

his proclamation establishing a national monument in Utah, he again tried to do what he had been unable to achieve through Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the founders expected national policy to be the result of open and full debate, hammered out by the legislative and executive branches. They believed in careful deliberation conducted in a representative assembly, subject to all the checks and balances that characterize our constitutional system. Having broken with England in 1776, they rejected government by monarchy and one-man rule. Nowhere in the Constitution is the President specifically given authority to issue these directives. The founders specifically placed all legislative powers in the Congress.

In the legislative veto decision in 1983, *INS vs. Chadha*, the Supreme Court insisted that congressional power be exercised "in accordance with a single, finely wrought and exhaustively considered, procedure." The Court said that the records of the Philadelphia Convention and the states ratification debates provide "unmistakable expression of a determination that legislation by the national Congress be a step-by-step, deliberate and deliberative process."

If Congress is required to follow this rigorous process, how absurd it is to argue that the President can accomplish the same result by unilaterally issuing an Executive Order or presidential proclamation. The President's controversial use of presidential directives skirt the constitutional process, offend the values announced by the court in the legislative veto case, and do serious damage to our commitment to representative government and the rule of law.

It is time to clarify the scope of executive authority vested in the presidency by Article II of the Constitution. Through its ability to authorize programs and appropriate funds, Congress can define and limit presidential powers. As Members, we must participate in our fundamental duty of overseeing executive policies, passing judgment on them, and behaving as the legislative branch should.

Mr. Speaker, the road to tyranny does not begin by egregious usurpations, but by those which appear logical and meant to gain public support. We must not be lulled into complacency by these, because with absolute certainty, the ones that come later will be aimed directly at our fundamental liberties and representative self-government.

Remember, eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

NAVY'S HANDLING OF VESSEL REPAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring up an issue which I

brought up earlier last week and which I continue to fight, and that is that the U.S. Navy has done it again.

The day before yesterday I was informed that yet another U.S. naval vessel, the USNS *Kiluea*, is going to be sent to a South Korean shipyard for scheduled maintenance. The USNS *Kiluea* is one of several U.S. flagged Navy vessels that transport ammunition to our surface fleet, and recently the USNS was stationed with U.S. forces operating in and around the peacekeeping mission in East Timor.

Several weeks ago, the Navy and the Military Sealift Command issued a Far East request for proposal seeking bids for ship repair work on the USNS *Kiluea*.

□ 1815

To the surprise of no one, the bid that won was a foreign shipyard because it can dramatically underbid U.S. shipyards. And so once again, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy and MSC is spending U.S. tax dollars to repair American naval vessels with foreign workers in a foreign land.

Incredibly, it seems that the U.S. military is bent on spending precious tax dollars in Japan, Korea, or Singapore to keep their shipyards operating and their workers employed but will not lift a hand for U.S. workers. That is the outrageous facts. Many of these vessels are entitled U.S. Navy ships.

Indeed, at the rate that the Navy is sending these jobs overseas, if Congress is not too careful and does not pay attention to this process, these Navy ships are going to have to be redesignated as Republic of Korea Navy ships.

Check this out. The Military Sealift Command, in violation of an amendment to Title 10, which I introduced, requires that U.S. naval vessels homeported in the United States must do their repair work, their normal repair work, not emergency work, in U.S. shipyards.

My amendment included Guam under this, and Guam is part of the United States and the workers are U.S. citizens. And what my amendment asked was that the Navy put those ships that are under their control and are homeported, and many of these ships operate right out of Guam, they steam right by a U.S. shipyard operated by Americans, staffed by Americans, and they bid out the work, and these very ships go right past those workers up to a shipyard in South Korea.

This is more than about dollars and cents. This is about jobs. The fact is that foreign shipyards can always beat U.S. shipyards in terms of price, for several reasons.

First, foreign shipyards are in most cases subsidized. Second, foreign shipyards do not pay their workers decent wages. Third, foreign shipyards do not have to comply with health and safety work laws and environments. Finally, some shipyards are in foreign countries that have had their currencies devalued compared to the dollar. For all

these reasons, foreign shipyards are cheaper than American. But they are certainly not any better.

What we are up against is the Navy's insistence that, through a series of ways of redefining where these ships are home-ported, they have been able to escape the full application and the spirit and intent of Title 10, which is to take ships that are home-ported in American ports, make sure that their work is done in American shipyards, their regular work.

What the Navy has done through the MSC is redefine these so that they can compete these out and give the work to foreign shipyards.

Our readiness continues to suffer on this. The internal Navy waiver process continues to be issued unabated. I am calling upon many of my colleagues here in the House, and some have already signed letters, but I am calling through a "dear colleague" letter to protest this effort directly to Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen.

This practice is wrong, it is harmful to the national security of the Nation, and it certainly hurts American workers.

REVISIONS FOR ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, PURSUANT TO HOUSE REPORT 106-373, TO REFLECT ADDITIONAL NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND LESS IN OUTLAYS FOR EMERGENCIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to House Report 106-373 to reflect \$0 in additional new budget authority and \$3,000,000 in additional outlays for emergencies. This will increase the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$564,472,000,000 in budget authority and \$597,574,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000. This will increase the aggregate total to \$1,454,921,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,434,711,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

As reported to the House, H.R. 2466, the conference report accompanying the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Interior and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2000, includes \$158,000,000 in budget authority and \$42,000,000 in outlays for emergencies. An earlier statement indicated incorrectly that H.R. 2466 only allocated \$39,000,000 in additional outlays for emergencies.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x6-7270.

REVISIONS FOR ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, PURSUANT TO HOUSE REPORT 106-373, TO REFLECT ADDITIONAL NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY AND LESS IN OUTLAYS FOR EMERGENCIES

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for