideration of 7 tax treaties by the Senate, (6) Legislation to reform the operations of the Internal Revenue Service, (7) Possible tax reduction proposals for 1998, and (8) Fundamental restructuring of the Federal tax system.

Contrary to what some have asserted, fiscal year 1998 will see increased demands by the Congress for the services of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

I will include the following for the RECORD:

HISTORY OF APPROPRIATIONS—JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION SINCE FISCAL YEAR 1980

Fiscal year	Appropriations	Authorized positions
1980		66
1981		68
1982		70
1983	\$3,377,000	68
1984	3,483,000	66
1985	3,605,000	66
1986	3,546,000	66
1987	4,159,000	66
1988	4,219,000	66
1989	4,346,000	70
1990	4,353,000	70
1991	5,203,000	77
1992	5,759,000	77
1993	5,759,000	77
1994	5,701,000	77
1995	6,019,000	73
1996	5,116,000	63
1997	5,470,000	61
1998	16,126,000	173
	25,907,000	266
	35,724,000	

<sup>1</sup> Requested.  
<sup>2</sup> House.  
<sup>3</sup> Senate.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], our ranking member.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I would urge the House to adopt this motion. I think there is absolutely no reason why joint committees ought to be allowed a higher level of funding than was approved for any other committee in this House when the committee funding resolution was brought to

the floor, especially in light of the nature of the publicity which has been directed lately at the committee that would be the beneficiary of the largess contained in the House bill.

I would like to read from a newspaper article from USA Today. It says tobacco industry representatives wrote the provision of the balanced budget law that allows cigarette makers to reduce their future liability in smoking related lawsuits, Congress' chief writer told USA Today. The industry wrote it and submitted it; we just used their language, Kenneth Kies, staff director of the Joint Committee on Taxation said.

Kies declined to identify the lobbyist who presented the provision or the company the lobbyist represented, but his statement is the first public acknowledgment that the controversial provision which could save cigarette manufacturers an estimated \$50 billion over 20 years originated with the industry itself.

□ 1700

Now, that statement was made by the director of the committee, which is being given a higher level of funding than any other committee has been given this year. It seems to me that if the staff director for that committee admits that they are not even doing their own job and they are turning part of it over to K Street and the lobbyists downtown, they have given up any excuse for needing additional funding to prepare tax legislation.

We have already finished most of the tax legislation that we are going to see for this session and next. We have had a huge change in the Tax Code. It seems to me that it would be highly out of order to provide this special treatment for the Joint Tax Committee, especially when they indicate that they are allowing a lobbyist from K Street to write \$50 billion amendments that are included in the major legislative action taken by the Congress this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge the support for the gentleman's motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just again urge my colleagues to reject this motion. This committee's work, this joint committee's work, is of very timely importance. We did just pass a major tax cut. Thank God that we did. We did it with bipartisan support. Although some of the proponents of this motion did not support that tax cut, the majority of the Congress of both parties did, also the Senate, and the President signed the bill, with a major reduction in income taxes for people with children, for capital gains, estate and death tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, this is only the beginning. We feel very strongly that this is just the first cut, that next year there should be another and the following year there should be another.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has suggested very strongly that the Committee on Ways and Means is going to take a serious look at reforming our overall progressive income tax program and reforming the Internal Revenue Service. This is going to require staff work.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking for only a funding level equal to what was there when the Democratic Party controlled the House back in 1988. This is the staffing level they had. We have reduced this dramatically, but now we are starting to cut taxes, and the economy of the country is picking up and responding positively.

We do not want this to be the last tax cut. We want it to be the first tax cut. We would like to make sure that the work that the House and the Senate and the President have done is properly accounted for, and that we keep on target and in the direction of further reducing the tax burden on the American public.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct before us.

It doesn't make sense to me why the Joint Tax Committee needs all of the funding it receives in this bill. Last month, when we all thought the committee was busy writing the provisions of the tax bill, it turns out they were checking their mailbox for suggested provisions from lobbyists.

One such suggestion was a \$50 billion giveaway to the tobacco industry that went directly from the desks of the industry lobbyists into the tax bill.

This provision will allow the big tobacco companies to reduce the payment they are required to make under a settlement by the amount collected in excise taxes on cigarettes. This is unacceptable.

That is why I introduced legislation with Senator DICK DURBIN that will repeal this middle-of-the-night giveaway. We must not allow American taxpayers to foot the bill for big tobacco's settlement with the American people.

This provision should never have been written into the tax bill in the first place, and it must be repealed immediately.

But in addition to repealing the provision, we must determine how it was slipped into the tax bill in the first place.

Fortunately, Kenneth Kies, the staff director of the Joint Tax Committee, answered this question for us August 29. When asked about this giveaway to the big tobacco companies, Mr. Kies was quoted in USA Today as saying, "The industry wrote it and submitted it, and we just used their language."

Mr. Speaker, if that is the way the Joint Tax Committee determined which provisions to include in the tax bill, there are far better ways to use taxpayers' dollars.

We must repeal this tobacco giveaway, and we must send a strong message to Mr. Kies and the Joint Tax Committee that the manner in which this provision was slipped into the tax bill is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes 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 202, nays 208, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

YEAS—202

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Mink
Ackerman	Goode	Moakley
Allen	Gordon	Mollohan
Andrews	Green	Moran (VA)
Baesler	Gutierrez	Murtha
Baldacci	Hall (TX)	Nadler
Barcia	Hamilton	Neal
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Neumann
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Bentsen	Hefner	Obey
Berry	Hilliard	Olver
Bishop	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Blagojevich	Holden	Owens
Blumenauer	Hooley	Pallone
Bonior	Hoyer	Pascrell
Borski	Hulshof	Pastor
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
Boyd	(TX)	Pomeroy
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Poshard
Brown (FL)	John	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Johnson (WI)	Rahall
Cardin	Johnson, E.B.	Rangel
Carson	Kanjorski	Reyes
Chabot	Kaptur	Rivers
Chenoweth	Kennedy (MA)	Rodriguez
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
Clayton	Kennelly	Rothman
Clement	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Coburn	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Condit	Klink	Sanders
Conyers	Klug	Sandlin
Costello	Kucinich	Sawyer
Coyne	LaFalce	Schumer
Cramer	Lampson	Scott
Cummings	Largent	Serrano
Danner	Levin	Sherman
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Skaggs
DeFazio	Lofgren	Skelton
DeGette	Lowey	Slaughter
Delahunt	Luther	Smith (MI)
DeLauro	Maloney (CT)	Smith, Adam
Dellums	Maloney (NY)	Snyder
Deutsch	Manton	Spratt
Dicks	Markey	Stabenow
Dingell	Martinez	Stark
Doggett	Mascara	Stearns
Dooley	Matsui	Stenholm
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Stokes
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
Eshoo	McDermott	Stupak
Etheridge	McGovern	Tauscher
Evans	McHale	Taylor (MS)
Farr	McIntyre	Taylor (NC)
Fattah	McKinney	Thompson
Fazio	McNulty	Thurman
Filner	Meehan	Tierney
Flake	Meek	Torres
Foglietta	Menendez	Trafficant
Ford	Millender	Turner
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Upton
Frost	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Gejdenson	Minge	Vento

Visclosky  
Waters  
Watt (NC)

Waxman  
Wexler  
Weygand

Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates

## NAYS—208

Aderholt  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Billbray  
Billrakis  
Bliley  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brady  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cannon  
Castle  
Chambliss  
Christensen  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis (VA)  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Ganske  
Gekas

## NOT VOTING—23

Berman  
Capps  
Dixon  
Engel  
Ensign  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Gonzalez

Hall (OH)  
Hinchey  
Istook  
Lantos  
McCollum  
McInnis  
Payne  
Rohrabacher

Pappas  
Parker  
Paul  
Paxon  
Pease  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Redmond  
Regula  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Royce  
Ryun  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaffer, Bob  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowbarger  
Solomon  
Souders  
Spence  
Stump  
Sununu  
Talent  
Lucas  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 352, severe thunderstorms caused my plane to arrive late. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WALSH, YOUNG of Florida, CUNNINGHAM, WAMP, LATHAM, LIVINGSTON, SERRANO, FAZIO of California, OBEY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON  
H.R. 2160, AGRICULTURE, RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG  
ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 1998

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]?  
There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. KAPTUR moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2160, be instructed to recede to the Senate regarding funding levels provided under the Food and Drug Administration for the program to prevent the use of tobacco products by minors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the motion I offer today instructs the conferees on the fiscal year 1998 Agriculture Appropriations Act to agree to the higher funding levels provided by the Senate for the Food and Drug Administration's Youth Tobacco Initiative.

Just this morning, Mr. Speaker, the Senate agreed to provide \$34 million, which was the full budget request, for the Food and Drug Administration Program to assist our States in enforcement and outreach efforts related to rules to prevent children, our children, from purchasing tobacco as minors.

The House bill included \$24 million for this important program, and originally the Senate had only provided \$4.9 million. But this morning, in an act of great wisdom, the Senate, on an amendment that was voiced after substantial approval was given and a motion to table defeated, voted in the Senate to raise the level to \$34 million, which was the full budget request.

Mr. Speaker, our bill here in the House included \$24 million for this important program. Our motion would simply instruct our House conferees to agree to the funding levels for the Food and Drug Administration provided by the Senate, therefore, fully funding this important initiative to protect our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to point out, I suppose, that nearly 90 percent of adult smokers in our country began doing so before the age of 18. In fact, at current rates, more than 5 million children under age 18 who are alive today will be killed by smoking-related diseases. So we are talking about the lives of millions of our children.

We know that every year more than \$1 billion in tobacco products are illegally sold to minors. I underline "illegally" sold to minors in this country. And as much as \$50 billion is spent every year in our country on smoking-related medical care.

Providing \$34 million, \$10 million more than in the House agreement but meeting the full budget request, will help our States set up enforcement programs and educate retailers and the public on the new Food and Drug Administration youth tobacco rules. It seems to me this is the least we can do to protect our country's future and our children.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], I concur that this is a very important issue for all of us. I share the gentlewoman's concern, but we have many differences in these two bills, and I strongly believe that the House should not, should not be instructing its conferees to accept a Senate position on any issue before the conference has even begun.

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

□ 1727

Mr. Livingston changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. CHENOWETH and Messrs. CLAY, STOKES, DINGELL, and UPTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees to fully fund the FDA's program to crack down on illegal tobacco sales to minors. I appreciate the assistance of Chairman SKEEN and other members of the subcommittee in providing \$24 million for this important initiative in the House bill. But I hope that in conference that we can join the Senate and provide the entire \$34 million needed to stop our youngsters from taking up smoking and becoming addicted.

Facts of underage tobacco use are undisputed. Every single day 3,000 young people under the age of 18 who cannot even buy tobacco legally, become regular smokers. Selling tobacco to minors is illegal in all 50 States, but studies show that children can buy tobacco 67 percent of the time. What does this teach our children? It teaches them to smoke and it also teaches them that there are no penalties for breaking the law.

The FDA plan will help retailers understand and comply with the law. It enables strict enforcement by checking that stores require people who look younger than age 27 show an ID card before they buy cigarettes. It is a perfectly legitimate practice with regard to the sale of alcohol. It is an enforcement mechanism, it is an outreach mechanism, and it does not set up any, and I repeat, it does not set up any new government bureaucracy.

□ 1745

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal reported that 83 percent of the Members of the other body who took tobacco money last year voted against fully funding this provision. I would like to think that Members of this body today will be voting on this motion based on what is best for America's children and not on what is best for their campaign coffers.

Frankly, the tobacco industry has no reason to oppose this motion because this money all goes toward endorsing current law. This is no new law that is being talked about. But perhaps because 90 percent of all smokers start the habit by age 18, the tobacco companies are concerned that cracking down on youth smoking will hurt their businesses.

I would be ashamed if any Member of this body voted against this resolution as payback for a campaign contribution. This motion is about saving lives. Investing a small amount in prevention today is going to yield enormous savings down the road, not only in dollars for reduced medical costs but in the lives of our young people who can be saved.

I urge my colleagues to support the motion to instruct.

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

I just wanted to mention that for Members who are listening on the floor or maybe listening to these remarks over their televisions in their offices, if you look at the budget issue involved here, and I wanted to place this on the record because it is important, voting for this motion to instruct is a very responsible vote.

Both the House and the Senate have decided within their respective appropriations committees for different marks, different funding levels for agriculture functions. In the Senate, the Agriculture Subcommittee allocations were much higher than in the House. In fact, they have \$30 million more in budget authority and over \$200 million more in outlays. As we go to conference, we have to conference on that as well.

So I want to assure my colleagues that the flexibility within the budget exists and we are not asking for anything unreasonable in this motion to instruct. We are again asking our House colleagues to agree with what the Senate has done and to instruct our conferees to agree to the \$34 million youth tobacco prevention initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for her leadership and advocacy of this issue. I recognize the sensitivity of the chairman as well, but would respectfully disagree with the approach. It is vital and imperative that this motion to instruct conferees is passed by this body.

There is a whole lot of barking going around about what we intend to do about preventing children from engaging in the beginning of tobacco use, or smoking, but there is not a lot of bite. This is a simple instruction that simply provides the bite that is needed to ensure that we provide the enforcement and the education to our retailers around this Nation.

One of the failings that brought about this intense increase in cigarette smoking by our young people is that in the highways and byways and the rural communities and urban centers, there has been no incentive on the part of our retailers to stop that young person who comes in, approaches that cigarette, or to keep them from going to the cigarette machine; and what we have now is a \$50 billion smoking-related medical care cost. This does not make sense.

All we are asking for our House Members to do is to be in sync with the Senate so that there is not a dilemma in conference, there is not confusion in conference, there is not disagreement in conference, that we would join in and support the \$37 billion that the Senate has approved so we can put some action behind our words, put your money where your mouth is and that is not in your pocket. That is to ensure that there is enforcement and education.

Every time I go into my schools, whether we are talking about prevention of HIV, whether we are talking about understanding of one's ability to know how to interact and to be able to use one's sexual intensity properly, it is all about educating our young people. It is all about being forthright. It makes no sense whatsoever that we would not want to support this motion to instruct conferees to put some bite in our bark, to ensure that the 3,000 young people under the age of 18 who get cigarettes every day are educated properly and these laws are enforced.

We need to provide the bite for the Food and Drug Administration. This is a sensible, intelligent, forthright motion to instruct conferees.

I would be incensed, and I think the American people would not understand why the House would be backtracking from a so-called commitment to ensure that the Food and Drug Administration has all of the tools that it should have to make sure that we see this siege upon our young people in America prevented and we educate them toward good health and to stop the smoking that has infiltrated their young lives and caused devastating health impact in their late lives.

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

I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to instruct conferees so that we can go to the conference with a strong position from both the House and the Senate and really do something for the young people of this country and help prevent additional addiction which will cost millions of lives in the future and billions of dollars. Let us do what is right for our children and give them a helping hand.

I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to instruct conferees.

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

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

Let me summarize this issue for my colleagues, if I might. Currently the House has \$24.3 million for new tobacco regulations. In an action today, the Senate provided \$34 million for the same purpose. I am not, I repeat, I am not opposed to providing funds for regulating tobacco, but there has been no resolution of the differences in the allocations of the House and the Senate. The Senate allocation is \$200 million more than the House. Until that is resolved, I do not believe that we should be issuing instructions to conferees to go to numbers higher than the House allocation can support.

I urge the defeat of the motion to instruct.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct

offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

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

Ms. KAPTUR. 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 299, nays 125, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

YEAS—299

Abercrombie	Eshoo	Klink
Ackerman	Evans	Klug
Allen	Ewing	Kolbe
Andrews	Farr	Kucinich
Bachus	Fattah	LaFalce
Baldacci	Fawell	LaHood
Barcia	Fazio	Lampson
Barrett (NE)	Filner	LaTourette
Barrett (WI)	Flake	Lazio
Barton	Foglietta	Leach
Bass	Foley	Levin
Becerra	Forbes	Lewis (GA)
Bentsen	Ford	Linder
Bereuter	Fowler	Lipinski
Berman	Fox	LoBiondo
Berry	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Lowe
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	Luther
Blagojevich	Frost	Maloney (CT)
Blumenauer	Furse	Maloney (NY)
Boehlert	Ganske	Manton
Bonior	Gejdenson	Manzullo
Borski	Gephardt	Markey
Boswell	Gibbons	Martinez
Brown (CA)	Gilchrest	Mascara
Brown (FL)	Gilman	Matsui
Brown (OH)	Gooding	McCarthy (MO)
Bryant	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Calvert	Goss	McDade
Camp	Green	McDermott
Campbell	Greenwood	McGovern
Canady	Gutierrez	McHale
Cannon	Gutknecht	McHugh
Capps	Hall (TX)	McKinney
Cardin	Hamilton	McNulty
Carson	Hansen	Meehan
Castle	Harman	Meek
Chabot	Hastert	Menendez
Christensen	Hastings (FL)	Metcalfe
Clayton	Hayworth	Millender-Hill
Clement	Hill	McDonald
Clyburn	Hilliard	Miller (CA)
Condit	Hinche	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Hinojosa	Minge
Cook	Hobson	Mink
Costello	Hoekstra	Moakley
Coyne	Holden	Mollohan
Cramer	Hooley	Moran (KS)
Crapo	Horn	Moran (VA)
Cummings	Houghton	Morella
Danner	Hoyer	Murtha
Davis (FL)	Hulshof	Nadler
Davis (IL)	Hutchinson	Neal
Davis (VA)	Istook	Neumann
DeFazio	Jackson (IL)	Ney
DeGette	Jackson-Lee	Nussle
Delahunt	(TX)	Oberstar
DeLauro	Jefferson	Obey
Dellums	John	Olver
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Ortiz
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (WI)	Owens
Dicks	Johnson, E. B.	Oxley
Dingell	Kanjorski	Pallone
Doggett	Kaptur	Pappas
Dooley	Kasich	Pascarell
Doyle	Kelly	Pastor
Duncan	Kennedy (MA)	Payne
Edwards	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Ehlers	Kennelly	Peterson (MN)
Ehrlich	Kildee	Peterson (PA)
Emerson	Kilpatrick	Petri
Engel	Kind (WI)	Pickett
English	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Ensign	Kleczka	Porter

Portman	Sensenbrenner	Taylor (MS)
Poshad	Serrano	Thompson
Pryce (OH)	Shaw	Thune
Quinn	Shays	Thurman
Rahall	Sherman	Tiahrt
Ramstad	Shimkus	Tierney
Rangel	Sisisky	Torres
Regula	Skaggs	Traficant
Reyes	Skelton	Turner
Riggs	Slaughter	Upton
Rivers	Smith (MI)	Velazquez
Rodriguez	Smith (NJ)	Vento
Roemer	Smith (TX)	Visclosky
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith, Adam	Wamp
Rothman	Snyder	Waters
Roukema	Spratt	Watt (NC)
Roybal-Allard	Stabenow	Waxman
Royce	Stark	Weldon (PA)
Sabo	Stenholm	Wexler
Salmon	Stokes	Weygand
Sanchez	Strickland	Wise
Sanders	Stupak	Woolsey
Sandlin	Sununu	Wynn
Sawyer	Talent	Yates
Saxton	Tanner	Young (FL)
Schumer	Tauscher	
Scott	Tauzin	

NAYS—125

Aderholt	Gallegly	Pease
Archer	Gekas	Pickering
Armey	Gillmor	Pitts
Baessler	Goode	Pombo
Baker	Goodlatte	Price (NC)
Ballenger	Graham	Radanovich
Barr	Granger	Redmond
Bartlett	Hastings (WA)	Riley
Bateman	Hefley	Rogan
Bilbray	Hefner	Rogers
Bliley	Herger	Rohrabacher
Blunt	Hillery	Ryun
Boehner	Hostettler	Sanford
Bonilla	Hunter	Scarborough
Bono	Hyde	Schaefer, Dan
Boucher	Inglis	Schaffer, Bob
Boyd	Jenkins	Sessions
Brady	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Bunning	Jones	Shuster
Burr	Kim	Skeen
Burton	Kingston	Smith (OR)
Buyer	Knollenberg	Smith, Linda
Callahan	Largent	Snowbarger
Chambliss	Latham	Solomon
Chenoweth	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Coble	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Coburn	Livingston	Stearns
Collins	Lucas	Stump
Combest	McCrery	Taylor (NC)
Cooksey	McInnis	Thomas
Cox	McIntosh	Thornberry
Crane	McIntyre	Walsh
Cubin	McKeon	Watkins
Cunningham	Mica	Watts (OK)
Deal	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
DeLay	Nethercutt	Weller
Dickey	Northup	White
Doolittle	Norwood	Whitfield
Dreier	Packard	Wicker
Dunn	Parker	Wolf
Etheridge	Paul	Young (AK)
Everett	Paxon	

NOT VOTING—9

Clay	Hall (OH)	Rush
Dixon	Lantos	Schiff
Gonzalez	McCollum	Towns

□ 1813

Mr. PAXON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PORTER, CALVERT, TIAHRT, BASS, BILIRAKIS, EWING, HUTCHINSON, METCALF, WAMP, TALENT, Mrs. EMERSON, and Messrs. SHIMKUS, BARRETT of Nebraska, LAHOOD and HULSHOF changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SKEEN, WALSH, DICKEY, KINGSTON, NETHERCUTT, BONILLA, LATHAM, LIVINGSTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2160, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2332

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 2332. His name was added in error.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2266, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2266) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill H.R. 2266 be instructed to insist on the House position prohibiting the use of funds to approve or license the sale of the F-22 advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 30 minutes. Let me simply explain what is in the motion.

We are about evidently to proceed to spend \$80 to \$100 billion to build a new fighter aircraft, the F-22, to take the place of the F-15 and the F-16. We are being told that the reason we have to do that is because we have sold some 1,700 F-16's to other countries around the world plus a good many F-15's, and so therefore we must develop a new generation fighter aircraft.

We are told that we have to proceed to do this because we sold so many F-15's and F-16's to other countries around the world that we have to build a new generation aircraft in order to regain our technology edge.

All this amendment says is that if indeed we are going to proceed to build the F-22 and spend \$80 to \$100 billion on that project to regain that technology edge that we ought to keep that technology at home and we ought not then sell that advanced technology to other countries. We are already being told that the contractor for the new F-22 is already talking about fully marketing that technology abroad. That is how we got into this problem in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if we want to stop chasing our tail, we will adopt this amendment and simply spell out that if we are going to spend \$80 to \$100 billion in order to regain a technology edge around the world, we are not then going to sell off that technology to other countries. That is all the amendment says, and I would simply suggest that if we do not do that, we will be back here in 10 years having to supply more money to replace the F-22 with an F-44, and 10 years after that replace it with an F-88 because we will have given away our technology edge time and time again. If we are going to spend taxpayers' money, we ought to keep the benefit of that technology here at home.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would announce to our colleagues in the House that it is my intention to support all of the provisions in H.R. 2266 that the House agreed to when we go to conference. The matter that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has made a motion to instruct is part of that bill, and I would advise him that we intend to support that provision in the bill in conference, and we support his motion.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, MCDADE, LEWIS of California, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, LIVINGSTON, MURTHA, DICKS, HEFNER, SABO, DIXON, VIS-CLOSKY, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2266, Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1998.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2266, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves, pursuant to rule XXVIII, clause 6(a) of the House rules, that the conference meetings between the House and the Senate on the bill H.R. 2266, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration: *Provided, however*, That any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida Mr. YOUNG.

Pursuant to clause 6(a) of rule XXVII this question must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 4, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Bereuter	Brown (OH)	Clyburn	Hill	Miller (CA)
Ackerman	Berman	Bryant	Coble	Hilleary	Miller (FL)
Aderholt	Berry	Bunning	Coburn	Hilliard	Minge
Allen	Bilbray	Burr	Collins	Hinchee	Mink
Andrews	Billirakis	Burton	Combest	Hinojosa	Moakley
Archer	Bishop	Buyer	Condit	Hobson	Mollohan
Armey	Blagojevich	Callahan	Cook	Hoekstra	Moran (KS)
Bachus	Bliley	Calvert	Cooksey	Holden	Moran (VA)
Baesler	Blumenauer	Camp	Costello	Hookey	Morella
Baker	Blunt	Campbell	Cox	Horn	Murtha
Baldacci	Boehler	Canady	Coyne	Hostettler	Myrick
Ballenger	Boehner	Cannon	Cramer	Houghton	Nadler
Barcia	Bonilla	Capps	Crane	Hoyer	Neal
Barr	Bonior	Cardin	Crapo	Hulshof	Nethercutt
Barrett (NE)	Bono	Carson	Cubin	Hunter	Neumann
Barrett (WI)	Borski	Castle	Cummings	Hutchinson	Ney
Bartlett	Boswell	Chabot	Cunningham	Hyde	Northup
Barton	Boucher	Chabot	Danner	Inglis	Norwood
Bass	Boyd	Chambliss	Davis (FL)	Istook	Nussle
Bateman	Brady	Chenoweth	Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
Becerra	Brown (CA)	Christensen	Davis (VA)	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Bentsen	Brown (FL)	Clement	Deal	(TX)	Olver
			DeGette	Jefferson	Ortiz
			Delahunt	Jenkins	Owens
			DeLauro	John	Oxley
			DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Packard
			Dellums	Johnson (WI)	Pallone
			Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.	Pappas
			Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Parker
			Dickey	Jones	Pascrell
			Dicks	Kanjorski	Pastor
			Dingell	Kaptur	Paul
			Doggett	Kasich	Paxon
			Dooley	Kelly	Payne
			Doolittle	Kennedy (MA)	Pease
			Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
			Dreier	Kennelly	Peterson (MN)
			Duncan	Kildee	Peterson (PA)
			Dunn	Kilpatrick	Petri
			Edwards	Kim	Pickering
			Ehlers	Kind (WI)	Pickett
			Ehrlich	King (NY)	Pitts
			Emerson	Kingston	Pombo
			Engel	Klecza	Pomeroy
			English	Klink	Porter
			Ensign	Klug	Portman
			Eshoo	Knollenberg	Poshard
			Etheridge	Kolbe	Price (NC)
			Evans	Kucinich	Pryce (OH)
			Everett	LaFalce	Quinn
			Ewing	LaHood	Radanovich
			Farr	Lampson	Rahall
			Fattah	Lantos	Ramstad
			Fawell	Largent	Rangel
			Fazio	Latham	Redmond
			Filner	LaTourette	Regula
			Flake	Lazio	Reyes
			Foglietta	Leach	Riggs
			Foley	Levin	Riley
			Forbes	Lewis (CA)	Rivers
			Ford	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
			Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Roemer
			Fox	Linder	Rogan
			Frank (MA)	Lipinski	Rogers
			Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Rohrabacher
			Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
			Frost	Lofgren	Rothman
			Furse	Lowey	Roukema
			Gallegly	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
			Ganske	Luther	Royce
			Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)	Rush
			Gekas	Maloney (NY)	Ryun
			Gephardt	Manton	Sabo
			Gibbons	Manzullo	Salmon
			Gilchrest	Markey	Sanchez
			Gillmor	Martinez	Sanders
			Gilman	Mascara	Sandlin
			Goode	Matsui	Sanford
			Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer
			Goodling	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton
			Gordon	McCrary	Scarborough
			Goss	McDade	Schaefer, Dan
			Graham	McDermott	Schaffer, Bob
			Granger	McGovern	Schumer
			Green	McHale	Scott
			Greenwood	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
			Gutierrez	McInnis	Serrano
			Gutknecht	McIntosh	Sessions
			Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Shadegg
			Hamilton	McKeon	Shaw
			Hansen	McKinney	Shays
			Harman	McNulty	Sherman
			Hastert	Meehan	Shimkus
			Hastings (FL)	Meek	Shuster
			Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Siskys
			Hayworth	Metcalf	Skaggs
			Hefley	Mica	Skeen
			Hefner	Millender-	Skelton
			Hergert	McDonald	Slaughter

Smith (MI)	Talent	Walsh
Smith (NJ)	Tanner	Wamp
Smith (OR)	Tauscher	Waters
Smith (TX)	Tauzin	Watkins
Smith, Adam	Taylor (MS)	Watts (OK)
Smith, Linda	Taylor (NC)	Waxman
Snowbarger	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Snyder	Thompson	Weller
Solomon	Thornberry	Wexler
Souder	Thune	Weygand
Spence	Thurman	White
Spratt	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Stabenow	Tierney	Wicker
Stearns	Torres	Wise
Stenholm	Traficant	Wolf
Stokes	Turner	Woolsey
Strickland	Upton	Wynn
Stump	Velazquez	Young (AK)
Stupak	Vento	Young (FL)
Sununu	Visclosky	

## NAYS—4

Conyers	Stark
DeFazio	Watt (NC)

## NOT VOTING—9

Clay	Hall (OH)	Towns
Dixon	McCollum	Weldon (FL)
Gonzalez	Schiff	Yates

□ 1844

So the motion 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. 1031

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 1031, the American Community Renewal Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SNOWBARGER]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

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.

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDING A CHANGE IN U.S.  
POLICY TOWARD CUBA

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the subject of the

United States' relations with Cuba. It was my privilege to visit Cuba last week with my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] as part of a delegation in connection with the Human Rights Foundation. Our focus was on the present economic and political circumstances in Cuba and the relationship between the United States and that country, with particular focus on the health conditions in Cuba, and the impact, if any, of the United States' economic restrictions on Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inspired to speak this evening by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN] and my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART], both of whom are friends and both of whom have spoken long and on this floor for human rights in Cuba.

I have two messages, and perhaps I should preface both of them by saying I do not consider myself an expert on Cuba. I was fortunate to spend 1 week there. I believe I was permitted to go where I wished to go. I was permitted to ask questions with no restriction. But I do not consider myself an expert. Still, I do wish to share my observations, largely at the urging of my two colleagues from Florida, who asked that I do so.

I wish to begin by emphasizing that there is a need for all Americans to continue to speak out on behalf of human rights in Cuba; that it is appropriate to call for full, free, and fair elections, including at the presidential level. I was informed during our trip there of the proximity of local elections, and also of the designation of multi-candidates for each available post in the assembly. Surely this is a positive development.

On the other hand, I was also informed that the Communist Party will still be the dominant basis for selecting the candidates for such offices, and that, obviously, should be opened up.

We were privileged to meet with the President of Cuba, Fidel Castro, we were privileged to meet with the Vice President of the Council of Ministers, and with the equivalent of the Speaker of the House, Senor Alarcon, and in each case we were able to raise any subjects that we wished.

When I met with Mr. Alarcon, I raised with him the issue of free and fair elections, access to prisons, and I emphasized the importance of allowing the International Committee of the Red Cross to visit the prisons of Cuba, and the presence of political prisoners.

His responses, as I took them down, were that there were still some prisoners in Cuban jails who, in his Government's belief, had received money from our Government to destabilize the Government of Cuba, and that that was the reason why they were in jail, although also other crimes.

He did not say that the International Committee of the Red Cross could visit those prisoners, and I urged him to do

so. Tonight, if members of his Government are listening, it seems to me that the Cuban Government would only benefit from permitting free access by international groups of such repute as the International Committee of the Red Cross in order to ascertain conditions in prisons on a regular basis.

Mr. Alarcon did point out that America has not been as critical of other nations in Latin America as we are of Cuba, and that may well be right. But I do want my colleagues to know that I raised the issue of human rights, of free and fair elections, and of political prisoners, and that those are serious issues and remain so to this day.

I emphasize now in my remaining time the most important lesson, though, that I learned. This was one that reemphasized a judgment that I had made preliminarily before I went to Cuba. That is that it is wrong and shortsighted and harmful to America to continue the embargo between our country and Cuba. The United States ought to trade with Cuba. We ought to trade as we trade with China, as we trade with Russia, as we trade with the countries coming out of the socialist systems.

When we trade we begin to develop an economic group of people, a group of people who are devoted to free markets, to the extent that there is a control over people's lives through the economy that is loosened by free trade, and there is also a very important humanitarian component.

One of the very important issues of our trip was health care. The Cuban Government made a point that even though officially trade in pharmaceuticals and medicines are not prohibited under the Helms-Burton law, there is intimidation that has been practiced or at least felt by American companies who would wish to send medicines to Cuba but feel it is not worth the difficulty of obtaining an end-use license, or making a certification that they would monitor those people who would use it, or guarantee that the medicines will never get into the hands of the Government.

These are very difficult obstacles to overcome, and so many American companies do not send medicines, with the result that the Cuban Government is able, and not inappropriately on all occasions, to say that the United States policy and Helms-Burton in particular is depriving their people of the full medical care that they might otherwise have. To the extent that is true, that hurts our country. It is not the intention of those Members of this body, our colleagues who voted for Helms-Burton, and it would serve the interests of all to end it.

I will conclude, if I might, Mr. Speaker, with just this one observation. When our plane left Nassau and touched down in Havana, the passengers applauded, and I thought, they must be happy to be coming home. When our plane left Havana and touched down in Miami through Nassau again, the passengers applauded.

There are people of good will on both sides of the Florida strait. Let us foster friendship, foster free market, foster trust in individual freedom, and I think a first step to doing so is to repeal the Helms-Burton Act; and at least, if we cannot do that, to allow the free trade in medicines and food.

#### TRIBUTE TO ARTENSA RANDOLPH

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a national leader in the public housing movement, the late Artensa Randolph. Ms. Randolph departed this life Tuesday, August 19, at the age of 81. She chaired the Chicago Housing Authority's Resident Central Advisory Committee, and served as a member of the Chicago Housing Authority's Executive Advisory Committee.

She was truly a staunch advocate for the rights of tenants of public housing. She possessed an enormous amount of courage, energy, and tenacity to advocate on behalf of the disenfranchised and the dispossessed. She was guided by the principles of justice and fairness for all people. She was indeed a remarkable person who gave her very best at whatever she did. Her work reached well beyond Chicago, for she influenced public housing policies and decisions on a national level.

Ms. Randolph moved to Chicago from Pine Bluff, AR, in 1937, and worked in the stockyards. During the 1960's she became involved in the tenants' rights movement, and was elected president of the Washington Park Homes Local Advisory Council in 1976. Her life paralleled the rise of public housing, and in many ways she was the catalyst for bringing about positive change in the way tenants are treated. She brought a tremendous amount of knowledge, perseverance, and dedication regarding public housing issues.

While Artensa Randolph has left this place, her spirit as a fighter for justice, fairness, and equality for all tenants of public housing shall endure forever. She has left a legacy that will speak to the unmet challenges still confronting public housing and its residents. We must never forget the cause which she championed, that of the poor. We must always stand ready to be a voice for the voiceless, and continue to make public housing the best that it can possibly be.

Anyone who continues to work at the age of 81 as chairman of a large organization, who helps to make policy for people all over the Nation, is indeed a champion. That was the life and that is indeed the legacy of Artensa Randolph.

#### REPORT ON CODEL TO NORTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to my colleagues in the House on a precedent-setting House CODEL visit to North Korea last month during our recess.

□ 1900

I was honored to lead a bipartisan delegation of seven members of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in traveling on oversight business to Asia. Our trip happened to include 3 days and 2 nights in North Korea, and I will include for the RECORD the formal written statement of our delegation released about that portion of our trip.

Mr. Speaker, the simple fact that the North Korean leadership welcomed a delegation of the size, seniority, and breadth of our seven-member group is very telling and somewhat remarkable, in my view. Crises is forcing the reclusive and anachronistic North Korean regime to reach out to the United States for assistance and pull back slightly on the veil of secrecy that has shrouded that nation for decades.

Even though our trip was obviously carefully managed by our hosts, we saw the signals of collapse during our visit. People really are starving; the infrastructure is crumbling; power shortages are routine; proregime propaganda is rampant; and the leadership, while refusing to concede failure, is tightening control and grasping for leverage.

After spending 48 hours in that isolated country, I felt as if I had been in a time warp, witnessing a life totally foreign to the American experience today, perhaps something back in the cold war days behind the Iron Curtain.

We repeatedly drove home the point that food aid distribution must be verifiable so that we can be sure it reaches the people who are most in need. And we were asked repeatedly about aid. We expressed hope that cooperation on the issue of MIA's would remain coming from the North Koreans and they have given us some cooperation. These are very positive signs.

But in response, the North Korean officials stated that the United States sanctions against them must be lifted and additional unconditional food assistance, and I stress the word "unconditional," must be provided.

The North Koreans did not acknowledge the need for internal economic, agricultural, or political reform, focusing instead on external factors as the root of the causes of their current difficulties. While they were cordial in their hospitality, and they did give us fine hospitality, these senior officials were obviously mistrustful of the United States. They also forcefully underscored their position that they would not negotiate with South Korea as long as the South's President, Kim Young Sam, remains in office. He is scheduled to remain in office until the end of this year.

In the short term, we should be principally concerned with establishing a

regular and more verifiable means of food aid distribution to ease the immediate crisis. I pointed out, and the others did, that Americans are a compassionate people willing to respond to human suffering in remote regions of the world. We have already provided about 60 million dollars' worth of aid, that adds up to about 100,000 metric tons of food, in relief of starving people in North Korea. Hopefully, it is going to people starving and not the military. But we were disappointed that during our visit we were not taken to see the food distribution centers, nor did we have access to the regions of the nation where food shortages are most severe.

However, we understand that our visit helped pave the way for a staff delegation from another committee to have greater access while in North Korea. In the longer term, an increasing presence of outsiders going about their business on behalf of nongovernmental relief organizations, the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization, Congress, and other organizations that have legitimate business there, should help force open the door between North Korea and the outside world.

Mr. Speaker, the signals are abundantly clear: The North Korean regime is dying. We must do our part to prevent that process from undermining the security of the peninsula and threatening America's vital interests in the region. Americans do have several good reasons for being interested in the future relations with the North Korean regime. Not just the humanitarian concerns and seeking to prevent the starvation of literally millions of people, but, second, our interests are very much at stake when we consider something on the order of 200,000 Americans and Korean-Americans are living and going about their business in South Korea within close range of the world's fourth largest army, with its massed artillery on the DMZ. And, we have very serious concerns about North Korea's activities in proliferating weapons of mass destruction to rogue nations and, in fact, that has been happening.

To the extent that our visit marked a milestone in the United States-North Korea relationship, I hope that the elite band of leaders in the North will not allow current events to foreclose the opportunity now at hand. I believe that the veil is lifting there, and I am certain to believe that a negotiated settlement bringing North Korea into this century certainly is better than any of the other alternatives using the military.

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

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE HOUSE PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE—CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION VISIT TO THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA—AUGUST 12, 1997

From August 9 through August 11, a bipartisan, seven-member Congressional Delegation (CODEL) from the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) was

in Pyongyang, Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) to meet with North Korean officials and gather first-hand information about the current situation in that volatile region. This was a precedent-setting visit to North Korea by a Congressional delegation of this size, seniority, and breadth of experience.

The delegation was led by HPSCI Chairman Porter J. Goss (R-FL). The other Members of Congress comprising the CODEL were Nancy Pelosi (D-CA), Bill McCollum (R-FL), Jane Harman (D-CA), Sanford D. Bishop, Jr. (D-GA), Charles F. Bass (R-NH) and Jim Gibbons (R-NV). In addition to their assignment on the HPSCI, these members represent a wealth of experience on relevant issues based on their other committee assignments.

The delegation's interlocutors were headed by Mr. Kang Sokju, First Vice Minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), and Mr. Li Hyong-chol, Director of American Affairs of the MFA. All discussions took place in the Pyongyang region. Despite repeated requests by CODEL members, the delegation was unable to travel to famine-stricken areas where it had hoped to determine the extent of the problem and investigate the system used for distributing food aid.

In several formal and informal working sessions with the North Koreans, the CODEL made the following points:

The United States has a strong and abiding national security interest in helping defuse tension on the Korean peninsula. The four party talks should be responsibly pursued;

North Korea must cease its sale of advanced weaponry, missile systems, and supporting technologies to Iran and other "rouge" states;

The United States stands firmly behind its military and security commitments to the Republic of Korea;

North Korea must fully honor its commitments in the nuclear arena, as specified in the Agreed Framework, including allowing International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) challenge inspections and comply with its responsibilities to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO);

North Korea's cooperation in helping locate and return the remains of several United States military personnel killed in the Korean War is a positive step. Such steps must be continued and expanded;

Provocative acts such as those that occurred in the Demilitarized Zone on July 16, 1997 are counterproductive to cooperation and understanding;

To participate fully in the opportunities of the world community, North Korea must open up its society; and

North Korea must make its food distribution to the civilian population fully transparent and verifiable, in order to facilitate the United States' consideration of additional assistance. The food aid cannot be diverted to the military.

Though the visit was carefully managed by the North Korean hosts, the tenor of the discussions was cordial but candid. Frank discussion about mutual mistrust occurred on several items of a lengthy agenda. The delegation believes talks were constructive in demonstrating bipartisan support for United States policy to encourage North Korea to engage in honest and good faith negotiations to lessen tensions in the region.

The North Koreans were focused on seeing the United States sanctions lifted and the need for additional food assistance. In addition, the North Koreans stated their refusal to abandon their centralized political and economic systems. The delegation emphasized that Americans are a compassionate people, generous in their willingness to alleviate suffering, but who seek assurance that food relief is used to feed those North Korean

people most in need. The delegation stressed that sanctions must be negotiated as part of a larger political package involving proliferation and other security matters.

The delegation will provide President Clinton, Speaker Gingrich, Minority Leader Gephardt, and the Department of State with a full report of the substance of its discussions and its impressions. The delegation concludes that opportunity for further constructive dialogue exists and will confer with other Congressional committees of jurisdiction.

The CODEL travelled to North Korea as part of a trip to Asia, which includes visits to Beijing, China; Tokyo, Japan; and Seoul, South Korea. The delegation returns to the United States on August 15.

#### THE HOUSTON COMETS WIN THE FIRST WNBA CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, can my colleagues believe it? The Houston Comets will see them at breakfast. The WNBA champions. "Can you believe it?"

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a proud woman and proud Houstonian. Move over Michael. Here we come, Magic, Bird, and Hakiem. Women's professional basketball got a league of their own and the Houston Comets are the new champions of the new world of women's basketball.

Houston is now the "Clutch City" as well as "Coop City" as the Comets, led by the regular season and championship game's most valuable player, Cynthia Cooper, beat the New York Liberty 65 to 51 before a sellout crowd and a national television audience at the Summit to claim the title of America's first Women's National Basketball Association Champion.

Mr. Speaker, it was a game my 17-year-old daughter Erica went crazy over. But, my 11-year-old son, Jason, did as well.

WNBA Coach of the Year Van Chancellor had brand new Mom, Sheryl Swoopes, work her heart out, and Wanda Guyton, after a heck of a season, may have been hurt, but Janeth Arcain, Tina Thompson, and Patty Jo Hedges, Tammy Jackson, and Kim Perrot, as well as "Coop," were cooking on all cylinders and served up some home cooking for the Lady Libertys to give the Houston fans and basketball fans all over the Nation the memories that they will forever and forever remember.

Some of these women have spent years and years playing on the hardwoods of Europe, and now they can come home and strut their stuff before their own family and friends and fans.

It was so very special for Cynthia Cooper to be able to play on her home court so that her own dear mom could see her playing, a mom that has been a strong supporter of hers throughout the years.

This championship is an historic occasion, and not just for women's sports

and not just as the fruition of our laws under title IX, and we have got to keep fighting to ensure that young people, young women, have the opportunity of equal access to sports and sportsmanship and playing the game well.

Saturday, August 30, was an historic occasion for the game of basketball. They have now come to their own. Women are playing the real game. Basketball is a game that has a long tradition of both women and men's play in our high schools and colleges. I have watched them for many years, and there is a deep respect for the game on our playgrounds and in our gyms. And, yes, it does teach character, it provides role models, and, yes, it teaches you how to play the game of life.

I dare say that it is probably the most popularly played game in our Nation, and it is fast becoming the most popular game in the world.

That championship game completes the cycle of respect and closes a hoop, if you will, on making the game of basketball a complete game. It is complete in the sense that now women, women who played for years and years, who have had to travel the globe just to practice their trade, who have the determination and devotion to play the game at the highest levels, have the respect of being able to make a living from their basketball skills in their own country where the game was invented and has evolved to the highest levels.

The Houston Comets, Mr. Speaker, they gave it all to Houston. They went to charities. They made themselves available to our schoolchildren. They were great. The Houston Comets are now a part of our history as a basketball nation and a basketball world. Those players will be forever mentioned and remembered as the first, the very first women of basketball.

Shine on Comets. We love you. Many of them who played their hearts out in the 1996 Olympics now have this great honor.

I am obviously bursting with pride as a Houstonian to salute our champion, the Houston Comets. The most fitting place for them now is to go to the House. That is the White House. So I have written and spoken to the White House regarding a visit with President Clinton here in Washington, D.C., at the White House to honor their historic achievement.

Mr. Speaker, to the Houston Comets let me say to them, and all Houstonians, wherever they may be, the Houston Comets, they really played the real game. Mr. Speaker, they are truly our real heroes. Mr. Speaker, see you at breakfast with the Houston Comets. Congratulations to them all.

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

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALDINE  
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], my colleague from Houston. That championship game last week was exciting not only for those of us who are from Houston, but all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to be here on the floor of the House and pleased to announce the high performance rating for a school district in Houston, Aldine Independent School District. It was recognized by the Texas Education Agency for the quality of their program.

As the parent of two graduates of Aldine schools, and my wife who teaches in the Aldine schools, and representing, along with the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], about half the district, it is a pleasure to see the school district receive the recognition that it deserves.

According to the latest data released by the Texas Education Agency, Aldine ranks among the Texas high performance school districts. This rating was based on 1996-1997 Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, our Statewide TAAS scores, attendance records, and low dropout rate.

Aldine is the largest recognized school in the State with a student enrollment of approximately 48,000 students. To earn a recognized rating, 75 percent of all students in each students group, district-wide, must pass each TAAS subject area. In addition, the dropout rate for all students cannot exceed 3.5 percent. They must also maintain an attendance rate of at least 94 percent.

Only a few schools have reached the high performing level of recognized or exemplary and Aldine is one of the four "recognized" school districts in Harris County, TX.

By achieving a recognized designation from the State, it is a great honor for everybody in the school district. But it is more than that. It recognizes each individual's hard work and commitment to education.

More specifically, a special thank you for the dedication of the curriculum program directors, principals, the teachers, the teaching assistants, and the students. It is a collaborative effort by these individuals which guarantee the continued success of the school district.

One of the reasons for the success of the Aldine Independent School District is their curriculum. The staff development focuses on teamwork and giving teachers of all subject areas the chance to support academic success. Each teacher in the district receives the same materials containing the same common strategies throughout the district. Program directors from different

subject areas then work with the teachers on integrating those common strategies into their curriculum.

The curriculum is based on the continual assessment of student performance, analysis of student performance data, and the development of benchmarks, targets, and then implementation. It is a structured system to ensure that the skills are mastered and applied to each student's learning.

Not only has there been success for Aldine Independent School District, but there has also been success for the State of Texas. Students across the State of Texas have improved their performance on TAAS testing, TAAS is a statewide assessment of skills, from 55 percent in 1994 to 73 percent in 1997. In comparison, Aldine ISD students have improved their mastery from 49 percent in 1994, to 75 percent in 1997.

For the State of Texas as a whole, the figures show an increase in the number of highest performing districts and a decrease in the number of lowest performing districts statewide, despite tougher performance standards for the years 1996 and 1997. Again, each year the performance standards get tougher, as we know, the worldwide competition gets tougher.

Texas has the most high school seniors taking the SAT test than any State in the country, at 48 percent, and these scores have continued to improve. Texas has brought education to the forefront. It is a priority for everyone, and that is an important distinction.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here this evening and recognize the contribution and the success of the Aldine Independent School District to the education of our children.

LISTENING TO THE AMERICAN  
PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULSHOF] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, continuing the tradition that we have tried to begin as newly elected Republican Members focusing on positive success stories across the district, as you know just as our Nation's children are returning to schools all across this great land, we lawmakers are returning here to Washington and I think probably sharing some of the mixed emotions that our schoolchildren have as far as returning here to this establishment.

What we do here, of course, is very important with the bills and the debates and our struggles here. But I think what we do pales in comparison to the real life struggles that our constituents, the American people, are facing each and every day.

We talk about this 4-week period of time here in August, or just as August past, as a recess or a vacation. And I

know many of the newly elected Members did not consider it as a vacation, as a recess. It was a very good time to get back home to really probe the minds and listen. And I think if anything that we have been able to accomplish that has been the most fruitful is that we stop shouting long enough in this body to listen to what the American people have to say.

And when we began to listen to those men and women that have been struggling to keep a roof overhead and keep food on the table, what we heard them tell us is that they were working longer and harder and yet had less to show for it at the end of the month and wondering where their tax monies had gone.

□ 1915

Basically what I was hearing, in a series of town hall meetings, was that the people back home in Missouri's Ninth Congressional District wanted us to change our ways here in Washington so that they would not have to change their ways back home.

I know certainly that there has been a wide difference of opinion on the budget agreement that we put together. Certainly future political candidates, I was flipping around the channels and watching C-SPAN and some of the speeches where future politicians or those seeking higher office have talked about what we did in a negative way. Yet I did not sense that at all. A series of town meetings in the Ninth Congressional District of Missouri were overwhelmingly positive.

The folks that came out recognized that we were on the path to a smaller, smarter government. They were appreciative of the fact that the centerpiece of our budget agreement, the tax relief package, was a child credit that will benefit the parents of 41 million children across this country, and the fact that nearly 2 million households will not have a Federal income tax liability just because of this \$500 child credit.

They were appreciative of the child health initiative that we have commenced, that we put together in this budget plan to help the Nation's most vulnerable that are uninsured. And I tried to explain and made clear that this was not a new Federal entitlement that we had imposed but a way to reach out with local innovative solutions to this national problem of uninsured children.

They were certainly appreciative, as education is very much on the minds of the folks in the Ninth Congressional District, that we have education tuition credits that we are putting in place so that children that dream of college can actually get there, and those that have been laboring under the weight of a student loan might have a little bit of his or her burden eased by allowing the deduction of interest on that student loan.

Certainly we recognize that a strong economy is vital because as we help educate and invest in our children, the

future of this country, we have to make sure that there are jobs available. And clearly people recognize that we do not create jobs here in Washington; it is the American people, it is the business people, it is small business across this country that creates the jobs. And so clearly we want to make sure that every investor, every inventor, every small business person, every farmer has some relief from this very burdensome tax on savings and investment that we have come to call capital gains, and they were very appreciative that we have at least taken a step in the right direction regarding a reduction on that burdensome tax.

Many of the women that came to town hall meetings were astounded to learn that women in this country are starting businesses at twice the rate of men in this country. But oftentimes women have that very difficult choice, do I stay home with family or do I rejoin the work force? So we have reached out to them and all small business people that want to work from their homes by restoring the flexibility through the home office deduction; and the American people, at least those in the Ninth Congressional District, see that and applaud that as a step in the right direction.

Finally, as we have talked about many times in this Chamber, I personally believe it is immoral that the Federal Government can take up to 55 percent of a family farm or family business at death. Death should not be a taxable event. Certainly we will be having future discussions about death tax relief, but we have made some positive strides by raising the exemption so that family farms and family businesses and those that labor can pass the fruits of their labors on to future generations.

I know one of the polls that somebody showed me as we were leaving town 4 weeks ago indicated that Congress' approval rating was at a high level, at least the highest level since the early 1970's, and sadly our approval rating in this body was above our disapproval for the first time in several decades. And of course that is a sad event, but we need to continue to focus on our agenda that we will be bringing to the floor in the weeks and months ahead before we take our final recess for the end of the year.

We have got a lot of work yet to do. But I think we need to focus a little bit on some of the success stories and some of the things that we have listened to the people across this country in our respective districts.

I see I have various colleagues that are here to join me. I think first I would yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE]. It is interesting that each of us has our own respective districts and I know our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORAN], I think was one of the most ambitious and he embarked on a 60-plus county tour and made sure that he blanketed his district.

But certainly we do not have quite the expanse of territory to cover as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. HILL], who is not with us, or the gentleman from South Dakota who has the entire State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE].

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri and would say that over the course of the August break, I had the opportunity to travel over much of the 77,000 square miles that compose our State of South Dakota. As I traveled the highways and byways and places like Sturgis and Spearfish and Custer and Rapid City and Hill City and Mitchell and Yankton and Watertown and Pierre and Gettysburg and Clark and Aberdeen and Sioux Falls, my home town of Murdo, made it there, places like Wall and winding up at the State Fair in Huron, we had an opportunity, I think, to really get in touch with the real world and remember what we are all about here.

And it was great, because I had my wife and two little girls with me. They had an opportunity to return and enjoy the freedoms that you have on the windswept prairies of South Dakota.

In fact, my 7-year-old, who is sort of a tomboy, enjoys doing things outside, one afternoon when we were at the grandparents in Gettysburg, she said something to the effect, as her sister asked her if she could paint her toenails, she said, no, I have got frogs and snakes to catch outside. And she came back with a snake hanging on her hand, much to her grandmother's chagrin. I think she about had a connip-tion when that happened.

Those are the types of things that people in our part of the country are able to enjoy. It is a wonderful place to be from, and it was great to be able to travel.

One of the things that we did while we were out there is, we held a series of meetings on transportation issues. Those issues are critical in our State because we rely so heavily on our farm-to-market transportation system, because we are predominantly an agricultural State, but also we rely quite heavily upon tourism as an industry. So roads and bridges and transportation are critical in our States.

I had the opportunity to listen to people who were interested in transportation policy issues, people like mayors and county commissioners and State officials and economic development experts and Chamber people and those who are in the business of building roads and bridges in the construction business. One of the recurring themes was, when you rewrite this Federal highway bill out there in Washington, please do it in a way that maximizes our flexibility and that allows us and enables us to make the decisions about what the highest needs are at the local level; and try and get away from this micromanaging of Federal highway programs and policies and priorities from Washington, DC.

Through those discussions, I was really reminded, too, of why we do what we do because really this is about people and about giving them more control of their lives. And I was reminded, as well, of the difference between the way that the Washington glitterati views things and the way that people back in the real world view things. And there are a couple of distinctions I would like to draw to my colleagues' attention here this evening because I think it was a great reminder; any of us, when we go home, often have these things brought to our attention.

But one of the things that we have been talking about a lot is for the first time in over 30 years we will have balanced the budget in this country, and that was a priority for all of us here. All of us who are here in the Chamber this evening talked a lot about that throughout the course of our campaign, about lowering the tax burden on hard-working families, men and women in this country.

In my State those are ranchers, small business people; those are people who are trying to make an honest living and just really hoping that Government will sort of stay out of their way. And one of the things I saw was a tax foundation study which enumerated and broke down the tax savings and benefits that were in this particular package for the State of South Dakota. It was about \$416 million in tax relief to our State, some 247 million coming from the family tax credit, but also estate tax relief for the 34,000 farmers and ranchers in South Dakota.

The 66 percent of the people in South Dakota who own their own homes will have the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of capital gains tax relief should they decide to sell that home. Income averaging can for farmers. There was an opportunity in there, as well, when it comes to the whole area of deferring income and allowing farmers and ranchers, people who have very volatile and erratic incomes to spread that over a period of years.

There were so many things that were positive in this. The one thing I will say though, and I heard this over and over, is that we made a step in the right direction; that we are lowering the tax burden in this country, but we did nothing to simplify what is already an inordinately complicated Tax Code.

I would hope that as we progress down the road in the next year or so, we can continue to draw attention to the complexity of the Tax Code in this country and how difficult it is for people to comply. We have added to what already are 471 different forms, and we spend some 5 billion man-hours a year complying with the Tax Code in America.

I was talking with an accountant in Pierre, and he was thanking his lucky stars for what we had done because it was job security for him. But at the same time, it has made it that much more complex and complicated and

really overwhelming, I think, to a lot of people in this country who try and fill out tax returns.

So I was reminded again of the need not only to simplify, to make things less complicated, but to take the power and control out of Washington, out of the hands of the Federal Government, out of bureaucrats, and to give it back to families and main streets and State and local governments and put that decision-making back in the living room. I think that is really what this whole thing is about. It is what this movement is about.

As we continue down the road, as we have started with the balanced budget and lower taxes, the next step along the way is to bring simplification, to lessen the regulatory burden, to continue to lower taxes and to bring some accountability to Government so that the people in this country know that they are getting a good bang for the taxpayer dollar. I think all that involves more flexibility.

We have a notion here in Washington I think that more is better, and frankly I think that the people of this country are much better off, my children are eminently better off in a form of government where we do not gauge success or measure success by how much we take tax dollars from hard-working families, run it through the Washington bureaucracy and then redistribute it in the form of grants.

We are a lot better off when we allow people to keep the money, the hard-earned dollars, and make the decisions about where best to use those. That is, I would hope, how we would measure success in the work that we are about here.

We have embarked on an important journey. It is the first step in what I hope will be a long process of restoring and taking control and power and decision-making and authority out of Washington and putting it back in the hands of families and individuals. That crosses so many different areas. You look at the world of education, allowing parents to have more decision-making authority, more choice on where they send their kids.

And so these are things that I heard as I traveled across the State, and as I said, it concluded what was an about a week at the State Fair, which is an opportunity to get a broad cross-section of people in South Dakota, to hear what is on their minds. And, frankly, I think that they are for the most part very upbeat, very optimistic about where we are headed, and I think that is a great tribute to what we have accomplished as a Republican Congress, because the things that we have accomplished and where we are today, in my view, are a testimony to and a tribute to the ability of the Republican Congress to move the agenda in that direction.

And I think probably that my colleagues here, the gentleman from Missouri, heard the same thing. I would hope that we would continue to be the

shining city on the hill that attracts people from all over the world because they have hope and opportunity and freedom to explore the American dream here, to pursue happiness in their particular way and that is really what we are about. This was a great reminder as I traveled across my State of South Dakota about why we are here, what we do, why we do it; and again it was a great privilege and honor to get a feel for the people that we represent.

I would like to hear as well from some of my other friends who are on the floor here this evening.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I think the word that the gentleman used, "optimism," I think that is probably what I heard most often from the folks that I had a chance to visit with. All the polls and surveys that these consultants and political pundits seem to find so important, I think truly when you get out of this place and you go back home and you listen to people in town hall meetings, you just open it up for discussion and you say, what is on your minds, I think some of the themes that you have mentioned are exactly what are the prevailing thoughts of most Americans, they do want less of Washington.

□ 1930

I certainly trust the folks on Ducelle Avenue in Columbia, MO, my hometown. I trust them to make the decisions with their tax money a lot better than I trust the 435 of us that assemble here to decide how that money should be spent. They clearly, the folks back home, are appreciative of the fact that we were letting them keep money, their own money. This is not some sort of a rebate, that we are giving them back their money. It is allowing them to keep the money they have earned. I heard some of the same themes that the gentleman mentioned.

I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PEASE] also was quite busy. In fact, his staff, as I understand it, had him crisscrossing the district. He saw himself coming and going, as I understand.

Mr. PEASE. I did, indeed. I was fortunate to spend about two-thirds of my time during the month of August doing the same thing that my colleagues from South Dakota, from Colorado, from New Jersey, from Missouri did; that is, spending time with the good folks in western Indiana, which comprises my district. And my experience was very similar to those that have been related here this evening. People from western Indiana I think are representative of all that is best in our country. They are folks that care about their kids, they care about their communities, they care about their country, and in most cases they really do not ask a lot of us, basically for us to leave them alone. They can make decisions for themselves, they will take care of their neighbors, they will reach out the helping hand to those who need it.

And in town meeting after town meeting, we heard the same thing, about an appreciation for the fact that their representatives in Congress, though they often differ, stood for the principles that they believed in, and, more than that, were willing to listen to those of differing viewpoints, to try and work together for the good of the country, to posture less and to build policy more, and generally gave positive marks, although they understand that what we did was really a down payment on the future, that there is still much work to be done, but that they supported the direction where we were going.

The thing that struck me more than anything in the time that I spent in my district and out of it, which I want to talk about in a minute, was the continuing generosity of the American people. Most of the folks in my district are working hard to support their families. Many of them have to have both spouses working in order to meet the needs of their children, or in some cases they are taking care of their parents, helping their neighbors, but in case after case, we saw people who still after all that gave of their time as volunteers, in their libraries, in their hospitals, in their schools, in community and youth organizations. Despite all the demands on them at work and at home, they still found time to be volunteers on behalf of others.

Which brings me to my second point, and that is, I spent the remaining third of the month of August as a volunteer myself in a couple of places: First, not far from here, near Fredericksburg, VA, where I was a volunteer, along with 5,000 other volunteers, at the national jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America, an event that is held every 4 years. We had 30,000 young people from all across this country who were able to come and spend about a week together because we had 5,000 men and women who gave of their vacations, who left time away from their families, who paid their own way to come and work, and sometimes in 90 and 100 degree temperature, most of them living in tents, so that young people could have a good experience. The barracks where I stayed with other adult volunteers had a cross-section of America. We had Protestants and Catholics and Jews, Buddhists, people of all creeds and colors, who care about young people and who care about the principles that scouting tries to teach, which are character development and citizenship training and personal fitness, and they gave of their time, many of them, for 2 and 3 weeks, and came and labored. We had an admiral, we had factory workers, we had school teachers, a cross-section of America who gave up their time on behalf of young people, and they did it cheerfully, an example, I think, of all that is best in our country's traditions, of trying to instill moral values in our young people and not waiting and in fact in some cases resisting the Government doing it but

taking it as their own responsibility to care for young people in their neighborhoods, in their communities and across the country.

Part of the time I also spent at the Boy Scouts' facility in northeast New Mexico, near Cimmaron, where the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. REDMOND], who was elected in a special election earlier this year, met me at a town hall meeting in Colfax County, northeast New Mexico, and we talked to the folks there about the same sorts of thing we have been talking about here, and where I was also able to spend a little volunteer time at Philmont Scout Ranch, which is 138,000 acres in the mountains of northeast New Mexico where I saw another example of volunteerism, where young people, teenagers, teenage boys from all over the country paid their own way to come to the mountains of northeast New Mexico and volunteer to work, in most cases hard work, breaking rocks and building trails in the mountains of northeast New Mexico, where they could learn ways that we can protect the environment for the future, learn the good lessons of personal responsibility, both for each other and for the environment, and giving of their time and their energy as volunteers for other young people's futures who will benefit from that scouting facility in northeast New Mexico. Eighteen thousand young people over the course of a summer come to Philmont Scout Ranch. They come at their own expense and they come with volunteers, men and women from across the country who pay their own way, give up their vacations to spend time with young people.

I am reminded, too, that the Boy Scouts, along with many other organizations across the country were participants in the President's Summit for Volunteerism that was held at Philadelphia earlier this year. They are representative of that spirit in this country where people take responsibility for young people. They do not wait for the Government to take responsibility. In fact, in many cases their agenda is to make sure that young people have the positive example of role models that are concerned about their moral development, their spiritual development, their physical development, and they take that responsibility themselves. The Boy Scouts as a national organization have committed between 1997 and 2000, 200 million hours of community service in neighborhoods across this country where young people and their adult volunteers will work on behalf of their neighbors. All of that sort of experience and the folks that I saw in libraries and hospitals and schools across my district remind me again of that wonderful American tradition of personal responsibility, being accountable for yourself and helping your neighbors, and even though it was tiring to spend that time as a personal volunteer and to spend those hours, as we all did, traveling around our dis-

tricts, it was refreshing and reinforcing and reminded me why it is important for us to be here and represent those values and do the best we can to support those folks back home.

Mr. HULSHOF. I appreciate the gentleman's report and certainly the good work that he has done, especially many of the themes that he has talked about as far as volunteerism and helping our young people. I had the opportunity to visit briefly with a group called Kids in Motion in Hannibal, MO, which is interesting because this was actually started, I think, 2 years ago, or last summer, that took at-risk youth in the Hannibal communities. This was not a government program. This was largely the efforts of two women, two businesswomen who chose to try to make a difference. And so they reached out to the business community to have jobs that would pay young people to try to help provide some positive role models, a little bit of institutional setting in the sense of teaching them how to get up on time and to get themselves ready for work. It was just an extraordinary experience when you realize that there is this sort of spirit in a small town where you recognize that there is a community problem, or a problem within your community, and rather than reach out to the government for some sort of assistance, here are two women that chose on their own accord to try to make a difference. I think this spirit pervades across the country. We need to help reinvigorate that spirit.

Mr. PEASE. I really believe in that. I believe it is our responsibility as a Congress to make it possible for folks to give more of themselves as volunteers, to reduce the tax burden on American families so that they have more time to spend with their families and as volunteers in their churches and in community organizations, to reinvigorate that tradition of American volunteerism that has persisted despite all of the time that we have taken away from families having to work to pay their taxes. I think it is our responsibility to give them back that time and that freedom. I know as the gentleman has seen, so many will step forward as volunteers to help in their communities and it is exciting to see that happen.

Mr. HULSHOF. I appreciate the gentleman. I see that our colleague from out West in Colorado is here and appears to have some visual aid along with him. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

It was a great month out in Colorado, Colorado, of course, being a western State with our sense of rugged individualism, we do not like Washington all that much, I have to admit, and I am afraid to say, and for good reason in many cases.

Since being elected to Congress, hardly a day has gone by when some-

body does not run up to me at the grocery store or the post office and say, "Congressman, I've been working harder, I've been working longer and it seems like I take less and less home," and that perception is in fact the reality over the years, and it is one that has really been the source of frustration for people throughout the country and it is the message that I think inspired many of us to run for office in the first place. Fortunately with the Republican majority, we are able to go to work on those very issues right here on this floor.

The package that we constructed a month ago, the tax cut package, is something that changed the message that I heard this last month being back home. Rather than the consistent complaints that we have always heard about high and excessive taxation here in Washington, I began to hear people at the grocery store and the post office coming up and thanking me for pushing and helping to support the Republican tax reform message again that we constructed a month ago. Let me suggest that it is a good first step and it is welcome news, but it is not the full measure of tax relief. We are going to come back and try to push for more at another point in time. But for the first time in 16 years, the American public has received a tax cut package. The first time in 16 years.

Let me just go through some of the numbers on this and tell about what I heard back home in response. Over 10 years, \$260 billion in taxes, that is what we will pay, fewer taxes that we will pay as opposed to the plan that was constructed when the Democrats were in charge of the Congress. That includes a \$500 per child tax credit, the capital gains tax cuts, the estate tax relief, education tax credit, expanded IRAs. Those individuals who understand that they have been paying more and more and more to the Federal Government and working harder and harder are exactly right. Let me direct my colleagues' attention to the chart here at my left.

Back in 1950, the Federal tax burden was 6 percent of the family budget. In 1994, the Federal tax burden jumped to 23 percent. That is a remarkable escalation in the tax bite that this Federal Government has taken away from American families. When we consider all taxes, State, local and Federal taxes, the total tax burden is almost 40 percent of a family budget. The farmers and ranchers and small business owners and the heads of families that I met with tell me that that 40 percent is far too excessive. I was in a Labor Day parade on Monday in the small town of Windsor in Colorado. Windsor is one of those towns that is just your typical American small town. Great patriotic families, people who love their work, love their community, will stand up for the flag and love their country, a town that has sent many, many war heroes to do battle to defend freedom and liberty. After that parade we held a little

barbecue and the numbers of individuals who came up and said thank you for cutting the capital gains taxes because that has real implications on running a capital intensive operation like a farm, thank you for cutting the estate taxes, the inheritance tax because now after working 30 years and putting all of my hard work and assets into a farm that produces and is successful, I finally know that I am going to be able to hand that farm over to my children. Think about that for a moment. Having the prospect of working so many years and putting so much into the ground and into the soil and into the family farm, that farm is more than just an economic enterprise. It is the definition of the character of many in the West and many in my State, most people in my State. The very notion that upon your death the Federal Government will get there first before your children do is something that just frightens the daylights out of many people. We are finally providing real hope, real opportunity. The suggestion that we have changed Washington as a Republican Party, that we have come here and have decided that the estate taxes must end, that we at our first step will reduce the effect of estate taxation, eventually getting to the point of abolishing them, I hope.

□ 1945

That is a message that was just embraced throughout the district, and it was a delight to go home and hear that.

I also attended a conference sponsored by the Independence Institute, and the Independence Institute is a free market organization, and the topic they were discussing was welfare reform, because last year the Republican Congress totally revised the welfare system in the United States and moved welfare authority out of Washington and pushed it back to the States in block grant fashion.

Let me tell you, it was truly exciting to go to these meetings with State legislators, with county commissioners, with local welfare workers, and hear them talk about the remarkable things that they are coming up with to reform the welfare system, to actually create systems on a county-by-county basis where people can make the transition from dependency on the Federal Government to total self-sufficiency.

And the numbers were remarkable as well. The numbers of people that are making that transition and finding the absolute joy of honest hard work and self-sufficiency is one of the most exciting things, I think, that I could have heard, and again thanking the Republican Congress for changing the way the government thinks about how we organize our society.

We are no longer looking to Washington and people here in the city of big government to organize and manage our lives. We have discovered, we have decided, and we have fought very hard for and passionately for a government

that believes we can trust citizens, we can trust taxpayers, we can trust them to spend the dollars that the government used to take from them and allow them to put it toward the things that they believe to be important. They are small businesses, they are farms, they are child health care, the charity of their choice, their church, their synagogue, their community.

And we have also decided that within that framework we are going to create more opportunity in a way that frees people from the burden of an oppressive welfare state and instead rewards honest hard work, real opportunity, and makes Americans free again.

That is the real difference that we have made here in Washington, and I can tell you it is not just talk after 1 month being back in the district and talking with constituents and being in your district, too, by the way. Mr. THUNE from South Dakota spent a little time, a couple days, traveling through South Dakota. It is a consistent message: The work that we have accomplished here in Washington is hitting home, it is making a big difference, and the American public is responding very favorably.

Mr. THUNE. If the gentleman will yield on that point, I think you make an important point, because one thing has been lost, and sometimes in people's minds, is the important changes that were made in the area of welfare reform, and I think it points to the fact that the American public was leading the way on the issue because they arrived at the conclusion long before Washington did that the current welfare system was an abysmal failure, and you did not have to look very far to see that, and what is encouraging in listening to Mr. PEASE from Indiana who was here earlier talking about volunteerism and about the restoration of values in this country that have built it and made it great, things like the work ethic, like personal responsibility, self-discipline, those are the things that are really encouraging, and I think the American public led the way on that.

I think that Washington finally got the picture, and we have changed the mentality and the philosophy in this town, finally, to recognize as well that we needed a new model and something that again put a premium and a value and a priority on those types of values and that kind of an ethic. And that is the thing that has been really encouraging again about getting out there and hearing that from people, and I hope that we will continue to be the impetus that will move us in a direction on other issues that restores power back home, out of Washington, DC.

And welfare reform is a perfect example of that, is something for which the Members of this body and the last Congress should take great credit because they have redefined and changed the way that America thinks about that important issue.

I am delighted to hear that the gentleman from Colorado made his way to our State of South Dakota and helped our tourism economy out there. We hope that you will come back often.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I was asked this question, you get a lot of different questions when you are at these town meetings and hosting these listening posts, but this one question had me stumped for a second. I was asked by a constituent if I could only pass one bill in this Chamber, what would that one bill be. And I say, well, if I could write it and could make sure that it would actually be enacted into law, it would be this: that the parents of our children would teach their children individual responsibility and right from wrong.

But clearly that bill cannot be passed; that bill will never see the light of day. It is not government's place to take the place of a family. That is something that we have to encourage families to do, many of the themes that you just mentioned. But if we could pass any bill, that would be it, to help parents teach kids, their own children, responsibility and right from wrong.

But again I would be happy to yield. Mr. THUNE. Well, I was just going to say I think what is encouraging to me as I travel in my State, and I think around this country, is we are seeing a resurgence of an emphasis upon those types of things. I think for years there has been an expectation that government could solve many of these problems, but I think Washington is realizing, as I said earlier, what families and churches and communities have known all along, and that is that it is the self-initiative, it is the ability to take these things into their own hands and to help resolve those issues, and to provide the kind of model and the kind of atmosphere in which these types of values can be nurtured and grown, and one of the things that was really stymieing that was the welfare system that has been in place for the past 30 years, and when that was changed, it broke the chain of dependency upon an old system that was outdated and did not work, and it created, I think it renewed, this whole attitude that we are seeing in this country that the things that you just mentioned, the importance of hard work, individual responsibility, self-discipline, the work ethic, the things that again have been the building blocks.

I mean, we cannot legislate that, but, frankly, we can do a lot, I think, to create an atmosphere in which those things will thrive, and that is really again what we are about here.

Mr. HULSHOF. In order to be geographically correct, I know we have heard from the Midwest and certainly from the West, but to make sure that we have all parts of this great land covered, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS].

Mr. PAPPAS. I thank the gentleman, and once again I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this and to

view the visual aids of my friend from Colorado. I always look forward to what he is to present.

My month back in New Jersey was pretty diverse, as it normally is, even when I am just home for a weekend. The highlight of my month really, though, was the annual Somerset County 4-H Fair, which is my home county which I am very proud of.

We talk about our fair as the largest free fair east of the Mississippi, and we believe that it is. It is a 3-day event. This was our 49th annual fair, and typically during that 3 days we have anywhere between 75,000 and 80,000 people attend the event. It is one that I am proud to be a part of.

I have been an adult volunteer there for many years and mainly because of the wholesome environment and wholesome activities that the 4-H program provides.

We, again, in our county are proud of the fact that it is the largest 4-H program in the State of New Jersey and one that I know is prevalent in many communities throughout the United States and really throughout the world.

4-H, though, is not just for agricultural areas. While parts of my district, agriculture is very strong, yes, even in New Jersey agriculture is an important part of our economy, but the activities, the ways in which young people can grow and can be involved again in activities that help them as individuals and help them grow and expand their horizons and their experiences in life, are such that I think it is very important and why I support it as much as I do.

The activities that center around county fairs in my part of the country, in the State of New Jersey, I think adds to the attractiveness of the range of activities in our State. My district runs from the western part of the State, the shores of the Delaware River, and it runs to the east, almost to the Atlantic Ocean, and while I do not have any of the coast, as we call it the Jersey shore, as part of my district, the economy of my district and the people of my district, as I do, take advantage of the Jersey shore. And during the course of the month I had an opportunity to visit many of the shore communities.

Tourism is the second largest part of New Jersey's economy, and I believe that the activities along the Jersey shore and activities such as the Somerset County 4-H Fair add to that economic activity of our State.

Another couple of things that were a part of my month were meeting with many business people, business men and women. Early part of August, I was the participant of an all-day seminar that was hosted by the Princeton Chamber of Commerce, which is a very prominent community in my district. They have done this for several years and have had a Member of Congress there to meet with their membership one on one, which I did for about an

hour and a half of the morning session, spoke to a group of CEOs in the morning, at breakfast, and then spoke to their general membership at lunch and participated in several Q and A sessions, and they were thrilled, to say the least, of the approved balanced budget plan that we enacted and the President signed and, of course, the tax relief measures.

But they reminded me, and was not anything that they needed to remind me, but it is important to hear it and important to know that people understand that the balanced budget plan is just that, it is a plan. It is a plan that is only good if we follow it, and it is a plan that will take several years to enact to see that very important goal of a balanced budget become a reality. I am certainly committed to that, and they understand that it is important for them, for their employees, for the future of their businesses, and, in turn, for the future of many of those who are employers.

I was encouraged to see how enthusiastic they were about that, but equally as important, the tax relief measure. I have said here, and I have said this in my district and in other parts of our State, that the tax relief measure is a first step to what I will hope to see several steps, second step beginning next year, and you, Mr. HULSHOF, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I know will be very active in seeing additional tax relief measures put forth and that we can debate and consider here in the Congress. That is something that I am committed to.

Just this afternoon, I spoke to a gentleman who is a small businessman in the central part of my district. He had e-mailed me and was frustrated over what he viewed as the abandonment of the Republican majority of our commitment to provide for tax and regulatory relief, and in speaking to him I corresponded with him, but I decided to telephone him as well to let him know, to assure him, that that is not the case, that what we in the House, Republican side, are attempting to do is to govern in a bipartisan fashion, recognizing that President Clinton, while he may not agree to the desire of tax relief that many of us would like to see, yet we need to meet each other halfway and that we have not abandoned our principles, we view this as a first step and that we are committed, just as he is, to trying to see things such as the elimination of the capital gains tax and the elimination of the death tax as goals just as important as the plan to see a budget that is in balance.

So I heard for that 4-week period what I hear on the telephone during the week when I am here through letters, through the time that I am home during weekends or long weekends, and I was just very happy to see that people are encouraged, people do have hope, but they also recognize that it is an ongoing process and one that they are willing to work with us on seeing those goals become realities.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I was in Wentzville, MO, on the eastern side of my district at the high school, and it was pointed out to me that in a normal day, if you just consider your actions of a normal day, when you wake up and grab a first cup of coffee you are paying a sales tax, when you drive to work you pay a gas tax, when you get to work you pay an income tax, when you flip on the light you pay an electricity tax, when you flush the toilet you pay a water tax, when you get home, if you are lucky enough to have a home, you pay a property tax, and, as we have talked about, if you are fortunate enough to work hard and save and want to pass on to the next generation, your kids, your descendants, then there is the Government wanting another bite with this Federal death tax.

The problem is not that people do not pay enough, the problem is that we here in Washington have been spending too much, and I think we have begun to try to get our arms wrapped around this problem of wasteful Washington spending, and, as you mentioned, it is simply a plan. We need to continue to make sure that the people in this body, certainly we want to provide for the essential services, but make sure that the people that come here from all parts of the country recognize that this is a critically important goal that we need to continue our path toward a balanced budget.

Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield, I am so glad that the gentleman from New Jersey is here, Mr. Pappas, because I remember when we first met as freshmen coming here, the first thing out of Mike Pappas' mouth was home office deduction.

□ 2000

We have got to get the home office deduction for small business people back in my home district. That is true in my area as well, as we talk about making the welfare transition from dependency to complete independence, to realizing the economic trends taking place in America toward smaller businesses and independent employment.

Our goal as Republicans has been in this Congress to try to find ways to triple the number of minority-owned businesses throughout the country as well. I have to tell you, when I went back home I heard so many people thanking us that MIKE PAPPAS' legislation made it into the final tax cut bill on the home office deduction.

Finally, we are going to be able to provide parity to small business owners, parity with respect to the expenses associated with running a business out of your home that large employers enjoy throughout the country as well.

Since you are here tonight, I want to thank you, and just let you and the constituents back in New Jersey know that this is an important item that you fought for that has had a tremendous

impact, not just in your home State of New Jersey, but had an impact in Missouri, South Dakota and Colorado.

You can drop me out of an airplane in a parachute anywhere in this country, and I guarantee people struggling to be entrepreneurs and finding a way to get their small business open and operating out of their homes appreciate the jobs created, thanks to the home office deduction. Would the gentleman talk a little more about that?

Mr. HULSHOF. If the gentleman would yield, I also wanted to ask you, you have had the opportunity I think to go into another district in Colorado, I think that of another freshman Member. Did you go into the inner city of Denver at one point? With regard to some of these themes, you talk about the minority business people. Did you talk about some of these conservative principles back in Denver?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for inquiring about that. My district, the 4th district of Colorado, is essentially the eastern half of the State, a very rural area, about the size of Indiana in square mileage. My district does not include Denver, but I did an exchange with a Member of the other party where I spent a day in her district and she in mine. We went to inner-city Denver and spoke with minority business leaders and owners of the business community in inner-city Denver.

The concern of the folks that we met with is very different than what you might expect in a setting of that nature. I did not hear requests for any kind of handout of any kind, any kind of preference program, anything along those lines that has come in Washington and in many places and seems to be what you would expect. It was just the opposite, asking for fewer government regulations, asking for the home office deduction, asking for 100 percent deductibility of health benefits for health care expenses for small employers, to get them to the same level where large employers are.

These are the key elements, removing the barriers of a large, oppressive Federal bureaucracy from the natural entrepreneurial instincts that occur to all Americans in all settings. It was just remarkable, because it is the same message I hear in the rural parts of my district. Going to inner-city Denver, I heard the same message.

This particular tax cut package that the Republicans crafted and constructed right here and passed and that we fought so hard for is really being embraced throughout the country. It is so exciting. And Mr. PAPPAS is exactly right, this is just the first step. It is a good start. But we are not finished, we are going to go back and get more and continue to fight to shrink the size of the government in Washington and expand the authority of real people, real, free people throughout America.

Mr. PAPPAS. If the gentleman would yield, one thing that I remind people is that again this is a first step. This plan

to balance the budget is just that, a plan that needs to be followed. But also taking up the suggestion of Speaker GINGRICH, and that is people in my district believe that the tax on savings and investment and the death tax needs to be eliminated, that we need to band together and involve people in the community that may not have ever been involved in the legislative process before, to help educate people within our districts and the communities, to help make the people in the local media, who may not be involved in these issues as the national media is, aware that this is important for everyone's future, and not just the rich as is too often heard in this Chamber, but for small business people, their employees, people who could be employed by small- and medium-sized businesses in the future.

So those that may be watching this, whether you live in the central New Jersey area or the 12th district of Colorado or Missouri or South Dakota, if you are interested in being a part of this, contact any of us, contact Members of Congress who really are desirous of organizing public education activities to see this ball moved down the field, so to speak.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hard work of the gentleman from New Jersey, and the things that he has pointed out here are important to all of us.

I guess as our time is winding down, I want to pick up on one note that was made earlier, and that is that one of the things that we have to, I think, insist upon in Washington, is accountability.

As we move forward now, having balanced this budget, the gentleman talked about the fact that we have got the blueprint there, but we have to be conscientious and see that it is enforced.

One of the other things that I think we need to take very seriously is the so-called Results Act which has been passed by the Congress. It goes into effect this year. For the people in this country, we spend \$1.6 trillion taxpayer dollars on the Federal Government, and the estimates are that as much as \$350 billion is lost through fraud, waste and abuse, some \$23 billion in the Medicare program alone, which represents 14 percent of their total budget allocated dollars.

So one of the things we do have to, I think, as we go through the process continue to try to root out, and that is all the spending in government that is over and above what is necessary to get the job done.

The people in this country expect Washington to be accountable. They deserve to have Washington be accountable. I think that that, too, is an important part. Think about the tax cut that we could do. \$350 billion in waste, fraud and abuse. Figure out what that would translate to the average person in this country in terms of lower taxes, or investments in other

types of things that might be important to the future of this country. But instead of having it lost through the waste, the fraud and the abuse that so oftentimes is endemic in big government and bureaucracy, that is the kind of thing that we are going to continue to focus upon, try and root that out, and see that those savings are passed on to the hard-working men and women in this country.

So I think that too is an important point and something that I think all of us are very concerned about and want to continue to pursue as part of our agenda for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Missouri. I think our time is winding up.

Mr. HULSHOF. I think the gentleman is correct. I again appreciate my colleagues for joining me and participating in this special order.

I think, Mr. Speaker, to those naysayers that have picked apart these past weeks' aspects of what we have done here, we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Clearly we are not here to rest on past accomplishments. We have a tremendous amount of work yet to do, and we have just touched the surface.

Mr. THUNE talked about trying to crack down on fraud and abuse in many of these programs. I know one of the things on the agenda we will be focusing on, Mr. PAPPAS mentioned the Committee on Ways and Means. We are going to be focusing on how to restructure possibly the Internal Revenue Service.

Everybody talks about trying to simplify the Tax Code. We need to continue to have those discussions, beyond just having Presidential candidates come forward and say this is what we ought to do. I think this is a dialog we have to get the American people on board with us, whether they favor just the Tax Code that we have and simplifying that, or whether they favor a flat income tax or a national consumption tax, a sales tax or the like.

But our efforts to restructure the IRS, whether it is the highway bill, the infrastructure, investing in roads and bridges that are so needed across the country, or as another freshman Member, we are talking about education. This is the time everybody is heading back to school or colleges and universities. The fact is we have to get more money than is presently appropriated back into the classrooms, so teachers are not having to dig in their own pockets and purchase school supplies to educate the kids that are entrusted to them.

There are so many things we have yet to do. But I think in our quest for progress, we have to continue to stay on the path. I think we are committed to doing that, certainly as this freshman class is on this side and many on the other side, of trying to work with politics of cooperation, rather than politics of confrontation.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on my special order in recognition of the life of Betty Shabazz to be given today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

## RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF BETTY SHABAZZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come forward this evening to lead a special order in recognition of the life of Betty Shabazz.

Betty Saunders was the adopted and only daughter of loving parents, who grew up in Detroit, MI. She died on June 24, 3 weeks after being burned over 80 percent of her body. Her grandson, Malcolm, has been convicted of the arson and has since been judged to have been mentally disturbed.

I come forward this evening to speak of a woman who in a very real sense was two women. Betty Shabazz was her own woman, and inescapably and memorably, Betty Shabazz was the widow of a great man, Malcolm X. The two identities are inevitably related. Each side, gracious and strong, fed the other side of this remarkable woman.

I want to begin by saying some words about Betty, and later on I want to say some words about Malcolm X, because many have no clear vision of who Malcolm became, and in honoring Betty, we inevitably honor this man who transformed himself.

I knew Betty well. On one level she was simply a friend, one of the girls. On the level where she is remembered best, she of course was the widow of Malcolm X. But at the level that I find most remarkable, Betty Shabazz was all Betty, not Malcolm, because Betty, like Malcolm, redefined herself from the wife of a great man who was tragically assassinated, to herself, a self-made woman.

There is, of course, Betty the mother. There is a kind of primacy that was attached to being Betty the mother. When you raise six girls, when your husband is struck down and assassinated before your very eyes, when you and four children are in the ballroom where that act occurs, you are inescapably, first and foremost, a mother. When you are pregnant with twins who are then later born, there is a very special primacy to being a mother.

Yes, she went on to get her doctorate and to become an associate professor at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, NY, and ultimately to become an adminis-

trator in that college. This is the kind of transformation aspect of her life that, in many ways, is shades of Malcolm.

□ 2015

Betty met Malcolm in New York, having come there to study nursing. She described the courtship as an old-fashioned courtship. I wish we had more of those today. Malcolm loved children, and he particularly loved his children. I must say that during their what turned out to be a short marriage, Betty was pregnant most of the time.

Malcolm was assassinated on February 21st, 1965, with four of those six girls by her side. She threw herself onto the children when she heard the bullets, and then she ran to Malcolm, by which time he was already dead.

How do you go forward after something like that? Unlike the two other civil rights widows, with whom she became friends, Betty was left without any protection. Myrlie Evers, the extraordinary wife of Medgar Evers, who has since become chair of the board of the NAACP, was left with the protection of our largest and oldest and best-known civil rights organization, the NAACP. Coretta Scott King, when Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated, was left with the protection of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and, as it turned out, of much of the Nation, for whom King was recognized as a very special martyr and a very great man. But as for Betty, it was members of the Nation of Islam who were ultimately convicted of the assassination of her husband. She was left with no organizational protection.

What did she do? She did what such women often do, only she did it in her way. She raised these girls, got more education, and went on and got a career. The country and the world did not hear much of Betty Shabazz during this period. I cannot imagine who could have heard much of Betty Shabazz, doing what she was doing during this period. She lived a very private life. She was particularly keen to protect these children, and, of course, she had to live and move forward.

I had a forum at the Black Caucus Weekend last year where I invited Betty Shabazz, my old friend, to be one of the speakers, because it spoke to issues about which she had been identified. And this very gracious and remarkable woman was anything but self-assured about coming to this forum and speaking at this forum with women whom she regarded as more practiced at such pursuits.

I remember that Betty said when she finally got herself so that she could see the movie Malcolm X that the young actress who portrayed her was far more self-assured than Betty felt she was during this period. There was a kind of inner assurance and inner conviction, an inner self-esteem that came out during the forum, and that was part of the very essence of Betty Shabazz.

Ultimately, in addition to her professional stature, Betty was to become a human rights advocate of very special stature.

I want to say something further about her husband, the man who transformed himself from a petty criminal to a major league thug to a black Muslim and finally to an orthodox Sunni Muslim who embraced universal brotherhood, because I think we ought to be clear who Malcolm became. There is lack of clarity on that in this country, because only then can we understand Betty Shabazz.

But before I go on, I see that I have been joined by my good colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHN LEWIS]. It is very fitting that JOHN should come forward first, for he and I worked together in the very same civil rights movement for which the civil rights martyrs became so well-known and admired in this country, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, and Medgar Evers.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JOHN LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], for calling this special order tonight. I know some time ago the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia had planned to hold a special order, but because of the schedule of the House, we are doing it tonight.

So Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in paying tribute to a noble spirit, Dr. Betty Shabazz. I felt a profound sense of loss when I learned of her death. Betty Shabazz stood tall as a wife, a mother, and a friend.

As a matter of fact, I knew Malcolm and got to know her husband fairly well. I first met him on the night of August 27th, 1963, 34 years ago, here in the city of Washington on the eve of the march on Washington. The last time I saw her husband alive was in Nairobi, Kenya, in October 1964, at the New Stanley Hotel.

Malcolm and Betty together represented something deep and good about the very best of America. Betty Shabazz stood tall as a wife, as a mother. She stood tall as a woman of courage, pride, and with a great sense of dignity.

As I said before, at the age of 28, Betty Shabazz suddenly lost her husband, Malcolm, to an assassin's bullet. With few resources, she began to raise her six daughters. With determination she pursued and achieved a doctorate degree in education. With a deep sense of compassion and an abiding faith, Betty Shabazz continued Malcolm's work.

On February 21, 1965, I say to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, my friend and colleague of long standing, I remember very well, we were driving back from Macon, GA in south Georgia on the way to the city of Atlanta, and then on our way to Selma, when we

heard on the radio that Malcolm had been assassinated by an assassin's bullet.

As the gentlewoman stated so well, Betty was pregnant with twins as she witnessed the murder of her husband. Just a week earlier the family home had been firebombed, and as the wife of a controversial public figure, worry and concern for the well-being of her family had become part of Betty's life.

So on this day, we are here to honor the life of a remarkable woman, an extraordinary person. Ghandi, the great teacher of the philosophy and the discipline of nonviolence, once said that there was a soul force in the universe which, if permitted, would flow through us and produce miraculous results.

In the life of Betty Shabazz we can find that soul force, a power to transform tragedies into great victory. By her quiet and courageous example, Betty Shabazz fought tragedy with love and compassion. She did not become bitter or hostile after the murder of her husband. Instead, Betty picked herself up and raised six lovely daughters. As their mother, she got involved in their lives. She passed on to them the great legacy of their father.

Betty not only had the ability but also the capacity to grow and to learn. Perhaps that is why she became an educator. That is why she had the capacity and the ability to reach out to others. She had the ability and the capacity to inspire. That is why I think we are here today. In her professional life as an administrator of Medgar Evers College in New York City, Betty Shabazz encouraged young people to study and to strive for their very best.

I would say to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], Betty Shabazz touched so many with her strength and kindness. I know on so many occasions she made me laugh. Being with Betty was always joyful, sharing funny stories or something we saw in the audience, or something we read about or something we saw during the Congressional Caucus weekend. I will never, ever forget her sweet and wonderful smile; just being in her company, being in her presence.

I have a photograph of Betty with Mrs. King and Dr. King's sister, Christine King Farris, and they are all smiling, sharing some story. Sometimes we never know how powerful, how influential a person is until we miss them or do not see them. Maybe we will never know.

Betty, through her courage, was able to supply all of us with faith and hope. She had the ability to be able to see good or goodness in all humankind. With one more river to cross, I wanted Betty to survive, to beat the odds. Even as she struggled to overcome and to recover from the extensive burns on her body, she held onto life longer than many had expected.

Yes, this is the life of a remarkable American woman, of a beautiful woman with iron will and strong deter-

mination. Betty Shabazz has left us. I would like to think that she is now in a better place, and at long last she has been reunited with her beloved Malcolm. Tonight our hearts and our sympathies go out to her family and her friends. We will all miss her, but the great example of her life leaves us sweetly blessed with a profound sense of hope.

So tonight I say to you, Betty, thank you. Despite great challenges, defeats, and difficulties, you, Dr. Betty Shabazz, walked through life with soul force. You had the ability, you had the capacity, to produce great results. You will be missed. As a Nation and as a people, we will not forget your gifts to all of us and to all humankind.

Again, I want to thank my friend and my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for bringing us together tonight to participate in this special order.

□ 2030

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] for his eloquent words concerning Betty Shabazz.

I see that I have been joined by other Members, and I am pleased to recognize at this time the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], who will now speak to us, and I am pleased to receive her words at this time.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], my sister and my esteemed colleague, for giving us the opportunity tonight to speak about a great woman, and to help America understand the place that this great woman will have in the history of this country.

Dr. Betty Shabazz, Mr. Speaker, was a woman of honor, a woman of integrity, and a woman who will set an example for all of America's children.

On February 21, 1965, Dr. Shabazz and her four young daughters witnessed the brutal assassination of her husband and their father, Malcolm X. This violent, terrifying incident thrust her into the national spotlight. We all remember Brother Malcolm. We all remember his wife, Betty Shabazz. And that is why we are here tonight, to pay special honor to Mrs. Shabazz.

She spent the next 32 years of her life preserving the legacy of Malcolm X. Through these efforts we came to know and admire Dr. Betty Shabazz, for in the process she established her own legacy. While we mourn the passing of our beloved friend and sister, we also celebrate her life and reunion with her husband in a strange twist of fate.

Malcolm X unknowingly prepared Dr. Shabazz for her life's work. Throughout their short but wonderful marriage, Malcolm urged her not to hold grudges. Brother Malcolm's advice Mrs. Shabazz took to heart. At the same time Dr. Shabazz found the strength she needed to help her children through the crisis of the loss of their father and to nurture and fortify them for life's uncertainties.

By example, Dr. Shabazz rejected bitterness as she embraced the principles of ethnic unity, universal peace, and nonviolence. She touched thousands of lives through her work as an educator and administrator. She was a quiet but effective healer of the breach between perceived conflict in ideologies. That is why it is so important that the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], our sister, called us here tonight, so that America will never forget Dr. Shabazz.

It was not her way to challenge other's memory of her husband. She chose instead to live the beliefs she and her husband shared. Although tragedy haunted their family, Dr. Shabazz remained strong in her convictions. Her life was a living testament to her strong belief in self and family values.

We talk about family values; Dr. Betty Shabazz lived them. Goes by an old dictum which I love to follow: I would rather see a sermon than to hear one any day. She did not preach family values; she lived them.

She believed in education as the linchpin of self-determination. Her early training as a nurse complemented her care and her spirit as a care-giver. Her passion for learning inspired her as she achieved academic excellence. She earned a bachelor's degree in public health. Her master's course work was in early childhood education.

In 1975, Dr. Shabazz received a doctorate in education, and after that she joined the faculty of Medgar Evers College where she served until her death. Betty Shabazz passes on her love of learning to her six daughters. They are also women of achievement in their own right. She believed in family, she loved her daughters, and she lived life. Indeed, her love for life and children fused at the moment of this tragic episode.

We cannot pay homage to Dr. Shabazz without mentioning the troubled life of her grandson, for even as she lay dying, her love and care reached out to him. I would say to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, and my colleagues, that I am certain that Dr. Shabazz would want us to remember her life by remembering the life and needs of her grandson.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her memorable words. I want to say how pleased I am to be joined at this time by the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], for holding this Special Order and providing us an opportunity to enter brief remarks about this distinguished woman who is a woman of our history.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened but inspired tonight. I am saddened because I stand here to say farewell to a sister friend who lived a life worth emulating. The late Betty Shabazz was a

woman of character, a woman of strength and presence. She rose above tragedy when her husband was murdered. She stood up to challenges, rose to the occasion after the death of her husband, and raised her children with dignity and pride.

Those words have been often stated tonight and will be said again. I am saddened at the loss of this special woman, this special woman of history. I am happy, however, to have known of this woman and to be alive to have this woman demonstrate what strength and character really is.

Not better words can be said than those spoken by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEKS]. It is certainly better to see the sermon than to hear ideology spoken.

Dr. Shabazz died this summer the victim of an unfortunate circumstance, but until the end she showed courage, grace, and class to the victim and her family. She was an extraordinary woman. After her husband's death, she lived quietly, raising her six daughters, giving them the value of family and the emphasis of education by showing that she, too, would go on to school earning a doctor's degree. She served as a college administrator, and as her children grew up, became more active in the community and the world as a participator in democracy.

We have lost a great human being, a mentor, a mother, a grandmother, and a friend. But we also have missed her spirit, a spirit of self-confidence and worth and value. We will always remember her strength, but we also will remember her courage and her love for her children, yes, and her grandson. Commitment to love all who had been given to her caring, nurturing arms to raise and to be a mother and a grandmother, and a committed sister friend. We say fare you well.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, those were very special words, and I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], my wonderful colleague, for coming forward to make them here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to be joined by another wonderful friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California, [Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD].

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for bringing this Special Order tonight so that we would have an opportunity to really speak about a dear friend, an outstanding woman, a woman of character, a woman of dignity.

Yes, on June 23d, we lost one of the greatest leaders in the fight for social justice, Dr. Betty Shabazz, and I join tonight with my colleagues in sending my deepest sympathies, as I did during those dark days and dark moments after her demise, to the entire Shabazz family.

Despite the third-degree burns which covered over 80 percent of her body,

and numerous painful skin grafts, she endured. Dr. Shabazz held on with strength and determination, those qualities that have continued to sustain us during these difficult days ahead.

So I am so proud tonight to be able to participate in this evening's function to offer the rightful homage to one of our greatest political and social activists to have graced this earth.

I rise tonight not to focus, though, on the tragic loss of Dr. Shabazz, but rather on the tremendous gains that we as a society have made due to the unyielding dedication and determined leadership of Dr. Betty Shabazz.

Throughout her 61 years of life, Dr. Shabazz embodied an extraordinary balance of intellect and compassion, coupled with grace and composure. Dr. Shabazz grew up in Detroit and studied at Tuskegee Institute, New York's Brooklyn State Hospital School of Nursing and the Jersey City State College in New Jersey, while helping her children to accept the absence of their father.

In 1975, she received a doctorate in education from the University of Massachusetts, and later became the Director of Institutional Advancement and Public Relations at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, NY. Throughout her academic career, and long afterwards, Dr. Shabazz served as a spokesperson and tireless advocate for the homeless, the poor, and for civil rights.

She educated children and adults on dealing with racism and civil rights, and built very strong relationships with the Hasidic rabbis and other Jewish leaders to address the violence and tensions dividing communities throughout this country.

On top of all of her work to advance social justice, Dr. Shabazz raised those six daughters of hers all on her own and she never asked for pity, she just exemplified her pride.

She was a leader with a powerful and contagious compassion for making a difference. She was also a team player and knew how vitally important it is that we all work together to resolve racial tension and inequality in this Nation.

The pain and sorrow that fills all of our hearts when we think of the tragic death of Dr. Betty Shabazz is overwhelming, but I ask my colleagues, and all within the sound of my voice, to join me in recognizing and honoring the wonderful ways in which Dr. Shabazz has enriched all of our lives as an inspiring role model and as a friend. Let us continue to impart her fine work to generations and for the generations yet to be born.

Yes, Dr. Betty Shabazz dedicated her life to social justice and had a tremendous impact on the young since the death of her husband, Malcolm X, some 30 years ago. While we mourn her passing, let us not forget, more importantly, how blessed we were to have had someone of this esteemed caliber touch all of our lives in such an unforgettable way.

The legacy of Dr. Betty Shabazz will live on in all of our lives.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for those very warm and wonderful words of tribute to Betty Shabazz.

There may, indeed, be other Members coming to the floor, and while I await them, I think I would like to deepen my own remarks, because we speak of Betty Shabazz, a woman who carved out her own identity in a most memorable way. And yet we also say and remember that this was the widow of Malcolm X. Because of confusion concerning who Malcolm X was and, therefore, in a great and important sense who Betty Shabazz was, I feel an obligation to say a word about the legacy of Malcolm X that Betty Shabazz carried with such grace.

It is according to what generation we live in and what we saw as to who we may understand Malcolm X to have been. It was his very capacity to transform himself that leaves me wondering when I hear people say Malcolm X, which Malcolm are they talking about?

□ 2045

Are they talking about the Malcolm who transformed his life and who in so doing should be an inspiration to us all that we can all become something else, something better, something different? It takes enormous will to be able to say at the end of 5 years, I am something different from who I was 5 years ago, because I have made myself something different.

If we think about the extraordinary transformation of Malcolm X, then I think there will be a greater capacity for us to imagine the transformation of our country and the transformation of many in our country who seem stuck where they are.

Let me say to you that Betty transformed herself, and in a real sense, when you see a great man like Malcolm, you ought to understand that a great man does not choose a little woman. He chose a woman who also was capable of transforming herself.

I have to say, if I was left in this world with four babies and two more I was about to bear, I am not sure I could have transformed myself. It would have been doing good just to hold on.

This is a woman who said, hey, I, too, can make myself what I need to be. And what a model she had for self-transformation.

Make no mistake about who Malcolm X was before we met him, Malcolm Little, the petty criminal who became the serious felon and who, while in prison, became converted by the Black Muslims and finally left them. Each and every time Malcolm X had to say to himself something that is very hard to say, who am I? Is this who I want to be? Can I be something else?

I ask you to consider, how many people do you know who have become something truly different from who they once were? How many people do

you know who have improved themselves? How many people do you know who live by principle so that they are willing to risk their very lives for principle? When Malcolm X converted, he became an orthodox Sunni Muslim and so did Betty Shabazz. He broke with the Nation on matters of principle at the risk of his life. He came to accept universal principles of human rights, brotherhood and sisterhood.

I do not always know who we are remembering when we remember Malcolm X. The Malcolm X on the T-shirt, which Malcolm X is that brother? Yes, it will be the Malcolm X of black nationalism. I think he would have continued to stand for that, but that sense of nationalism would have been for him the motivating force to continue to bring justice to his people, for he had also embraced orthodox Sunni Muslim religion and spoke openly and often of universal principles of brotherhood. This is a man who learned, was willing to say when he thought he had been wrong, and to move on.

I have to tell you, I ask you, even among great men or women to find me examples like that. Here is a great man, Martin Luther King. But he was born into the tradition that he came to represent and he represented the best of that tradition. He was born into a family of Baptist ministers which led him to get a wonderful education which led him to study philosophy. All of this was growing into something. That is very different from becoming somebody different, from leaving behind somebody who you were, recognizing and taking responsibility to say that was the wrong person, that is not who I want to be, and becoming somebody else.

Very few of us can become somebody else while growing, as a matter of principle. That is what Malcolm El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz did, and when you wear those T-shirts, do understand that you are not wearing T-shirts of the man who spoke of white devils because Malcolm, who became a Sunni Muslim, said that is not who I am anymore. I am Malcolm El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz who embraces the notion that we must become one people.

That is who he was, and I have had many a conversation with Betty Shabazz about that Malcolm. This was the last and the final Malcolm, and that is the Malcolm who deserves our greatest respect. That is the Malcolm whom history will remember now, not only as a revered leader of my own black community but as a far more universal figure, standing for universal principles and standing for the strength of character to change who he was.

Oh, do I wish I could put aside some of my habits and tomorrow wake up and say, Eleanor, that part of Eleanor is not anymore, I can say with assurance that there is a new Eleanor here. That kind of strength of character I find simply awesome.

I have to tell you that at the memorial service that I attended for Betty

Shabazz, I found that legacy living and I found that legacy of principle living in Attalah, the eldest daughter, the eloquent Attalah. This girl has Malcolm in her. And let me indicate how and why. There came a point in the service, to show you how universal a figure Malcolm has become, Governor Pataki was there, Mayor Giuliani was there, all of the prominent politicians of New York were there. Mayor Koch was there. He talked about a street, a grand avenue named for Malcolm.

There came a point in the service when they recognized the politicians in the audience and they would stand up and say something or at least be recognized. When they recognized Mayor Giuliani, there was some boos in the church. At that point, others in the church began to clap so as to drown out the boos, and it was all over.

When it came time for the daughters to come forward, all six of them, it was only one who spoke for them, the eldest. I know about that obligation; I am the eldest of three daughters. Attalah stepped forward, extemporaneously to speak for the remaining family. And she obviously had thought about what she was going to say. And the question of the boos, I can tell you, had been dealt with. But this girl had Malcolm's principle in her. She felt the necessity to say that that had been wrong. I was never so impressed in my life.

She did not have to get in that. She did not have to take the chance that there were some in the audience who thought maybe you should boo Giuliani and so you might turn them off. She did not have to get in it. She got in it. As an aside, she said, and by the way, it is wrong in this service to boo the mayor or anyone else. She had to say it. It was a matter of principle for her. Teach girl, I thought. That is what Malcolm would have done. Malcolm would have said, hey, silence is not a moral act. The moral act is to say, that was wrong and I am going to take the consequences. I am going to stand up and say it.

That is Malcolm. That was Attalah. That legacy is in her. It was in her with great eloquence. This is family I revere for the way in which their values have been spread across their family. These values feed on one another. I don't know where they come from. I cannot say Attalah got this from Malcolm. She was such a little girl. I do not know that Betty got her sense of universal brotherhood from the final Malcolm. I do not know that. All I know is that in families those things just come together and that is what being a family is all about. I hope we all regard ourselves as part of that family as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], another very good Member of this body.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. The words will be few but heartfelt, only

because as I have listened to your passion and compassion and those of my other sisters, as I hope the Speaker will tolerate briefly and indulge us just for a moment, because this is such a special occasion. As the moments tick by, I hope he will allow those who have come to the floor to complete this tribute.

But in listening to you, sometimes it is appropriate to offer the benediction but for the fact that others continue to come to pay tribute. I will simply say a few points because I knew the honorable and cherished Dr. Betty Shabazz as an admiring watcher, if you will, of her eloquence and love of life.

Interestingly enough, from a distance, unlike the knowledge and personal friendship that you possessed, I watched her stateliness, her regalness, and her capturing the audience wherever she went in her most humble and honest way.

She taught at a college in New York. A good friend of mine had the pleasure of being on campus as a faculty member with her, Sheryl Williams, I called her Sheryl Williams. And on the occasions that we had to speak together, there was always an endearing comment made about Dr. Betty Shabazz.

My fellow sisters are right that Dr. Betty Shabazz was part of a family, Malcolm, the children, the sisters, the daughters, so Dr. Betty Shabazz was a wife, a mother, noble, queenly, an educator, a nurturer. She certainly was a grandmother, proudly so, something she did not rebuke; and I believe that it is true in life and, yes, in death.

She showed up places and she was a bright star and clearly she provided a light for us. I hope that as she now watches us, and as Dr. Betty Shabazz sleeps on peacefully, that we will take to heart the partnership that she had with Malcolm X, one who did believe in humankind; and that those who wish to emulate and imitate this dynamic offering to this Nation and this world, Dr. Shabazz and Malcolm X, that they will imitate the realness of who they are, people who reached out in obstacles and adversity and fought against the tide.

And so my tribute tonight is to recognize that I have many miles to travel to be able to capture the bright and shining star still remaining here given to us by Dr. Betty Shabazz, and likewise I have many miles to travel in order to capture the spirit and the dynamic strength of Malcolm X. But my commitment to you, to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia who has expressed such deep and abiding friendship; as I see the chairwoman of the Black Caucus, who likewise shares that relationship, that we will not stand and allow the clock to be turned back, the light to be darkened, the daughters of Malcolm and Dr. Betty Shabazz to be forgotten or ignored, the grandchildren that represent so many who may have lost their way to be abandoned by us.

□ 2100

As we continue our service in the U.S. Congress, our commitment will be to lift up the bloodstained banner, but lift it up with the understanding that Dr. Betty Shabazz lived, Malcolm lived, the family lived, and they will live on through us. I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for her leadership on this special order.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for those remarkable words about Betty Shabazz. If I had to bet money, I would have been willing to do so that the next speaker would have to come to the floor this evening. It is my very special pleasure to recognize at this time the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], who is at the same time the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON]. I thank her for taking the time to organize this tribute to Betty Shabazz. She is one of the busiest persons in this House. Not only does she have the regular legislative duties, but given all that is going on in the District, I know the hours that she is spending working with the very serious problems that are confronting this District and this Nation. I want to tell her, for her to have time to get us to stop and focus and do this tribute is more than admirable. I admire her stamina, and her courage, but I also deeply respect the fact that she decided no matter how busy she is, that our dear friend and sister Betty Shabazz deserves the attention of this House, of this body. I thank very much the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that she and I both attended the memorial services for Dr. Betty Shabazz in New York. We were there and we watched as people came from all over this Nation to pay tribute to Betty Shabazz. We watched our friends mount the podium there and talk about their relationship with her. We watched people she has worked with both in the political arena, in academia, step forward to tell us about their very special relationship with this remarkable woman. When I was there, I talked a little bit about Betty Shabazz, my friend that I have worked with, that I have known, that I have spent time with, that I have exchanged all kinds of information with, about our families, et cetera. But I could not help but think about how long it took me to meet Betty Shabazz, even though I had met Malcolm many years ago.

Of course, I and the Nation met Malcolm X as he came forth with his brilliant oratory and presence to help make this Nation think about who we are and what we are doing, to help draw attention to the injustices of our own society, to help us to articulate our pain, to force legislative bodies to pay attention. He did all of that, this magnificent man with this brilliance

and this kind of presence that many of us have never witnessed before.

And so I met Malcolm X and I can recall being in Los Angeles, going to wherever I would hear he was going to be, to listen one more time. I was finding my own self in those years, coming to grips with not only my philosophy about life but about what I really felt about what I had learned, my experience growing up in St. Louis. And so I met Malcolm X, I listened to him. I was profoundly influenced by him, carried away with his brilliance, with his ability to articulate what I was feeling so often. But I never asked, and what about his family? What about his children? What about his wife? It was only after Malcolm's death did I meet and get to know Betty Shabazz.

Too often we see leaders, we see people in high visibility roles, and somehow we think about them without thinking about them in relationship to their families, their children, their home environment. After I met Betty Shabazz, I understood why Malcolm could comfortably do what he did. In order to be the leader that Malcolm X was, he had to have tremendous support and understanding. This was a woman who was with one of the most controversial leaders of our time. This was a woman who knew that her life and the life of her children were in danger. Their house was set afire. This was a woman who knew that even though her husband had evolved to a point where as some describe him as more international, more wanting to bring people together, there were people who did not feel the same way as I felt and many, many others felt about Malcolm X. But this was a woman who loved her husband. This was a woman who raised the babies. This was a woman who knew that at any point in time, her husband could be killed, her house could be burned, she could be killed, but she believed in Malcolm X and they believed in each other. He loved Betty Shabazz and Betty Shabazz loved Malcolm X.

And so, even though I had not met her, I did not know her, it became very, very clear to me after meeting her why Malcolm X was able to do and be in the manner that he was. And so this Betty Shabazz that I met was not a woman with her head hanging down, it was not a woman who had been scarred by the assassination of her husband, it was not a woman whose very life, existence and ability to thrive, this was a woman, a very wise woman, who, of course, felt the deep pain of having lost this brilliant man that she loved, but this was a woman who had counseled with her husband, had talked through the possibility of his death. This was a woman who witnessed her husband's assassination with her babies but was not destroyed by it. This was a woman whose wisdom goes far beyond that which most of us hope to be able to achieve.

She suffered the pain of the loss of her husband, she mourned his death,

and she went on to do and be what Malcolm would want her to do. Not only did she find a way to raise the children, she went back to school. This is a woman who got a Ph.D. This is a woman who not only became the professor, the teacher, the leader; she spread out in the overall community, in this country, and went on to become a speaker, a leader, someone who joined with her sisters to try and make life better for others. This was a woman who said to me once, "Maxine, I came out to Los Angeles, and I had an opportunity to speak with these young men, some of whom were in gangs, some of whom had left the gangs, but they sat with me, and I had an opportunity to talk with them and tell them about Malcolm, and what Malcolm would have them do." And she said, "I'm coming back again. I'm going to come back to talk with them. Because I think it is important for me to share what I know." So this woman, raising children, teaching, being available to the many groups and organizations who demanded of her time, not only did I see her all over this country at the many Malcolm X celebrations that go on, we sat and talked about these celebrations and her role and her responsibility. She never tired of responding to the request.

I would often see her at the Congressional Black Caucus dinners. We hold these Congressional Black Caucus weekends, and she would always come, and we would joke, "Well, she won't be with us at this Congressional Black Caucus weekend." But she will certainly be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and the other members of the Congressional Black Caucus for helping me to select Betty Shabazz as one of the awardees. I as the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus will be presenting awards to Betty Shabazz, posthumously, and to Coretta Scott King and to Myrlie Evers, 3 women who have lost their husbands, 3 women whose husbands were the civil rights leaders recorded in history never to be forgotten, 3 women who stood by their husbands, who raised the children while their husbands were shot down in America, but who did not go away, who did not vanish, who did not become so devastated that they did not continue to play a role in American life. They are all speakers, they are all heads of organizations, they are all teachers, they are all keepers of the flame of the faith. And so we are going to award them the chairwoman's award at the Congressional Black Caucus weekend. We are going to say to them, thank you for being who you are. We are going to say thank you for persisting in the quest for freedom, justice and equality despite what was done to your husbands. We are going to say to Coretta Scott King and to Myrlie Evers, we love you, we love you and we want you to know that. We want to use the most important platform that we

have in the Congressional Black Caucus, and to Betty, who we will not be able to say it to because she is gone now, to her children who will be there and Attalah, her daughter, who will accept the award, we want them to know that we loved their mother, and that we hold her in the highest of esteem, and we hope that this small token that we are able to present that evening from all of us will speak to our love for them. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for allowing us the opportunity to focus some attention from this House on Betty Shabazz.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for those remarkable remarks. This special order would not have been the same without her.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I simply want to thank not only the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus but the other Members and friends who came forward at a time when many of us are thinking through ways to transform ourselves into better people, to transform our country into a better place, and when I, I must say, Mr. Speaker, am trying to think of a way to transform my own city into a united city that will regain its own human rights and that will reform its own agencies at such a time I find great inspiration in the life and work of Malcolm X and in the life and work of Betty Shabazz.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great woman and humanitarian, Dr. Betty Shabazz. Her family lost a mother, grandmother, or sister but the world lost a friend and a symbol of inspiration to all of us. In her death, Dr. Shabazz leaves a legacy of dedication to family, a quality that is much praised but little practiced. Her impact will be felt for a period much longer than we realize right now.

Her much recognized qualities of perseverance and determination were first publicly recognized after her husband's death on February 21, 1965. Betty Shabazz, left with no source of income to provide for her four young daughters and the twins she was pregnant with, was determined to raise her children and did so alone. Along with taking care of six children, she completed her nursing school education and went on to earn bachelor's, master's and doctorate degrees. Dr. Shabazz lived the dictums of self-reliance, discipline and education as espoused by her husband, Malcolm X.

Our prayers are with the family in this hour of grief. I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the many contributions Dr. Shabazz has made to our country and to the world.

□ 2115

#### TRIBUTE TO BETTY SHABAZZ

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me also add my accolades to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Delegate NORTON, for calling this very im-

portant Special Order. It has been already said about the outstanding work that she does here in the District fighting for the people of the District, as she fought for people here in the entire United States of America when she had a tremendous, important administrative position years ago, and she continues to do that work.

And to the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus, Ms. WATERS from California, she continues to lead the caucus in unprecedented times. We are so proud of the outstanding work that the caucus has done, and I would just like to, as I was in my office working, and I turned to this channel and saw that this Special Order was being done, I was unaware of it but felt it was extremely important to me to come over and to say a few words.

I knew Betty Shabazz very well, because living in Newark, NJ, she was not far away, and about a month before the tragedy I had the opportunity to be in her company three or four times. First, we had a meeting in Mount Vernon, the Constituency for Africa. Mayor David Dinkins was there, Congressman RANGEL, Mel Foote called in from the Constituency of Africa in Mrs. Shabazz's hometown, and of course the first person to speak after the invocation was given at the church was Doctor Betty Shabazz, because she not only worked for people in this area and in this country, but worldwide, and she was loved by everyone.

I know Dr. Edison Jackson, who was the president of Medgar Evers College, he was the former president of Essex County College in Newark, NJ, where I live, and the wisdom of President Jackson to see the worth of a Betty Shabazz, to have her lead the light for that great institution named after, as has been mentioned, Medgar Evers, another person who was taken away from us, and his wife Myrlie Evers carried the torch, and so it is unique; as a matter of fact, the college that Dr. Edison Jackson at Essex County taught at before going to Medgar Evers after leaving California on Martin Luther King Boulevard. Doctor Shabazz, it is altogether.

I would just like to say that then she came over to Newark about 2 weeks before the tragedy and spoke out at community meetings. She was always there, grass-roots people. She would come to the caucus and go to all of the sessions and rush around because everyone wanted to see her.

And so we have lost a tremendous person. It is unfortunate that tragedies take people. This week we are hearing the tragedy of the great Princess of Wales taken away unnecessarily, and once again Dr. Betty Shabazz.

So I think that we have to remember and we have to always be aware of the fact that we all have to do more in our own way. She was a great person.

I, too, attended the memorial service and David Dinkins and Basil Patterson and Percy Sutton did such outstanding jobs as they brought this community together.

I once again would like to simply thank the gentlewoman from the District here, and I appreciate having the opportunity to address the House.

#### GOOD NEWS FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about good news for America.

I just had a wonderful opportunity during the past month to see lots of folks all across Wisconsin, and it was very educational for me and, I hope, for some of the folks we saw that they picked up on some of the good things that have happened here in the last month or thereabouts out here in Washington.

The one thing that struck me, though, as I talked to more and more of our families across Wisconsin and our senior citizens across Wisconsin and some of our young people, college age students across Wisconsin, they did not really realize that the tax cut bill has been signed into law, so I would like to begin this evening by pointing out that the tax cut bill, along with the first balanced budget since 1969 and restoring Medicare, has all been signed.

It is done. The ink is dry. The President signed it. It has passed the House. It has passed the Senate. First balanced budget since 1969, taxes coming down for the first time in 16 years, and Medicare restored for at least a decade. That is what was accomplished before we left for recess in August.

The other thing I learned is that not very many people really understood what was in the tax cut bill, and I would start talking to people and I would say, "Well, the budget is balanced, that's the most important thing we could do, and that was our responsibility, and that's done, and at the same time we've reduced your taxes."

And they go, "yeah, sure, but that affects somebody else."

And then we would start through it, and the first question would be: Do you have children? And this is so important. If you have children age 17 or younger for virtually all families out there, 550,000 Wisconsin families alone, you are eligible to keep \$400 more for each one of your children in your own home next year instead of sending it to Washington.

We should make this very clear. This is not somehow a gift from Washington to the people. This is money that the people get up in the morning, they go to their jobs, they work hard, and they earn the money, but instead of sending it to Washington, they keep it in their own homes to spend on their own families and the way they see fit. That is the first part of the tax code.

And I am going to put this a little different so folks have a handle on how important and significant this is.

In January of next year, a family with a child, with one child, should go into their place of employment, they should talk to the person that handles the W-4 forms, they should increase their exemptions so as to increase their take-home pay by \$33 per month. It is \$33 per month in increased take-home pay for each one of the children in the house.

And my fear is people are not going to do this. My fear is what is going to happen is they are just going to go through the year and Washington is going to see all this extra money coming out here that those families should be keeping in their own home, and, of course, when Washington sees money, sometimes they spend it out here, and I will admit, as hard as we try to stop that and as hard as I personally worked to stop them from spending on new programs, it would be much, much better if our families out there did the right thing.

And, again, let me make this very clear. Starting in January of next year, a family with children should go into their place of employment, they should talk to the personnel director, whoever it is that handles the W-4 forms, they should change the number of exemptions so as to allow their take-home pay to increase for \$33 per month per child.

Let me put this another way. If you have three children in your family, for most families you should start taking home \$100 a month more in your take-home paycheck than what you were in December. So the difference between your take-home pay in December and January should be \$100 a month for a family with three children.

That is significant; it is real. The bill is signed. You should do it in January of next year, increase your take-home pay. Keep the money in your own home; do not send it out here to Washington.

But that is not all in the tax cut bill. The other thing that people seemed when I talked with them out in Wisconsin to be generally familiar with was the capital gains reduction. The capital gains tax in the past was 28 percent, and that has been reduced to 20 percent. So the good news is that capital gains, the amount of money that you send to Washington, is lower when you sell a stock or a bond or whatever it is that you might have held and made a profit on.

Good news is that drops even further in the year 2000, to 18 percent, and it depends on your income bracket there. If you are in a \$41,000-a-year or higher income bracket, the capital gains are 20 percent, and if you are lower than that, they dropped all the way down to 10 percent.

Those two people seem to be vaguely familiar with, at least out there, but there is a whole bunch of others that they were not familiar with at all. Let me start with the first one.

If people own a home, homeowners for the most part when they sell their

home will no longer owe any Federal taxes. In the vast majority of the cases, very few exceptions, and only on the very higher-priced homes, will people owe any money in Federal taxes. If you have lived in your residence, it is your personal residence, you have lived there for 2 years or more, you will not owe any Federal taxes when you go to sell your home. This affects a whole bunch of people.

There were a lot of folks out there, empty nesters, people whose children are grown and gone who are waiting for that one-time exclusion at age 55 to sell their home and downsize. That is no longer necessary. The age 55 one-time exclusion is gone. It is no longer there. If you lived in your home for 2 years, you sell the home, you make a profit, there is no tax on it.

It was interesting. I was in Green Bay, WI. I was doing a radio talk show about the tax cuts, and I had a young lady call in, and she said, "Well, I bought my home for \$22,000, and I'm now about to sell it for \$60,000." So a period of years have gone by, and she said, "How much taxes am I going to owe?"

And I said, "Well, you're not going to owe any Federal taxes on the sale of your home."

So she said, "Does that mean I owe income taxes?"

And I said, "No, no, you do not owe any Federal taxes when you go to sell that house."

And she said, "Even though it went from \$22,000, I'm going to get \$60,000 back, how much taxes do I owe?" She asked me three times the same question because folks are having a hard time believing that Washington actually did something right, they actually lowered taxes instead of raising them like they were doing previously.

So the third part here that I would like to talk about then in the tax cut, if you owned your home, you have lived there for 2 years or more, and you sell your home, in the vast majority of the cases, the only exceptions are the very high priced homes, you will not owe any Federal taxes on the sale of that home.

This affects a lot of senior citizens, also. In Wisconsin, 74 percent of our senior citizens still own their home, and it may be people that took the one-time 55 exclusion that had bought a different home at age 56, maybe a smaller home or whatever, but if they have lived in the house for 2 years and they are now 60, let us say, for example, they can now sell that home, move to a different home, if they like, own it for 2 years, sell it again, so there is no one-time exclusion, you can do this as many times as you want as long as you live in the home for at least 2 years.

So this part was very unfamiliar with most of the people out there.

Then I went on to the part and I started talking about saving up for their children's education, because we had a lot of families that we were talking with, and we started talking about

the fact that it is now possible to put \$500 per year per child into what is called an education savings account. The money then accumulates tax free, and the student can then take it out when they reach age 18 and are ready to go off to college.

I talked to a lot of grandparents about this account because it seems that there are a lot of grandparents that are interested in giving their grandchildren some sort of a gift, whether it be a Christmas or their birthday or whatever, and it makes an ideal gift from a grandparent to a grandchild, and I know everybody cannot afford it, but there are some grandparents out there who would like to give this sort of a gift to their grandchildren, and it is certainly an ideal way to provide their grandchildren with a college education.

Again, the education savings account, you can put \$500 a year into this savings account, the money accumulates tax free, and when the kids take it out at age 18 they pay on the lower tax rate that they would be at. So it is money for them for college.

Speaking of college, very, very important. I took my daughter to her first year of college. My son had left for—he is a junior in college, and of course we talked to a lot of college students and the parents of a lot of college students, and there is a general lack of understanding of how this college tuition credit is going to work. Well, it works like this:

If you have got a freshman or a sophomore in college and the cost of their college education is \$2,000 a year or more, and in Wisconsin at least that is the vast majority of the cases, if it is 2,000 a year or more in costs, the parents get to keep \$1,500 more of their own hard-earned money in their own home rather than sending it out here to Washington.

And, again, I would point out this is not a gift from Washington. This is money that the people have gotten up in the morning, gone to work and earned. The only thing is instead of being taxed on it, instead of that tax coming out here to Washington and Washington spending it, you keep that money in your own home.

So if you have a freshman in college, and the costs of their college tuition is \$2,000, room, board and tuition is \$2,000 or more, you should start keeping \$125 a month more in your take-home pay starting in January of next year.

And, again, that is simply 1,500 divided by 12 is \$125 a month more.

For juniors and seniors, if the cost is over \$5,000, which in many cases it is for room, board, and tuition, you should start keeping a thousand dollars more of your own money in your own paycheck, and again that should start in January.

This is very, very straightforward, and if the people do not start keeping their own money, if they send it out here to Washington, we are not sure Washington is not going to spend the

money. We here in Washington, many of us, want the people to start keeping their own money next January. Why should you send it out here to Washington when it is your money?

College tuition, then, freshman and sophomores, in most cases are going to get a \$1,500 credit; juniors and seniors in most cases, in many, many cases, are going to get a \$1,000 credit.

□ 2130

I said are you interested in saving more money for retirement. He said yes, but I am in a pension funds already, so none of those IRA's affect me.

I said well, no, that is not entirely true. In fact, this new IRA, called the Roth IRA, you can put \$2,000 per year into the Roth IRA per person. So in this case a husband and wife could put \$4,000 away for their retirement.

You put after tax dollars into the Roth IRA, but when you take the tax dollars out at retirement, it is tax free. This might be one of the best provisions for middle age people in the entire country. This might be one of the best savings accounts in terms of taking care of yourself in retirement.

So even if you are in a different pension fund, and even if you are already doing some other things to take care of yourself in retirement, you may want to take a look at the Roth IRA, where you can literally put \$2,000 per person into this savings account, and at retirement, you take the money out tax free.

It is very significant, because \$2,000 put in at age, say, 40 typically will at least triple by the time you reach retirement. That means it goes from \$2,000 thousand to \$6,000 in value when you take it out, and there is no tax on that \$4,000 on increased value. A very, very significant change in the tax laws that people should be taking advantage of.

Again, the idea here is to encourage savings and encourage people to take care of themselves in retirement.

Then we went on to talk to some others. Farms, roughly 90 percent of the farms transferred from one generation to another in this Nation today will no longer have any taxes due because of the Tax Code change. So for small farmers and businessowners, you will be able to pass that small business or farm on to the next generation without the tax burden that was there before.

It is very clear to farmers as you pass this on from one generation to another, the benefit. But there a hidden benefit in here that not many people have picked up on. When a business is held by a family and the family has been running that business for a period of time, if the owner of that business cannot pass it on to the next generation, many times the business gets sold and somebody else takes over and the jobs are moved out of that community to a different community. So by allowing that business to stay in the family and be passed from one generation to another, many times that means jobs

stay in a community that otherwise might not have stayed there.

There are so many different provisions in this Tax Code that provide benefits to the American people that I found by the time I was done, we virtually could not find anyone who was not in some way, shape or form going to benefit by this Tax Code.

I have left out one other group, and that is young couples or young working folks, singles, couples. Those folks have the benefit of being able to save for education and their first home in this Roth IRA that I was just describing, where they can then literally take the money out tax free and use it for the down payment on their first home or for college education.

So, again, there is a benefit for the young workers, the people in their thirties, forties, and fifties preparing to retire for themselves, there is a benefit for seniors who own a home and who want to sell it, there is a benefit literally all across the generations here, and certainly there are many, many benefits for our families contained in the tax cut bill.

Again, I would be remiss to talk about these tax cuts without also saying that the budget is balanced first. I would like to bring the American people and my colleagues some other good news. Numbers have come out now that reestimate the revenues coming into the Federal Government, and, in fact, as we have been saying in our office for quite some time, the economy is stronger than people were giving it credit for and revenues are coming in faster.

What does that mean in English? The budget is balanced for the first time since 1969 next year. Four years ahead of schedule, we are on track to balancing the budget, the job is done, and your taxes are coming down at a great time.

What a great time this is in this country. I never, 3 years ago when I was first elected, thought we would be in a position to stand here and talk seriously about a balanced budget in 1998, taxes coming down, Medicare restored, welfare reform. Able-bodied welfare recipients have now to go to work, and not heartlessly. They are guaranteed a job in Wisconsin. We are seeing our welfare rolls fall dramatically. Good news all across the specter in terms of what has happened in the last couple years here in Washington.

With that, I would like to turn my attention now to another topic that I find is very confusing as I talk with groups of people. A lot of folks are saying if the budget is balanced, what about that \$5 trillion debt out there? It has to be smoke and mirrors, because we know there is a \$5 trillion debt out there.

Let me explain the difference between two terms. The first term is deficit and the second term is debt. Deficit is like the family with their checkbook. Deficit is like overdrawing your check book.

Since 1969, each and every year Washington has written out more in checks than what it collected in taxes, so they have literally overdrawn their checkbook each and every year since 1969. That is called the deficit.

When they overdraw their checkbook, what they did was borrowed the money, put it in their checkbook, and then, of course, the checks were cashed and on we went.

So for each and every year since 1969 they have overdrawn their checkbook, and then they went and borrowed the money, put in the checkbook and made good on the checks. As you might imagine, since they have been borrowing more and more money each and every year since 1969, the debt has been growing each and every year, and that is the \$5.3 trillion we have staring us in the face.

I am talking now about the debt and how fast it has been growing, and I think it is very important that the American people realize that we still have a very significant problem staring us in the face.

On this chart I show the growing debt facing America. From 1960 to 1980, the growth was relatively slow and relatively small. That is, The deficits were not big because they did not borrow lots of money in each one of those years.

But from 1980 forward, the debt has been growing in large amounts. This is what brought many Members of the class of 1995 out here, the Republican class of 1995. We watched this debt grow and realized we were about here on this debt chart right now, and that if we don't do something about this as a Nation, we are not going to have a future in this country.

That is what brought many of us here in the first place, and that is why it is such good news we are going to stop borrowing the money and the red line will quit going up when we reach a balanced budget.

When I point to 1980, all my colleagues on that side of the aisle say sure, that is the year Ronald Reagan was elected, and all my colleagues on this year say yeah, I know, but that is the year the Democrat Congress started spending out of control.

The fact of the matter is it doesn't matter which side it was responsible. The fact is we as a nation have this debt staring us in the face, and it is not a Republican problem or a Democrat problem, it is an American problem, because this Government does represent the people. It is time that we as a nation solve the problem, rather than pass the blame back and forth in the House of Representatives and the Senate and the presidency.

For those that have never seen this number, this is the amount of money, it is \$5.3 trillion, that is the amount of money that the Federal Government has borrowed on behalf of the American people. This is the accumulation of the overdrawn checkbook, the amount of money that was necessary

to make the checkbook balance since 1969.

Let me translate that into English. I used to be a math teacher, so you will see some of the math still in here. If we divided this debt up by the number of people in the United States of America, if each and every American were to pay just their share of the Federal debt, they would need to pay \$20,000. The Federal Government has borrowed \$20,000 on behalf of the every man, woman, and child in the United States of America basically within the last 15 to 20 years.

The real problem, you look at a family of five like mine, my kids are here, my wife is here, we have got five of us in our House, the Federal Government literally borrowed and spent \$100,000 on behalf of my family.

The real problem, the kicker, is the bottom line number. You see every family of five in the country today or the average family of five is paying \$580 a month to do nothing but pay the interest on this debt.

This money is owed to people. It is a real debt. Interest is being paid on it. The cost of interest alone to a family of five in the United States of America today, or any group of five people, is \$580 a month. A lot of people say, I do not really pay \$580 a month in income tax. I don't have to worry about it.

But it is not only income tax. If you do something as simple as walk in the store and buy a loaf of bread, the store owner makes a profit on that loaf of bread and, of course, part of that profit gets sent out here to Washington, and, you guessed it, it goes to help pay the interest on the Federal debt.

As a matter of fact, one dollar out of every six collected in taxes goes to paying the interest on the Federal debt. So the real problem with this picture is that there are real people out there, real families out there, that are paying \$580 a month to do nothing but pay the interest on the debt.

It would be logical to ask the question, how in the world did we get into this mess and didn't anybody try to correct it in the past?

I wanted to talk specifically about the past, the past. Let me define the past to be pre-1995. Again, this is very specific, what we are talking about here. The American people were promised a balanced budget repeatedly. This is not news that all of a sudden we have a \$5 trillion debt staring us in the face. As a matter of fact, the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill, first passed in 1985, promised the American people a balanced budget in 1991. Well, we look at the deficit line in this chart, and what actually happened, and it is clear that the promise made from Washington was broken.

The promise was not kept. But they knew what to do. When they couldn't keep the first promise, Washington made a series of new promises. Again, I emphasize this is the past. This is what led many of us into leaving the private sector and coming to Washington.

This blue line shows the fixed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill, and it was promising a balanced budget in 1993. I think that 1992 and 1993, those are real important dates to look at out there because, you see, when the budget was supposed to be balanced, instead we had huge and growing deficits. So rather than balance the budget as was promised then under this bill, when we got to the early 1990's, instead we had huge, growing deficits.

So what did Washington do? In 1993, passed the biggest tax increase in American history. Washington looked at this picture and concluded that the right answer was to reach into the pockets of the American people and take more money out of their pockets and bring it out here to Washington.

Why would they do that? Well, because if they take more money out of the pockets of the American people and bring it out here to Washington, they can keep their Washington spending programs going and still bring the deficit down. You see, that is what the tax increase of 1993 was all about.

To pass the tax increase of 1993, what it really allowed them to do is keep spending going out here in Washington. Again I emphasize, this is the past, because in 1994, the American people decided to change what was going on in Washington, D.C. In 1994, the people for the first time in many, many, many years elected a Republican House of Representatives and a Republican Senate. This history of broken promises, this history of tax increases, that changed in 1995.

We had this theory when we came here in 1995 that went like this: Rather than raising taxes on the people and taking more money out here to Washington, why don't we slow the growth of spending here in Washington, have fewer Washington spending programs and get to a balanced budget, because Washington is spending less, not because they are taking more money out of the pockets of the American people. That was our theory.

Our theory went like this: If we can just get Washington to spend less money, that means they would borrow less money out of the private sector. If they borrowed less money out of the private sector, of course, that means more money available in the private sector; more money available in the private sector, the law of supply and demand is straightforward, the interest rates stay down.

So if we could just get Washington to spend less money, they would borrow less money. That would leave more money available in the private sector, and with more money available, the interest rates would stay down. If the interest rates stayed down, our theory was, people would buy more houses, buy more cars; and of course when people bought more houses and cars, that meant other people had to go to work building the houses and cars, and that meant job opportunities and less welfare and less cost to the Government

and more people paying taxes in. This was the 1995 theory.

I think it is more than fair that the American people should at this point start asking how did they do? How are the Republicans doing? They came here in 1995, laid down a plan to balance the budget in 7 years, how are they doing?

I think that is a legitimate question. I brought the next chart along to show exactly how the new Congress, since 1995, is doing. The red columns in this chart show the promises that were made in 1995. These are the deficit amounts that the Republican Congress said we would keep the deficit to in order to reach a balanced budget by the year 2002.

I am happy to say that in the first year, and this is in, this is not a promise, an empty promise, we not only hit our target, but we were about \$50 billion ahead of schedule.

So the good news is, in year one, the Republican plan not only hit our target, we were well ahead of schedule. Year two came. Year two, the change was significant. Washington borrowed over \$100 billion less than was projected out here until year two and it worked exactly the way the theory we had hoped would work.

That is when Washington borrowed less money, because their deficit was lower, that left \$100 billion more money available in the private sector; \$100 billion more in the private sector kept the interest rates down, and sure enough, it worked. People bought more houses and cars and stoves and refrigerators and all the other things that go with it, and that provided job opportunities so the unemployment rate dropped to the lowest level in years. That meant job opportunities for people. They went to work and started paying taxes in, and of course, that made the program go better.

The rest of this chart was kind of theory a few days ago. We found out recently that the theory was way too lacking the optimism that should be there because of the strong economy we are in. We are now finding we are going to reach a balanced budget, this blue column, the actual deficit is going to go to zero sometime between the year 1998 and the year 1999, 3 or 4 years ahead of the promise that was made by the Republicans back in 1995. Is this a change or what?

Before 1995, we had the broken promises of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and the higher taxes. Post-1995, well, we are 3 years into the plan and are now looking at balancing the budget 3 years ahead of schedule for the first time since 1969, and lowering taxes and restoring Medicare at the same time because the idea of constraining the growth of Washington spending works.

□ 2145

A lot of folks say, well, you are just plain lucky out there in Washington. You are just plain lucky. The economy is booming, and since the economy is booming there is more revenue coming

in, and you guys can get your job done and you all look great out there doing it, and everybody is bragging about it.

I brought with me a chart to show the actual facts on that particular argument as well, because I hear that quite a few different places that I go to. We have had booming economies in the past. In the past every time Washington went into a booming economy Washington subsequently went into booming spending cycles. In fact, all the extra revenue that came in, they spent it, so we never did get the deficit down. We never did get to a balanced budget.

In fact, this Congress since 1995 is very different. We are in a booming economy. Yes, the revenues are coming in stronger than expected. But rather than go and spend the extra money, this Congress has seen fit to slow the growth of Washington spending by over 40 percent at the same time the economy remains strong.

This is how fast Washington spending was growing before 1995. This is how fast it is growing since 1995 on through the year 2002. So let us make this very clear. In the face of a strong economy and more revenues coming in, instead of Washington doing what it has always done in the past, going and spending the extra money, what Washington did is at the same time the economy was strong they slowed the growth of Washington spending.

So in the face of a slowed growth of Washington spending and a strong economy, we hit our deficit targets, we are on track, we are ahead of schedule, and we are about to balance the budget for the first time since 1969, while at the same time lowering taxes and restoring Medicare.

For those that are interested in inflation-adjusted dollars, it is even more dramatic. The Washington spending was increasing by 1.8 percent. It has now been slowed to .6 percent. We are down to a point where Washington spending in real dollars has virtually stopped in terms of increasing spending. That is good news, and that is why we are also able to both balance the budget and reduce taxes at the same time for the good of the American people.

I brought one more chart with me that I think says it all, because a lot of people are saying, well, how can all of this stuff happen at the same time? You know, in fact, would this all have happened anyhow?

This chart shows what would have happened if when we got here back in 1995 we had played golf, tennis and basketball instead of doing our jobs. The deficit line that is shown here in the red, this is what we inherited when we got here, back in 1995. In fact, Members can see that the deficits were projected to go all the way up to \$350 billion at that point in time.

A lot of people remember 1995. They remember the 100 days. They remember the government shutdowns. They remember the hassles and what seemed

like a constant battle out here in Washington. I want to say something. I was here. It was a constant battle. It was worse here living through it than what the American people saw out there in public.

But at the end of 1995, we had made progress. This yellow line in the chart shows what the deficit projections were after one year of very difficult battles. The green line shows what we had hoped to do. We laid this out in 1995, and again, we hoped to get to that balanced budget by the year 2002.

The good news is here. The good news is what we have actually accomplished is below either one of those projections, and in fact we are now going to reach zero right here in the year 1998 or 1999. So not only are we not losing what was given to us in 1995 when we got here, but we are going to reach a balanced budget in 1998 or 1999 for the first time in more than a generation.

Again, I cannot emphasize this enough. The last time the budget was balanced I was a sophomore in high school. My son is now a junior in college, my daughter is a freshman in college, and my youngest is a freshman in high school. This is more than a full generation ago, the last time we balanced the Federal budget. It is great news for the future of this country.

I have been real upbeat and I have been real optimistic about this, as well we should be. We should be celebrating this first balanced budget in a generation; welfare reform, taxes coming down, Medicare restored, we should be celebrating this. But we would be remiss if we did not recognize that even after we got a balanced budget, we still have this \$5.3 trillion debt hanging over our head.

Remember, when we say the budget is balanced, that is just a checkbook. All we mean is that we are taking in as many dollars as we are spending in this given year. That does not pay this debt off. I have good news on that front, though, too. We are working on it. We have a plan on the table right now, it is called the National Debt Repayment Act.

What the plan does is this. It says after we reach a balanced budget, we recognize we still have this huge problem. We have a responsibility to future generations to do something about this problem. So after we reach a balanced budget, we are going to cap the growth of Washington spending at a rate of at least 1 percent under the rate of revenue growth. So spending is now going up slower than revenue growth.

With spending going up slower than the rate of revenue growth, if you start a balance, that creates a surplus. With the surplus, we take one-third of that surplus and provide additional tax cuts to the American people, so the American people should expect a tax cut every year from here on out. Two-thirds of it goes to repaying the Federal debt.

I have great news. If we were to enact this plan, by the year 2026 the entire

Federal debt would be repaid, and we would pass this Nation on to our children debt-free. But there is another hidden advantage to doing that. As we are paying down the Federal debt, the money that has been taken out of the Social Security Trust Fund would also be returned.

Social Security is collecting more dollars than it is paying back out to our senior citizens in benefits each year. As a matter of fact, this year alone the Social Security system will collect about \$70 billion more in tax revenue than what it is paying back out to our senior citizens in benefits.

The idea is that money is supposed to be set aside in a savings account so when the baby boom generation gets to retirement, you can go to the savings account, get the money, put it in the checkbook, and make good on the Social Security payments to our senior citizens.

That money, though, it is not in that savings account. That money is all part of this \$5.3 trillion debt. What Social Security is doing is instead of putting the money in the savings account, they are collecting the Social Security tax dollars, more than what they are paying out to seniors in benefits, they are putting all the money in the general fund, in the big government checkbook, if you like. They are writing out checks out of that checkbook, and of course there is no money left at the end. That is the deficit. Then they are simply putting an IOU down in the Social Security Trust Fund.

Under the National Debt Repayment Act, as we go about paying off the Federal debt, we would also be putting the money back into the Social Security Trust Fund. So under the National Debt Repayment Act, we create a surplus by slowing the growth of Washington spending, which we have already been successful doing.

We just continue what we have done for the last 2 years, continue it on forward. We create that surplus, we take one-third of the surplus and work to reduce taxes further each year for the American people. We take two-thirds and apply it to the Federal debt, and when we are repaying the debt, it is completely repaid by the year 2026, we are also restoring the Social Security Trust Fund.

Just think about this. It is not only the fact that we are doing the right thing, we are paying the bills we have run up over the last generation; it is not only that. It is not only that we are going to give this Nation to our children debt free.

It goes a step further. When the debt goes away \$1 out of every \$6 that the Federal Government is now spending no longer needs to be spent. That opens the door for huge tax cuts for the American people.

When we start talking about these tax cuts, let us talk about some of the possibilities here, because under the National Debt Repayment Act, as the debt gets paid down, lower interest

payments, the government needs less money, we can now talk about revamping the entire tax system.

I do not know how all of my colleagues feel and all the listeners this evening feel, but many of us do not like the fact that the IRS is so complicated it is almost impossible to understand. In all fairness, the new Tax Code did not make it any easier. It did lower taxes. We should not complain about the fact that taxes are coming down. But the fact is the IRS is far too cumbersome and far too difficult to understand.

As we look at these tax cuts down the road, therefore, it gives us the opportunity to throw out the IRS as we know it and bring in a new tax system that would be a lot simpler than the one we have today. Until we get this in hand, we cannot do that.

So the good news under the National Debt Repayment Act, and again I would encourage all of my colleagues that are not already on board as co-sponsors to join us in the National Debt Repayment Act, what it does is it pays off the debt by the year 2026 so our children get this Nation debt-free, restores the Social Security trust fund for our senior citizens, and for those people in the work force today, for those people in the work force today, they should expect additional tax cuts each and every year as far as the eye can see. It is great news to the American people.

When we start thinking about the future tax cuts, I opened the hour here by talking about the fact that I had listened to a lot of people out there in Wisconsin. What the people told me when I listened to them is two tax cuts they were most interested in. The first one is the marriage tax penalty. This is just totally unfair in our society today. I could not find anybody who did not think we should not get rid of the marriage tax penalty.

That works like this. If you have 4 people all working in the same place at the same time earning exactly the same salary, but two of those people are married to each other and two of those people are not married to each other, the two people not married to each other pay less tax than the two people that are married to each other. That is called the marriage tax penalty, and that is just plain wrong. That is one thing I heard.

The other thing I heard repeatedly is, Mark, just simplify the entire Tax Code. Just make it a lot simpler. If you are going to do more tax cuts, for goodness sakes, just cut it across board. I can tell the Members, we are going to look forward to eliminating the marriage tax penalty and work towards an across-the-board tax cut for virtually all Americans out there. So whatever bracket you are in, it would be very easy to compute if your taxes went down by 5 percent or 10 percent or whatever the number is.

I would like to wrap up my part this evening by again going back and just

comparing the past, the present, and the future.

The past: broken promises of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings bill, the higher taxes of 1990, 1993; especially 1993, the biggest tax increase in American history, taxes went up with a gasoline tax increase. For those who were not paying real close attention, the discussion went like, well, that tax increase is only on the rich. But you were rich if you bought gasoline at a gas pump, because it went up 4.3 cents a gallon.

So the tax increases of 1993, the broken promises of a balanced budget of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, all of these deficits that ran up this huge 5.3 trillion dollar debt, that is all in the past. In 1994, the American people, and the credit should go to the American people, the American people changed what was going on. They sent a new group out here to run Washington.

Under that new group, where are we at? I think it is a fair question to ask, where are we at? We are in the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget. We are not only on track, we are ahead of schedule. We will have our first balanced budget since 1969 next year, three or four years ahead of what was promised back in 1995. So for the first time since 1969 the budget will be balanced. It has changed here in Washington. Instead of the broken promises of the past, we will have a balanced budget for the first time.

How about the higher taxes of 1993? That is not happening under this Congress, either. As a matter of fact, taxes are coming down. Just to run through that list of tax cuts and what is all in this bill, again, just briefly, \$500 per child, starting—it is \$400 next year and goes up to \$500 the year after; capital gains going from 28 to 20, or even to 10, depending on your income bracket. If you sell your home, it is your principal residence, you have lived there for 2 years, in general there will be no taxes on the sale of your home. However old you are, the one-time exclusion age 55 is no longer there.

Grandparents, parents, to save up for your children's education you can put up to \$500 per year per child into a savings account. The interest accumulates tax-free. College tuition for most freshmen and sophomores out there, the parents are going to keep \$125 a month more. That is \$125 a month more if you have a freshman or sophomore in college, in most cases you keep that money in your house. You earned it. It is not a gift. You earned it. It is your money. You keep it instead of sending it out here to Washington. \$1,500 is the total for freshmen or sophomores, \$1,500, and in most cases for a junior or senior it is \$1,000 that you keep in your own home.

If you are in a pension fund today, wherever you are, if you are saving for retirement, if you would like to increase the amount that you are saving for your retirement, there is a new IRA called the Roth IRA that most every-

body watching tonight, my colleagues, are eligible for. You can put up to \$2,000 per year per person into the Roth IRA for a husband and wife, \$4,000 a year you put in after-tax dollars, which means you have already paid taxes on that money. But the good news is the interest accumulates tax-free, and when you take it out, it is tax-free completely. So you put the money in, it accumulates, and at retirement when you take the money out it is tax-free.

For young folks, if you want to save up to buy a house or college education, put money into an IRA type account and you are allowed to take it out without the penalty. For small businesses, and I may not have mentioned this one earlier, the health care deduction for self-employed people is going all the way up to 100 percent over a period of years.

Death taxes are reformed. Ninety percent of farms are passed from one generation to another with no taxes paid. Businesses, family owned businesses will pass on to the next generation in many cases without taxes so the jobs can stay there in the community.

The point of this is we are in a very, very changed Washington, DC. The tax hike of 1993 versus the tax cut of 1997, that is dramatically different. There has been a dramatic change that has been brought on by the American people, sending a new group out here to control the House and Senate, and the American people have a right to understand just how far we have come.

The present: a balanced budget for the first time since 1969. The present, tax cuts, the first time in 16 years. The present: Medicare restored for our senior citizens. The present: welfare recipients, able-bodied welfare recipients having the opportunity to work so they have a chance at a job promotion and a better life for themselves and their families. That is the present. It is very, very different than it was just a couple of short years ago out here. I do not believe the American people fully understand the magnitude of the change yet. That is the present.

Where are we going? Well, even after we get the budget balanced, even after we started with the first tax reduction in 16 years, Medicare restored for a decade, we still have a \$5.3 trillion debt hanging over our heads.

□ 2200

We have introduced the National Debt Repayment Act, which would repay the debt in its entirety by the year 2026, giving this Nation to our children debt-free. It would restore the Social Security Trust Fund for our senior citizens and, as it creates surpluses by controlling the growth of Washington spending, one-third of those surpluses would be used to provide additional tax cuts.

Think what a changed environment this is: The budget is balanced, taxes coming down, and a plan on the table

that actually talks about paying off the Federal debt, instead of how we are going to stop borrowing this money. What a changed country this is.

We as the American people should start having optimistic visions of the future again for our children. Growth, opportunities, our kids are going to have opportunities in America just like we did to start from scratch and build a company from the ground up, or do what they want to do in this society. Those opportunities will once again be there because instead of passing them an ever growing debt, instead of giving them a legacy of virtual bankruptcy, we are now in a position to talk seriously about repaying the debt, passing the Nation on to our children debt-free, restoring Social Security for our senior citizens, and additional tax cuts for people in the work force today.

That is what this is all about, and I sincerely hope that is what my service to this country is all about, because it is a worthwhile endeavor if we reach those goals.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SCHIFF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, on September 4.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, on September 4.

Mr. HOEKSTRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CAMPBELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today and on September 4 and 5.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on September 9.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on September 4.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAYNE, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. ROEMER.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

Ms. MALONEY of New York.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. NADLER.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. DICKS.

Mr. PASCRELL.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. NEAL.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

Ms. SANCHEZ.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Mr. CLAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. HAYWORTH.

Mr. NEY.

Mr. SHIMKUS.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. GREENWOOD.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

Mr. CALVERT.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NEUMANN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. ETHERIDGE.

Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. KIND.

Mr. ENGEL.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1120. An act to provide for a consultant for the President pro tempore; to the Committee on House Oversight.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that

committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 408. An act to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes.

H.R. 584. An act for the relief of John Wesley Davis.

H.R. 1198. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the City of Grants Pass, Oregon.

H.R. 1585. An act to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1944. An act to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon.

H.R. 2014. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

H.R. 2015. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On August 1, 1997:

H.R. 2014. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(2) and (d) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

H.R. 2015. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (c) of section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998.

H.R. 1198. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Grants Pass, Oregon.

H.R. 584. An act for the relief of John Wesley Davis.

H.R. 1944. An act to provide for a land exchange involving the Warner Canyon Ski Area and other land in the State of Oregon.

H.R. 1585. An act to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes.

On August 4, 1997:

H.R. 408. An act to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to support the International Dolphin Conservation Program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 4, 1997, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various committees, House of Representatives, during the 1st and 2d quarters of 1997 in connection with official foreign travel, a consolidated report of Speaker authorized travel in the 2d quarter of 1997, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, as well as foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various miscellaneous groups, House of Representatives, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Sanford Bishop	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Helen Chenoweth	3/26	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Michael Crapo	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Earl Hilliard	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Collin Peterson	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Robert F. Smith	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.49		169.49
Hon. Charles Stenholm	3/23	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Andrew Baker	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Sharla Moffett	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Michael Nevada	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Bryce Quick	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Jason Vaillancourt	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Paul Unger	3/22	3/28	Canada						169.48		169.48
Committee total									2,203.30		2,203.30

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB SMITH, Chairman, July 23, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Visit to Israel, Jordan, Egypt and Morocco:											
Hon. Terry Everett	1/11	1/13	Israel		417.00						417.00
	1/13	1/14	Jordan		251.00						251.00
	1/14	1/17	Egypt		701.00						701.00
Commercial airfare							2,743.68				2,743.68
Committee total					1,369.00		2,743.68		0.00		4,112.68

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman, July 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Terry Everett	5/8	5/10	Nicaragua		468.50		( <sup>3</sup> )				468.50
Hon. Robert F. Smith	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Hon. Richard Pombo	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Hon. Bill Barrett	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Paul Unger	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Bryce Quick	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
	5/28	6/1	Philippines		1,188.00						1,188.00
Kevin Kramp	5/24	5/28	Thailand		570.00		3,972.95				4,542.95
Committee totals					11,016.50		23,837.70				34,854.20

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

BOB SMITH, July 23, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Sean Peterson	4/4	4/8	Johannesburg, South Africa		1,035.00						1,035.00
	4/9	4/11	Harare, Zimbabwe		585.00						585.00
	4/12	4/15	London, England		1,284.00		7,229.25				8,513.25
Armando Falcon	5/9	5/14	Fukouka, Japan		1,295.00		4,646.95				5,941.95
Hon. Mark Foley	6/12	6/16	Port-au-Prince, Haiti		892.00		542.45				1,434.45
Committee totals					\$5,091.00		\$12,418.65				\$17,509.65

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM LEACH, Chairman, July 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Robert Taub	6/10	6/15	Denmark		661.96		2,118.29		16.45		2,796.70
John T. Griffin	5/18	5/22	United Kingdom		403.63		736.65		42.02		1,182.30
Joseph F. Jakub III	5/18	5/21	United Kingdom		563.47		779.28		9.35		1,352.10
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		313.33		3116.67		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		3111.11		3116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Hon. Mark E. Souder	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		313.33		3116.67		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		3111.11		3116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Marshall Sanford	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		313.33		3116.67		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		3111.11		3116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Hon. Bob Barr	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		313.33		3116.67		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		3111.11		3116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Rod R. Blagojevich	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		313.33		3116.67		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		3111.11		3116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Robert Charles	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		313.33		3116.67		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		3111.11		3116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Sean Littlefield	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		313.33		3116.67		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		3111.11		3116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Kevin Long	5/23	5/24	Panama		179.00		313.33		3116.67		228.44
	5/24	5/26	Colombia		636.00		3111.11		3116.67		863.78
	5/27	5/28	Bolivia		298.00		37.14		47.67		382.81
	5/29	6/1	Peru		770.00		118.92		150.15		1,039.07
Committee total					16,693.06		5,878.22		2,872.62		\$25,443.90

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Estimates only; information not available from State Department.

DAN BURTON, Chairman, July 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Visit to Panama, Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina and Chile:											
Hon. Floyd D. Spence	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Hon. Herbert H. Bateman	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Hon. Howard "Buck" McKeon	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Hon. John M. McHugh	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	3/30	Argentina		416.00						416.00
Commerical airfare							2,987.85				2,987.85
Dr. Andrew K. Ellis	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	3/30	Argentina		416.00						416.00
Commerical airfare							2,987.85				2,987.85
Andrea K. Aquino	3/21	3/23	Panama		358.00						358.00
	3/23	3/25	Venezuela		476.14						476.14
	3/25	3/29	Brazil		472.00						472.00
	3/29	4/01	Argentina		822.00						822.00
	4/01	4/04	Chile		898.00						898.00
Delegation expenses	3/21	3/23	Panama					106.30			106.30
	3/25	3/29	Brazil					370.18	2,621.70		2,991.88
	3/29	4/01	Argentina					815.00	3,941.61		4,756.61
Visit to China:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	3/24	3/28	China		954.00						954.00
Commerical airfare							3,986.95				3,986.95
Visit to Panama:											
Gene Taylor	4/01	4/04	Panama		254.00						254.00
Commerical airfare			Panama				2,026.95				2,026.95
George O. Withers	4/01	4/04	Panama		254.00						254.00
Commerical airfare							1,400.95				1,400.95
Visit to Italy, Bosnia, Albania, and Germany:											
Hon. Sonny Bono	4/19	4/21	Italy		275.00						254.00
	4/20	4/20	Bosnia		0.00						0.00
	4/21	4/21	Albania		0.00						0.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997—  
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commerical airfare .....	3/21	4/22	Germany .....		75.00		6,765.35				75.00 6,765.35
Committee totals .....					20,386.98		21,341.08		6,669.61		48,397.67

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD SPENCE, Chairman, July 31, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Kristi E. Walseth .....	5/29	6/1	Germany .....		\$650						650.00
Commercial airfare .....							3,434.65				3,434.65
Committee total .....											4,084.65

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JERRY B.H. SOLOMON, Chairman, July 10, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner .....	4/1	4/5	China .....		973.50		4,773.95				5,747.45
Philip Kiko .....	4/5	4/7	Japan .....		636.00						636.00
.....	4/1	4/5	China .....		973.50		4,773.95				5,747.45
.....	4/5	4/7	Japan .....		636.00						636.00
Hon. George Brown .....	3/29	4/5	Mexico .....		1,736.50		947.92				2,684.42
Michael Quear .....	3/29	4/5	Mexico .....		1,736.50		775.92				2,512.42
Committee total .....					6,692.00		11,271.74				17,963.74

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Chairman, July 17, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Bill Archer .....	5/29	6/2	Russia .....		1,103.00		2,384.95		396.63		3,884.58
Hon. Mac Collins .....	5/29	6/2	Russia .....		1,450.00		2,384.95				3,834.95
Hon. Barbara B. Kennelly .....	5/29	6/2	Russia .....		1,450.00		2,384.95				3,834.95
Hon. Wally Herger .....	5/29	6/2	Russia .....		1,450.00		2,384.95				3,834.95
Committee Total .....					5,453.00		9,539.80		396.63		15,389.43

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman, July 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Michael Sheehy .....	4/18	4/19	Europe .....		317.00						317.00
Commercial airfare .....							3,414.35				3,414.35
Thomas Newcomb .....	4/18	4/25	Europe .....		1,970.00						1,970.00
Commercial airfare .....							3,035.15				3,035.00
Patrick Murphy .....	4/18	4/25	Europe .....		1,970.00						1,970.00
Commercial airfare .....							3,035.15				3,035.15
Wendy Selig .....	4/23	4/25	Europe .....		468.00						468.00
Commercial airfare .....							2,634.45				2,634.45
Hon. Julian Dixon .....	5/8	5/10	Central America .....		468.50						468.50
Calvin Humphrey .....	5/8	5/10	Central America .....		468.50						468.50
SWendy Selig .....	5/8	5/10	Central America .....		468.50						468.50
CODEL Expenses .....								250.00			250.00
Hon. Norm Dicks .....	5/23	5/30	Europe .....		2,073.000						2,073.00
Commercial airfare .....							3,368.25				3,368.25
Michael Sheehy .....	5/23	5/25	Europe .....		642.00						642.00
Commercial airfare .....							3,849.25				3,849.25
Committee total .....					8,845.50		19,336.60		250.00		28,432.10

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PORTER J. GOSS, Chairman, July 18, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ASIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 24 AND APR. 2, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Newt Gingrich	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. John Dingell	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Bob Livingston	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Chris Cox	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Jeff Jefferson	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Al Hastings	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Jay Kim	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Ed Royce	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Bill Livingood	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Arne Christenson	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Gardner Peckham	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Rachel Robinson	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Ben Cohen	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Barry Jackson	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Christina Martin	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Bob Hathaway	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Adm./Dr. John Eisold	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Dwight Comedy	3/24	3/26	Korea	268,400	305.00					536,800	610.00
Hon. Newt Gingrich	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. John Dingell	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Bob Livingston	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Chris Cox	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Jeff Jefferson	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Al Hastings	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Jay Kim	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Ed Royce	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Bill Livingood	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Arne Christenson	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Gardner Peckham	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Rachel Robinson	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Ben Cohen	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Barry Jackson	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Christina Martin	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Bob Hathaway	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Adm./Dr. John Eisold	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Dwight Comedy	3/26	3/27	Hong Kong	3,049.56	394.00					3,049.56	394.00
Hon. Newt Gingrich	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. John Dingell	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Bob Livingston	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Chris Cox	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Jeff Jefferson	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Al Hastings	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Jay Kim	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Ed Royce	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Bill Livingood	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Arne Christenson	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Gardner Peckham	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Rachel Robinson	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Ben Cohen	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Barry Jackson	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Christina Martin	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Bob Hathaway	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Adm./Dr. John Eisold	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Dwight Comedy	3/27	3/30	China	2,111.40	255.00					6,334.20	765.00
Hon. Newt Gingrich	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. John Dingell	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Bob Livingston	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Chris Cox	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Jeff Jefferson	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Al Hastings	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Jay Kim	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Ed Royce	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Hon. Mark Foley	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Bill Livingood	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Arne Christenson	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Gardner Peckham	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Rachel Robinson	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Ben Cohen	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Barry Jackson	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Christina Martin	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Bob Hathaway	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Adm./Dr. John Eisold	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Dwight Comedy	3/30	4/2	Japan	37,376.69	304.00					112,130	912.00
Committee Total					6,688.00						20,064.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

NEWT GINGRICH, May 2, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO RUSSIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 27 AND MAY 31, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Curt Weldon	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Hon. Lindsey Graham	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO RUSSIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 27 AND MAY 31, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Roger Wicker	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Hon. Jay Dickey	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Hon. Charles Taylor	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00		2,560.15				3,940.15
Hon. Steny Hoyer	5/27	5/30	Russia		1,000.00		3,460.95				4,460.95
Hon. Corrine Brown	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Hon. Owen Pickett	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Douglas Ritter	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Cory Alexander	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Marlene Kaufmann	5/27	5/30	Russia		1,000.00		3,460.95				4,460.95
David Trachtenberg	5/27	5/31	Russia		1,380.00						1,380.00
Committee total					15,800.00		9,482.05				25,282.05

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CURT WELDON, June 22, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO JAPAN AND NORTH KOREA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 3, AND APR. 8, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Rick Carne	4/3	4/8	Japan, N. Korea		1,350.00		4,627.95				5,977.95
Committee total					1,350.00		4,627.95				5,977.95

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICK CARNE, May 1, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO ESTONIA, LATVIA, POLAND AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 25 AND APR. 4, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
William R. Teator	3/25	3/27	Estonia		612.00						612.00
		3/27	Latvia		245.00						245.00
		3/31	Poland	1,599.04	526.00						1,599.04
		4/1	Czech Republic		564.00						564.00
Committee total					1,947.00						1,947.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

WILLIAM R. TEATOR, April 21, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO BARBADOS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 9 AND MAY 11, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Carlos Romero-Barceló	5/9	5/11	Barbados		1,261.23		599.05				1,861.18
Committee total					1,261.23		599.95				1,861.18

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CARLOS ROMERO-BARCELÓ, June 9, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO ESTONIA, LATVIA, POLAND AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 13 AND MAY 16, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Gretchen E. DeMar	5/13	5/16	Canada	1,044	3,755.97		351.90	107.15	150.00	1,251.15	3,905.97
Committee total					755.97		351.90		150.00		1,257.87

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> U.S. dollars equivalent based on rate of exchange applied by U.S. Consulate per Mr. H.J. Steemers for per diem and registration fee.

GRETCHEN E. DEMAR, June 5, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 26 AND JULY 1, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Amory Houghton, Jr.	6/27	7/1	Germany								
Hon. Donald Payne	6/27	6/29	Germany				4,693.65				4,693.65

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 26 AND JULY 1, 1997—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Carrie Meek	6/28	7/1	Germany				2,530.05				2,530.05
Hon. Charles Taylor	6/28	7/3	Germany				2,996.05				2,996.05
Robert W. Van Wicklin	6/27	7/1	Germany				3,356.05				3,356.05
Committee total							12,140.08				12,140.08

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

AMO HOUGHTON, July 30, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 24 AND JUNE 1, 1997

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Doug Bereuter	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
Hon. Floyd Spence	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Hon. Ralph Regula	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				972.00
Hon. Gerald Solomon	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
	5/27	5/28	Macedonia		136.00						
Hon. Tom Bliley	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Hon. Marge Roukema	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Hon. Herbert Bateman	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Hon. Joel Hefley	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Hon. Vernon Ehlers	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Hon. Scott McInnis	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Hon. Pat Danner	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
John Herzberg	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Jo Weber	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Rick Stafford	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Linda Pedigo	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/24	5/27	Slovenia		844.00						
Martin Stetzing	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				1,952.00
	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				972.00
Commercial airfare						1,564.00				1,564.00	
Jim Doran	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				972.00
Commercial airfare						2,295.00				2,295.00	
Ronald Lasch	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				972.00
Commercial airfare						2,295.00				2,295.00	
David Goldston	5/28	6/1	Luxembourg		972.00		(?)				972.00
Commercial airfare						2,295.00				2,295.00	
Committee total					34,140.00		8,449.00				42,589.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

DOUG BEREUTER, July 11, 1997.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4550. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Removal of U.S. Grade Standards and Other Selected Regulations [Docket Number FV-95-303] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4551. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Winter Pears Grown in Oregon, Washington, and California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-927-11FR] received August 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4552. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Dried Prunes Produced in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-993-1 IFR] received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4553. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Milk in the Texas Marketing Area; Suspension of Certain Provisions of the Order [DA-97-06] received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4554. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Reduced Assessment Rates for Specified Marketing Orders [Docket No. FV97-922-2 IFR] received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4555. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Irish Potatoes

Grown in Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California, and in All Counties in Oregon, Except Malheur County; Define Fiscal Period and Decrease Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-947-1 FIR] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4556. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Amendments to the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act [Docket Number FV96-351A] (RIN: 0581-AB48) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4557. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of Administrative Rules and Regulations Governing Issuance of Additional Allotment Base to New and Existing Producers [Docket No. FV97-985-1 FR] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4558. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Amended Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-981-4 FR] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4559. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fresh Peaches Grown in Georgia; Termination of Marketing Order No. 918 [Docket No. FV-97-918-1 FR] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4560. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Revision of Administrative Rules Pertaining to Delinquent Assessments [Docket No. FV97-920-1 FR] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4561. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Kiwifruit Grown in California; Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-920-3 IFR] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4562. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fresh Bartlett Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Reduced Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-931-2 IFR] received August 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4563. 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. FV97-911-1A FIR] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4564. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—National Arboretum [7 CFR Part 500] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4565. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Humane Treatment of Dogs; Tethering [Docket No. 95-078-2] (RIN: 0579-AA74) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4566. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health

Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Additions to the Quarantined Areas [Docket No.97-056-4] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4567. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Dominican Republic Because of Hog Cholera [Docket No. 97-084-1] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4568. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Designation of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 97-073-1] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4569. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Change in Disease Status of Italy, Except the Island of Sardinia, Because of African Swine Fever [Docket No. 97-002-2] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4570. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Herbicide Safener HOE-107892; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300517; FRL-5731-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4571. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bacillus Cereus Strain BP01; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-300526; FRL-5735-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4572. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Copper Octanoate; Tolerance Exemption [OPP-300524; FRL-5734-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4573. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300520; FRL-5732-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4574. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Coat Protein of Potato Virus Y and the Genetic Material Necessary for its production; Exemption from the requirement of a tolerance [OPP-300531; FRL-5738-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4575. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Replicase Protein of Potato Leaf Roll Virus and the Genetic Material Necessary for its production; Exemption from the requirement of a tolerance [OPP-300530; FRL-5738-3] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4576. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Myclobutanol; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300522 FRL-5732-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4577. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation; Receivers and Conservators (RIN: 3052-AB72) received August 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4578. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—1997 Marketing Quotas and Price Support Levels for Fire-Cured (type 21), Fire-Cured (types 22-23), Dark Air-Cured (types 35-36), Virginia Sun-Cured (type 37), and Cigar-Filler and Binder (types 42-44 and 53-55) Tobaccos (Commodity Credit Corporation) [Workplan Number 96-056] (RIN: 0560-AF03) received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4579. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Disaster Reserve Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AF11) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4580. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Macadamia Tree Crop Insurance Regulations; and Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Macadamia Tree Crop Insurance Provisions [7 CFR Part 456 and 457] received August 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4581. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—General Crop Insurance Regulations; and Common Crop Insurance Provisions [7 CFR Parts 403 and 457] received August 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4582. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Macadamia Nut Crop Insurance Regulations; and Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Macadamia Nut Crop Insurance Provisions [7 CFR Parts 455 and 457] received August 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4583. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Accounting Requirements for RUSElectric Borrowers (RIN: 0572-AB36) received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4584. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Securities Representing Investment of Customer Funds Held in Segregated Accounts by Futures Commission Merchants [17 CFR Part 1] received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4585. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to FY 1998 appropriations requests that would provide resources for the implementation of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 105-118); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4586. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting FY 1998 budget amendments for the Legislative Branch, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 105-120); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4587. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the FY 1998 appropriations requests for the Department of Commerce, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 105-121); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4588. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available appropriations of \$7,642,000 for the Department of the Treasury from the Treasury Counter-Terrorism Fund, pursuant to Public Law 104-208; (H. Doc. No. 105-123); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4589. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification of 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 nt.; to the Committee on National Security.

4590. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Secretary's Selected Acquisition Reports (SARS) for the quarter ending June 30, 1997, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on National Security.

4591. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on improvement of pricing policies for use of major range and test facility installations of the military departments, pursuant to Public Law 103-160, section 846(a) (107 Stat. 1723); to the Committee on National Security.

4592. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Department of Defense Newspapers, Magazines and Civilian Enterprise Publications (RIN: 0790-AG37) received August 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4593. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Single Process Initiative [DFARS Case 97-D014] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4594. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Cost Principles [DFARS Case 95-D714] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4595. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Application of Berry Amendment [DFARS Case 96-D333] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

4596. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's "Major" final rule—Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control (Regulation Y); Amendments to Restrictions in the Board's Section 20 Orders [Regulation Y; Docket No.R-0958] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4597. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Oman, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4598. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2002 resulting from passage of H.R. 1226, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on the Budget.

4599. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2002 resulting from passage of H.R. 1901, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on the Budget.

4600. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for OSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Longshoring and Marine Terminals (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) [Docket No. S-025] (RIN: 1218-AA56) received July 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4601. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits [29 CFR Part 4044] received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4602. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Occupant Crash Protection; Occupant Protection in Interior Impact (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket No. 74-14; Notice 121] (RIN: 2127-AG94) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4603. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Toxic Substances Control Act Test Guidelines [OPPTS-42193; FRL-5719-5] (RIN: 2070-AB76) received August 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4604. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Revisions to Tennessee SIP Chapter 1200-3-5 Visible Emissions [TN-142-9727(a); FRL-5872-9] received August 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4605. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO-028-1028; FRL-5875-7] received August 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4606. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee; Approval of Revisions to the Chattanooga/Hamilton County Portion of the Tennessee SIP Regarding Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), Nitrogen Oxides, Lead Emissions, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), and PM10 Revisions [TN-178-02-9724a; TN-179-01-9723a; FRL-5871-9] received August 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4607. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revision to the Illinois State Implementation Plan for Ozone [IL137-1a; FRL-5868-5] received August 7, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4608. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments: Flexibility and Streamlining [FRL-5871-4] (RIN: 2060-AG16) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4609. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Control of Air Pollution; Amendments to Emission Requirements Applicable to New Nonroad Spark Ignition Engines At or Below 19 Kilowatts and New Marine Spark Ignition Engines; Provisions for Replacement Engines and the Use of Two Stroke Engines on Certain Nonhandheld Equipment [FRL-5871-1] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4610. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Approval of Revisions to the SIP Regarding Emission Standards and Monitoring Requirements for Additional Control Areas [TN-171-01-9764a; FRL-5863-9] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4611. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Approval of Revisions to Maintenance Plan for Knox County, Tennessee [TN-150-01-9711a; FRL-5866-1] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4612. 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 Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; States of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska [FRL-5868-3] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4613. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [CA-179-0045a; FRL-5863-4] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4614. 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; Maine; (Hancock and Waldo Counties Ozone Maintenance Plan Revision—Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets) [ME47-01-7002a; A-1-FRL-5867-8] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4615. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District [CA-

173-0044a; FRL-5867-3] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4616. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Revisions to North Carolina SIP Involving Open Burning and Other Miscellaneous Rules [NC-82-9728(a); FRL-5863-6] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4617. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—New York: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Program Revisions [FRL-5870-8] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4618. 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; State of Maryland; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [MD037-3015; FRL-5864-8] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4619. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Modification of Significant New Use Rules for Certain Substances [OPPTS-50626A; FRL-5735-4] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4620. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona—Maricopa County PM-10 Nonattainment Area [AZ-69-0012; FRL-5867-9] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4621. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for Alaska [Alaska 001; FRL-5847-7] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4622. 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; State of Georgia; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [GA-34-2-9716; FRL-5865-9] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4623. 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; District of Columbia, New Source Review Program [DC032-2006; FRL-5864-4] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4624. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington [WA61-7136, WA64-7139a; FRL-5869-8] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4625. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and

Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Volatile Organic Compounds for the State of New Jersey [Region II Docket No. NJ17-2-169, FRL-5868-4] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4626. 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; Maryland; Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Degreasing Operations and Vehicle Refinishing, and Definition of Motor Vehicle [MD040-4014a and MD047-4014a; FRL-5867-5] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4627. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Chromium Emissions From Hard and Decorative Chromium Electroplating and Chromium Anodizing Tanks [AD-FRL-5872-7] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4628. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans (SIP); Texas; Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Increments for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM-10); Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes [TX60-1-7269; FRL-5870-1] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4629. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA-128-0043; FRL-5875-9] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4630. 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 Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, Louisiana; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [LA-39-1-7332a; FRL-5876-3] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4631. 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 NO<sub>x</sub> RACT Determinations for Individual Sources [SIPTRAX No. PA-4051a; FRL-5865-8] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4632. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO-029-1029; FRL-5875-4] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4633. 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 Plan,

South Carolina: Addition of Supplement C to the Air Quality Modeling Guidelines [SC-30-1-9645a; FRL-5877-1] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4634. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [CA 157-0046a; FRL-5881-1] received August 20, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4635. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [CA 034-0049a FRL-5880-4] received August 20, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4636. 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 (Hobbs, Tatum and Jal, New Mexico) [MM Docket No. 96-77, RM-8780, RM-8918] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4637. 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 (Idalou, Texas) [MM Docket No. 97-69, RM-9007] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4638. 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 (Clayton and Jena, Louisiana) [MM Docket No. 97-59, RM-8976] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4639. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—The Commission's Forfeiture Policy Statement and Amendment of Section 1.80 of the Rules to Incorporate the Forfeiture Guidelines [CI Docket No. 95-6] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4640. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Parts 2, 15, and 97 of the Commission's Rules To Permit Use of Radio Frequencies Above 40 GHz for New Radio Applications; International Harmonization of Frequency Bands Above 40 GHz; Petition of Sky Station International, Inc., for Amendment of the Commission's Rules To Establish Requirements for a Global Stratospheric Telecommunications Service in the 47.2-47.5 GHz and 47.9-48.2 GHz Frequency Bands [ET Docket No. 94-124, RM-8308; RM-8784] received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4641. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules To Provide for the Use of the 220-222 MHz

Band by the Private Land Mobile Radio Service [PR Docket No. 89-552] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4642. 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 (Shawsville, Virginia) [MM Docket No. 97-103, RM-9030] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4643. 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 (Mansura, Louisiana) [MM Docket No. 97-110, RM-9045] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4644. 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 (Cloudcroft, New Mexico) [MM Docket No. 96-257, RM-8966] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4645. 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 (Mount Horeb, Mazomanie and Dodgeville, Wisconsin) [MM Docket No. 97-10, RM-8984, RM-9033] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4646. 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 (St. Marks and Woodville, Florida) [MM Docket No. 96-142, RM-8829, RM-8873] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4647. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Section 254(k) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended [FCC 97-163] received August 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4648. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Correction to Ranges of Comparability for Clothes Washers (RIN: 3084-AA26) received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4649. 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. 95F-0170] August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4650. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Current Good Manufacturing Practice in Manufacturing, Processing, Packing, or Holding of Drugs; Revision of Certain Labeling Controls; Partial Extension of Compliance Date [Docket No. 88N-0320] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4651. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management Staff, Office of Policy, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Food and Cosmetic Labeling; Revocation of Certain Regulations [Docket No. 96N-0174] (RIN: 0910-AA69) received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4652. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting two final rules: "Statement of Principles and Policy for the Agreement State Program," and "Policy Statement On Adequacy and Compatibility of Agreement State Programs" received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4653. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Human Tissue Intended for Transplantation (Food and Drug Administration) [Docket No. 93N-0453] (RIN: 0910-AA40) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4654. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for \$1 million or more; the listing of all Letters of Offer that were accepted, as of June 30, 1997, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4655. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on chemical and biological weapons proliferation control efforts for the period of February 1, 1996 to January 31, 1997, pursuant to Public Law 102-182, section 308(a) (105 Stat. 1257); to the Committee on International Relations.

4656. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2751 nt.; to the Committee on International Relations.

4657. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination and certification regarding government actions to terminate chemical weapons proliferation activities of foreign persons, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2410c(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

4658. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on additional measures to confirm that the embargo on Iran prohibits all trade and investment activities by United States persons, wherever located, and to consolidate in one order the various prohibitions previously imposed to deal with the national emergency declared on March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); (H. Doc. No. 105-117); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4659. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the emergency regarding export control regulations is to continue in effect beyond August 19, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 105-119); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4660. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4661. A letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the Agency's classified Executive Summary and Annexes to the U.S. Arms Control and

Disarmament Agency's (ACDA) 1996 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2590; to the Committee on International Relations.

4662. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the 1996 Annual Report of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2590; to the Committee on International Relations.

4663. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an alternative plan for Federal civilian employee pay adjustments, to take effect in January 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5305(c)(1); (H. Doc. No. 105-122); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and ordered to be printed.

4664. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Census, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Census Designated Place (CDP) Program for Census 2000 [Docket No. 970728183-7183-01] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4665. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List [97-015] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4666. A letter from the Director of Benefits, Farm Credit Bank of Texas, transmitting the annual report for the Farm Credit Banks of Texas Thrift Plus Plan for the Year ended December 31, 1996, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4667. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation; Acquisition of Commercial Items [APD 2800.12A, CHGE 76] (RIN: 3090-AF86) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4668. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Office of Personnel Management (RIN: 3206-AG 87,3209-AA15) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4669. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semi-annual report on activities of the Office of 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.

4670. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4671. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Delegation of Royalty Management Functions to States (Minerals Management Service) (RIN: 1010-AC25) received July 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4672. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Temporary Conditional Approval of Tungsten-Iron Shot as Nontoxic for the 1997-98 Season (RIN: 1018-AE09) received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4673. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Framework for Early-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations (RIN: 1018-AE14) received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4674. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adult Education Program (Bureau of Indian Affairs) (RIN: 1076-AA15) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4675. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Logical Mining Units in General; LMU Application Procedures; LMU Approval Criteria; LMU Diligence; and Administration of LMU Operations [WO-320-1320-02-24-1A] (RIN: 1004-AD12) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4676. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—St. Croix National Scenic Riverway, Boating Operations (RIN: 1024-AC46) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4677. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 1997-98 Early Season (RIN: 1018-AE14) received August 27, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4678. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands (RIN: 1018-AE14) received August 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4679. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for Three Plants from the Channel Islands of Southern California (RIN: 1018-AD37) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4680. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Area 2A Commercial Fishery [Docket No. 961217359-7050-02; I.D. 080597A] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4681. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Framework 9 to the Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery Management Plan [Docket No. 970508108-7108-01; I.D. 022597B] (RIN: 0648-AJ62) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4682. 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 States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Adjustment from the Queets River to Leadbetter Point, WA [Docket No. 970429101-7101-01; I.D. 070297B] received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4683. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for 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; Amendment 9 [Docket No. 970311053-7139-02; I.D. 020397B] (RIN: 0648-AJ23) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4684. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations [Docket No. 970129015-7170-04; I.D. 031997B] (RIN: 0648-AI84) received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4685. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Western Pacific Crustacean Fisheries; Amendment 9; OMB Control Numbers [Docket No. 960401094-6183-02; I.D. 022296D] (RIN: 0648-AI32) received August 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4686. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 961204340-7087-02; I.D. 073097D] received August 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4687. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Scallop Fishery; Shelikof District of Registration Area K [Docket No. 970613138-7138-01; I.D. 080797B] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4688. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Shallow-water Species Fishery by Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 961126334-7025-02; I.D. 080897B] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4689. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Scallop Fishery; Closure in Registration Area Q [Docket No. 970613138-7138-01; I.D. 081397A] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4690. A letter from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Species; Listing of Several Evolutionary Significant Units (ESUs) of West Coast Steelhead [Docket No. 960730210-7193-02; I.D. 050294D] (RIN: 0648-XX65) received August 26, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4691. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Northern Anchovy Fishery; Quotas for the 1997-98 Fishing Year [Docket No. 970813196-7196-01; I.D. 073197A] received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4692. A letter from the Acting 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; End of the Primary Season and Resumption of Trip Limits for the Shore-based Whiting Sector [Docket No. 961227373-6373-01; I.D. 082097C] received August 21, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4693. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Indiana Regulatory Program [SPATS No. IN-136-FOR; State Program Amendment No. 95-4] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4694. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Indiana Regulatory Program [SPATS No. IN-138-FOR; State Program Amendment No. 95-3 II] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4695. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—North Dakota Regulatory Program [ND-036-FOR, Amendment No. XXIV] received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4696. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Coal Moisture (RIN:1029-AB78) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4697. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting the Office's final rule—Kentucky Regulatory Program [KY-211-FOR] received September 2, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Pension and Welfare Benefits, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Rule Relating to Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties (RIN: 1210-0056) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4699. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the Clifton, Arizona Local Flood Protection Project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4700. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the Federal navigation project at Santa Barbara Harbor, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting volume II of the annual report on civil works activities for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4702. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Small Railroads; Policy Statement on Enforcement Program (Federal Railroad Administration)

[FRA Docket No. SBR97-1, Notice 1] (RIN: 2130-AB15) received August 8, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4703. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passenger Origin-Destination Survey Reports [Docket No. OST-95-744] (RIN: 2139-AA04) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4704. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F28 Mark 0100 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-NM-149-AD; Amdt. 39-10100; AD 97-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4705. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commercial Passenger-Carrying Operations in Single-Engine Aircraft under Instrument Flight Rules (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28743; Amdt. No. 135-70] (RIN: 2120-AG22) received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4706. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW2000 Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-ANE-25-AD; Amdt. 39-10094, AD 97-11-51 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 11, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4707. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-NM-137-AD; Amdt. 39-10090; AD 97-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4708. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-221-AD; Amdt. 39-10089; AD 97-15-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4709. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche Rinaldo Piaggio S.p.A. Model P-180 Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-CE-56-AD; Amdt. 39-10088; AD 97-15-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4710. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Avco Lycoming and Textron Lycoming Reciprocating Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-ANE-26-AD; Amdt. 39-10085; AD 97-15-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4711. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Adminis-

tration) [Docket No. 28982; Amdt. No. 1811] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4712. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28981; Amdt. No. 1810] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4713. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28983; Amdt. No. 1812] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4714. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alteration of Jet Route (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 94-ASW-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4715. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Assateague Channel, Chincoteague, Virginia (Coast Guard) [CGD05-97-012] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4716. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Port Canaveral, FL (Coast Guard) [COTP JACKSONVILLE 97-035] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4717. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100 and -200 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-NM-152-AD; Amdt. 39-10102; AD 97-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4718. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of the Legal Description of the Dallas/Fort Worth Class B Airspace Area; TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-ASW-11] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 14, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4719. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; SD (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-AGL-19] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4720. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Grafton, ND (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-AGL-23] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4721. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of

Class E Airspace; Carlisle, AR (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-ASW-03] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4722. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Alice, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-ASW-05] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4723. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Ponca City, OK (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-ASW-06] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4724. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Athens, TX (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-ASW-07] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4725. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Altus, OK (Federal Aviation Administration) [Airspace Docket No. 97-ASW-09] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4726. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada PW100 Series Turbo Prop Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-ANE-32-AD; Amdt. 39-10107; AD 97-17-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4727. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Puritan-Bennett Aero Systems Co., Cone and Seal Assemblies, part numbers 210543 and 210543-01 (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-CE-75-AD; Amdt. 39-10113; AD 97-18-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4728. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-200 Series Turbofan Engines (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 97-ANE-08; Amdt. 39-10106; AD 97-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4729. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 95-NM-228-AD; Amdt. 39-10097; AD 97-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4730. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Railroad/Highway Projects (Federal Highway Administration) [FHWA Docket No. FHWA-97-2681]

(RIN: 2125-AD86) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4731. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials: Withdrawal of Radiation Protection Program Requirement (Research and Special Programs Administration) [Docket No. RSPA-97-2850 (HM-169B)] (RIN: 2137-AD08) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4732. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Inland Waterways Navigation Regulations—Temporary Reduction in Speed Limits on the St. Clair River, Great Lakes (Coast Guard) [CGD09-97-021] (RIN: 2115-AE84) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4733. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety and Security Zones; Presidential Visit, Martha's Vineyard, MA (Coast Guard) [CGD01 97-085] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4734. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety and Security Zones; Presidential Visit, Martha's Vineyard, MA (Coast Guard) [CGD01 97-082] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4735. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Norfolk Harbor, Elizabeth River, Norfolk, Virginia and Portsmouth, Virginia (Coast Guard) [CGD 05-97-007] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4736. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Hampton Offshore Challenge, Chesapeake Bay, Hampton, Virginia (Coast Guard) [CGD 05-97-065] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received August 28, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4737. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aviat Aircraft, Inc. Models S-1S, S-1T, S-2, S-2A, S-2S, and S-2B Airplanes (formerly known as Pitts Models S-1S, S-1T, S-2, S-2A, S-2S, and S-2B Airplanes) (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 96-CE-23-AD; Amdt. 39-10109; AD 97-17-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4738. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28992; Amdt. No. 1813] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4739. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard In-

strument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28994; Amdt. No. 1815] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4740. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (Federal Aviation Administration) [Docket No. 28993; Amdt. No. 1814] (RIN: 2120-AA65) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4741. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Water Quality Standards for Idaho [FRL-5864-2] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4742. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Nomenclature Changes in the Board's Regulations [STB Ex Parte No. 567] received August 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4743. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—*The May Department Stores Co. v. United States* [Citation: 36 Fed. Cl. 680 (1996)] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4744. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, First-out Inventories [Rev. Rul. 97-32] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4745. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Procedure for Changing a Method of Accounting under Section 263A (RIN: 1545-AQ94) received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4746. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 97-44] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4747. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Highly Compensated Employee Definition [Notice 97-45] received August 4, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4748. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Remedial Amendment Period (RIN: 1545-AV23) received August 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4749. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Allocations of Depreciation Recapture among Partners in a Partnership (RIN: 1545-AT32) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4750. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Medical Savings Accounts [Announcement 97-79] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4751. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Reduction in Certain Deductions of Mutual Life Insurance Companies [Rev. Rul. 97-35] received August 15, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4752. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Designated Private Delivery Services [Notice 97-50] received August 29, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4753. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit [Revenue Ruling 97-34] received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4754. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Electing Small Business Trusts [Notice 97-49] received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4755. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Taxation of fringe benefits [Revenue Ruling 97-33] received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4756. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rules for Property Produced in a Farming Business [TD 8729] (RIN: 1545-AV37) received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4757. A letter from the National Director, Tax Forms and Publications Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Filing Information Returns Magnetically/Electronically [Rev. Proc. 97-34] received August 25, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4758. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, United States Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Country of Origin Marking [T.D. 97-72] (RIN: 1515-AB82) received August 19, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4759. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Annual Report to the Congress on Foreign Economic Collection and Industrial Espionage, pursuant to Public Law 103-359, section 809(b) (108 Stat. 3454); to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

4760. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the eighty-second Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 154(k); jointly to the Committees on Commerce and the Judiciary.

#### 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:

*[Pursuant to the order of the House on July 31, 1997 the following report was filed on August 5, 1997]*

Mr. KOLBE: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2378. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for

the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted September 3, 1997]

Mr. KOLBE: Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental report on H.R. 2378. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-240, Pt. 2).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 700. A bill to remove the restriction on the distribution of certain revenues from the Mineral Springs parcel to certain members of the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians; with an amendment (Rept. 105-241). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 976. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain funds appropriated to pay judgment in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1903. A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to enhance the ability of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to improve computer security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 105-243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## 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:

[Submitted September 2, 1997]

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. BURN of North Carolina, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 2298. A bill to improve the regulation of radiopharmaceuticals; to the Committee on Commerce.

[Submitted September 3, 1997]

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2379. A bill to designate the Federal building and U.S. courthouse located at 251 North Main Street in Winston-Salem, NC, as the "Hiram H. Ward Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 2380. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to gambling on the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKS (for himself, Mr. METCALF, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DELUMS, Ms. FURSE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 2381. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to allow certain grant funds to be used to provide parent education; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 2382. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to change the discretionary spending limits to allow the 4.3 cents per gallon Federal gas tax redirected to the Highway Trust Fund to be spent on other domestic programs; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. EHLERS (for himself and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 2383. A bill to authorize the enforcement by State and local governments of certain Federal Communications Commission regulations regarding use of citizens band radio equipment; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 2384. A bill to prohibit reactivation of the high flux beam reactor at Brookhaven National Laboratory; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2385. A bill to repeal the provision providing for crediting the increase in excise taxes on certain tobacco products against payments made pursuant to tobacco industry settlement legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. SPENCE):

H.R. 2386. A bill to implement the provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act concerning the stability and security of Taiwan and United States cooperation with Taiwan on the development and acquisition of defensive military articles; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on National Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CAPPS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, Mr. McHALE, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 2387. A bill to repeal the provision crediting increased excise taxes on certain tobacco products against payments made pursuant to the tobacco industry settlement legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 2388. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the basic formula price for milk of the highest use classification under Federal milk marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 2389. A bill to authorize funding for the National Women's Business Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 2390. A bill to repeal the provision which credits the increase in the tobacco excise taxes enacted by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 against the payments due under the tobacco industry settlement agreement of June 20, 1997; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2391. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend and make uniform the repayment plans available under the various Federal student loan programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2392. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to place a limitation on habeas corpus relief that prevents retrial of an accused; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAXTON (by request):

H.R. 2393. A bill to approve a governing international fishery agreement between the United States and the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 2394. A bill to direct the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to transfer certain parcels of land located in the counties of Greene and Calhoun, IL; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CHRISTENSEN:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol rotunda for the Senate Thanksgiving Celebration; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Res. 217. Resolution recognizing the important contributions made by Americans of Austrian heritage; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE:

H. Res. 218. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of Ava Gardner; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH introduced a bill (H.R. 2395) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Elmo*; 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. 12: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 15: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 51: Ms. FURSE, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 59: Mr. POMBO, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 64: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 80: Mr. HOSTETTLER and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 108: Mr. OWENS and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 145: Mr. FARR of California, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. MANTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. COBURN, Ms.

- SANCHEZ, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 180: Mr. SHAYS.  
 H.R. 209: Mr. QUINN.  
 H.R. 211: Mr. FROST, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 301: Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 305: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 306: Mr. SABO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. DIXON.  
 H.R. 339: Mr. COMBEST and Mr. GRAHAM.  
 H.R. 404: Mr. RADANOVICH.  
 H.R. 438: Mr. LUTHER.  
 H.R. 480: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. GRAHAM.  
 H.R. 493: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mrs. KELLY.  
 H.R. 498: Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 530: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. NETHERCUTT.  
 H.R. 551: Mr. SHAYS.  
 H.R. 611: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. SANCHEZ.  
 H.R. 635: Mr. TALENT.  
 H.R. 641: Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H.R. 689: Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 695: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 758: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROGAN, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 777: Mr. COYNE, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. REYES, and Mr. TRAFICANT.  
 H.R. 789: Mr. ISTOOK.  
 H.R. 805: Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. NORWOOD.  
 H.R. 815: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 859: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mrs. EMERSON.  
 H.R. 864: Ms. CARSON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 869: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. GRAHAM.  
 H.R. 875: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. WEXLER.  
 H.R. 880: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mrs. NORTHUP.  
 H.R. 883: Mr. BOYD and Mr. YATES.  
 H.R. 906: Mr. MARTINEZ.  
 H.R. 919: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 925: Mr. FARR of California.  
 H.R. 1005: Mr. COX of California.  
 H.R. 1009: Mr. COMBEST.  
 H.R. 1023: Mr. PITTS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 1037: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.  
 H.R. 1050: Mr. CLAY and Mr. DIXON.  
 H.R. 1053: Mr. BAKER.  
 H.R. 1054: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. LATHAM.  
 H.R. 1059: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HORN, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. HYDE.  
 H.R. 1060: Mr. CAMP, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.  
 H.R. 1108: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky and Mr. PICKETT.  
 H.R. 1126: Mr. COYNE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
 H.R. 1132: Ms. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1134: Mr. JACKSON, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BAESLER, and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 1154: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.  
 H.R. 1158: Mr. PAPPAS.  
 H.R. 1164: Mr. CONDIT.  
 H.R. 1165: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 1171: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 1178: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1215: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 1218: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
 H.R. 1231: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1232: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 1241: Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. STENHOLM.  
 H.R. 1270: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.  
 H.R. 1345: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1371: Mr. HALL of Texas.  
 H.R. 1398: Mr. HALL of Texas.  
 H.R. 1415: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KLINK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. CAPPAS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. HEFLEY.  
 H.R. 1423: Ms. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1425: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 1427: Ms. STABENOW.  
 H.R. 1434: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 1437: Mr. WAXMAN.  
 H.R. 1450: Mr. TORRES and Ms. ESHOO.  
 H.R. 1456: Mr. COOK.  
 H.R. 1500: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.  
 H.R. 1507: Mr. SKAGGS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FORBES, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H.R. 1508: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. BAKER.  
 H.R. 1519: Mr. ACKERMAN and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.  
 H.R. 1531: Ms. FURSE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 1541: Mr. GILCHREST.  
 H.R. 1542: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. NORTHUP.  
 H.R. 1570: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.  
 H.R. 1571: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.  
 H.R. 1624: Mr. BALDACCI and Mr. GREEN.  
 H.R. 1636: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 1689: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. BAKER.  
 H.R. 1715: Mr. FOGLIETTA.  
 H.R. 1716: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 1719: Mr. SOLOMON.  
 H.R. 1733: Mr. EHLERS.  
 H.R. 1754: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.  
 H.R. 1773: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.  
 H.R. 1776: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.  
 H.R. 1788: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
 H.R. 1799: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. LEVIN.  
 H.R. 1827: Ms. CARSON.  
 H.R. 1832: Mr. LUTHER.  
 H.R. 1836: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. BERETER.  
 H.R. 1839: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. EVERETT.  
 H.R. 1842: Mr. MYRICK, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.  
 H.R. 1849: Mr. COBURN.  
 H.R. 1861: Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
 H.R. 1873: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 1874: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 1903: Mr. NETHERCUTT.  
 H.R. 1908: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
 H.R. 1951: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. HILLIARD.  
 H.R. 1962: Mr. PAPPAS.  
 H.R. 1970: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 1984: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BERRY, Mr. JOHN, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. ROGERS.  
 H.R. 2004: Mr. MANTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 2020: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WELLER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BALDACCI.  
 H.R. 2023: Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 2029: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
 H.R. 2034: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, and Mr. MINGE.  
 H.R. 2072: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. REYES, and Mr. LAMPSON.  
 H.R. 2085: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DELLUMS.  
 H.R. 2103: Mr. SKEEN.  
 H.R. 2110: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 2113: Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. WICKER.  
 H.R. 2116: Mr. CLAY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. CARSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FAZIO of California, and Mrs. CLAYTON.  
 H.R. 2121: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. PAYNE.  
 H.R. 2122: Mr. GIBBONS.  
 H.R. 2140: Mr. WAMP, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. SANCHEZ.  
 H.R. 2145: Mr. PARKER.  
 H.R. 2185: Mr. MARTINEZ, and Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 2221: Mr. BARTON of Texas.  
 H.R. 2231: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. MCINTOSH.  
 H.R. 2232: Mr. COX of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, and Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 2250: Mr. NEY, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.  
 H.R. 2251: Mr. DELLUMS.  
 H.R. 2263: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COOK, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. LAZIO of New York.  
 H.R. 2283: Mr. DICKS, Mr. QUINN, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.  
 H.R. 2290: Mr. GEJDESON.  
 H.R. 2317: Mr. TORRES, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.  
 H.R. 2321: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. SNOWBARGER, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. PORTER.  
 H.R. 2329: Mr. TAUZIN.  
 H.R. 2369: Mr. MANTON.  
 H.J. Res. 66: Mr. WYNN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr.

BECCERRA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. FORD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.J. Res. 89: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. YATES, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. MCHALE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. COOK.

H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. WATERS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. REYES, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. RIGGS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H. Con. Res. 96: Ms. FURSE.

H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. PORTER and Mr. NEY.

H. Con. Res. 114: Ms. FURSE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 127: Mr. Burton of Indiana, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Con. Res. 134: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COOK, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. REYES, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H. Res. 16: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SABO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LUTHER.

H. Res. 37: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. LUTHER.

H. Res. 83: Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Res. 139: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. COOK.

H. Res. 171: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mrs. LOWEY.

#### 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. 1031: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2332: Mr. BOEHNER.

#### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. CRANE

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 79, strike lines 8 through 21.

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

*(Substitute Amendment for Amendment No. 24)*

AMENDMENT NO. 29: In the item relating to "HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES", insert after the first dollar amount (before the comma) "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

In the item relating to "CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION—DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING", insert after the first dollar amount (before the comma) "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 30: In the item relating to "Department of Education—EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED", AFTER THE FOURTH DOLLAR AMOUNT, INSERT THE FOLLOWING "(INCREASED BY \$200,000,000)".

In the item relating to "Department of Education—Education for the Disadvantaged", after the eighth dollar amount, insert the following "(reduced by \$150,000,000)".

In the item relating to "Department of Education—Education Research Statistics, and Improvement", after the first dollar amount, insert the following "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

In the item relating to "Department of Education—Education Research Statistics, and Improvement", after the second dollar amount, insert the following "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. RIGGS

AMENDMENT NO. 31: Page 102, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 516. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMISSIONS PREFERENCES IN PUBLIC EDUCATION.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Education to withhold any financial assistance, or to impose, administer, or enforce any other penalty, sanction, or remedy, for the refusal or failure of a Federal grant recipient to enforce a preference or affirmative action plan based on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin for admissions to public educational institutions.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The limitation established in subsection (a) shall apply only to Federal grant recipients located in a State in which the enforcement of such preference or plan is prohibited by the laws of the State or by an order of a Federal court.

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. RODRIGUEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 32: Page 66, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$8,834,000)".

Page 67, line 2, after "Act" insert ", \$34,388,000 shall be for comprehensive regional assistance centers under title XIII of said Act".

H.R. 2264

OFFERED BY: MR. RODRIGUEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 66, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$33,970,000)".

Page 67, line 2, after "Act" insert ", \$59,524,000 shall be for comprehensive regional assistance centers under title XIII of said Act".