REgarding the People's Republic of China

Mr. COX of California, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 463, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 463) regarding United States concerns with human rights abuse, nuclear and chemical weapons proliferation, illegal weapons trading, military intimidation of Taiwan, and trade violations by the People's Republic of China and the People's Liberation Army, and directing the committees of jurisdiction to commence hearings and report appropriate legislation, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 463

Whereas the People's Republic of China has long enjoyed most favored nation trading status with the United States notwithstanding significant policy and security issues in our bilateral relationship;

Whereas, despite the positive influence that United States trade with the People's Republic of China has had in encouraging the abandonment of state control over all aspects of the economy by the Communist government, serious human rights, trade, security, and weapons proliferation issues have remained and often worsened during the period of this trade policy;

Whereas this experience has made clear that of itself, the extension of most favored nation trading status (and the potential of its annual non-renewal) has been inadequate to address the many policy and security issues that characterize our bilateral relationship;

Whereas these policy and security issues include, with regard to the economic activities of the People's Liberation Army—

(1) according to the Defense Intelligence Agency, the People's Liberation Army of Communist China is in fact engaged, through controlled enterprises, in government-controlled and subsidized trade overseas; (2) the General Staff Department of the People's Liberation Army owns and operates Polytechnologies, which is the weapons trading arm of the People's Liberation Army, Polytechnologies has a representative office in the United States;

(3) the General Logistics Department of the People's Liberation Army owns and operates a large international conglomerate known as Corporation, which has a representative office in the United States;

(4) the People's Armed Police, which is partially controlled by the People's Liberation Army, is responsible for the occupation and suppression of dissent in Tibet and the execution of prisoners throughout China, provides guards for the forced labor camp system in Communist China, and owns and operates China Jilin Equipment Import and Export, which has a representative office in the United States;

(5) the export of products by these entities allows the People's Liberation Army to earn hard currency directly, which in turn can be and is used to modernize its forces without being reflected in official reports of military spending;

(6) consumers in the United States are ordinarily unaware that revenues from the products they are purchasing from or through such entities contribute to the financial benefit of the People's Liberation Army;

(7) trade with the People's Liberation Army effectively is a subsidy of military operations of the People's Republic of China that is inconsistent with our national security; and

(8) free trade in world markets is based on the assumption that the import and export of goods and services are conducted by independent enterprises responding to profit incentives and market forces, and commercial activities by the People's Liberation Army are fundamentally inconsistent with these precepts;

Whereas, with regard to Communist Chinese military activity and weapons proliferation—

(1) it has been reported that United States intelligence has estimated that Communist Chinese military industries have become a leading supplier of illicit precursor chemicals for use in Iran's chemical weapons program;

(2) in contravention of Communist China's commitment to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the China National Nuclear Corporation, a Communist Chinese military industry, sold materials critical to the production of enriched uranium to a non-NPT signatory, Pakistan;

(3) China National Precision Instrument Import-Export Company, a Communist Chinese military industry, sold nuclear-capable missiles to Pakistan;

(4) China Great Wall Industry Corporation, a Communist Chinese military industry, sold nuclear-capable missiles to Pakistan;

(5) Poly Group, a People's Liberation Army owned company, sold $1,200,000,000 worth of arms to the military rulers of Myanmar (Burma);

(6) in contravention of the United Nations embargo, China North Industries Corporation (Norinco), a Communist Chinese military industry, sold chemicals critical to the manufacture of nuclear weapons to Iraq;

(7) Poly Group and Norinco, Communist Chinese military industries, attempted to sell 2,000 AK 47 rifles, 20,000 AK 47 bipods, 4,000 30 round ammunition magazines, and 2 machinegun silencers, and offered for sale 300,000 silenced machinguns and "Red Parakeet" missiles (stingers), RPGs (rocket propelled grenades), 60mm mortars, and hand grenades to United States law enforcement authorities conducting a so-called "sting" operation;

(8) according to the May 21, 1996, United States Customs Service affidavit against the Communist Chinese representatives of Norinco and Poly Group, at paragraph 96, one of the Communist Chinese representatives bragged that a "Red Parakeet" missile, which he was offering for sale in the United States—"could take out a 747";

(9) these and other enterprises owned by the People's Liberation Army and the Communist Chinese military industries regularly export a variety of products to the United States, including clothing, toys, shoes, hand tools, fish, minerals, and chemicals;

(10) the People's Liberation Army implemented an unprovoked, dangerous, and aggressive campaign to intimidate Taiwan in July of 1995, and again before Taiwan's first direct presidential election in March of 1996, with military maneuvers, live-fire exercises, and missile tests in close proximity to that island democracy; and

(11) the People's Liberation Army seized territory claimed by the Philippines and threatened the United States Navy's right of free passage in the South China Sea;

Whereas, with respect to human rights—
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(1) according to the United States Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights for 1995, the Government of Communist China "continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms, stemming both from the authorities' intolerance of dissent and the inadequacy of safeguards for human freedoms. Abuses included arbitrary and lengthy incommunicado detention, forced confessions, torture, and mistreatment of prisoners. In addition, the Chinese Government continued to impose severe restrictions on freedom of speech, the press, assembly, association, religion, privacy, movement, and worker rights;"

(2) the Communist Chinese Government launched a major anticrime campaign called "Strike Hard" carried out nationwide by the Public Security Bureau (PSB), and in Tibet and Xinjiang (East Turkestan) also by the People's Armed Police, which has included large scale arbitrary arrests, detentions with minimal legal protection, and swift executions;

(3) the current anticrime campaign has targeted political, religious and labor activists in addition to common criminals in Tibet, Xinjiang, and in the whole of Communist China;

(4) the Communist Government has ordered a crackdown on unofficial religious believers, and transferred religious affairs bureaus under the Public Security Ministry, requiring all local congregations to register with the Religious Affairs Bureau or risk the legal dismantling of the church and official harassment, fines and arrest;

(5) according to Asia Watch, the Communist Chinese authorities in Tibet have launched a repressive campaign against religious practice and the Public Security Bureau and PLA have been involved in violent suppression of dissent in Tibet and Xinjiang, resulting in the imprisonment of over one thousand Tibetans and Uighurs this year;

(6) the Ministry of Public Security has imposed new regulations to strengthen controls over Internet use, the State Council must approve "interactive" networks, and the official Communist Chinese news agency (Xinhua) has been put in charge of supervising all foreign wire services selling economic information to Communist China, censoring their reports for "false economic news". The Communist Chinese authorities also monitor Internet use, the State Council has been involved in violent suppression of dissent in Tibet and Xinjiang, resulting in the imprisonment of over one thousand Tibetans and Uighurs this year;

(7) Wei Jingsheng, the leading Chinese pro-democracy activist, was sentenced on December 13, 1995, to a second 14-year prison term, in a trial in which he was denied access to counsel of his choice and given access to the actual charges against him for only two days before trial;

(8) on November 21, 1995, the Government of the People's Republic of China announced the arrest of Wei Jingsheng and its intention to try him for "attempting to overthrow the government" which left him in extremely poor health;

(9) the government had previously imprisoned Wei from 1979 until 1993 on a charge of "spreading counterrevolutionary propaganda". His participation in the Democracy Wall movement;

(10) during his long imprisonment Wei was subjected to torture and other ill treatment which left him in extremely poor health;

(11) far from advocating an "overthrow" of the Government of China, Wei has been a strong advocate of peaceful and a peaceful transition to democracy; and

(12) Wei was regarded as a leading contender for the 1995 Nobel Peace Prize, having been interviewed by the Nobel committee and praised for his work throughout the world, including 56 members of the United States Congress;

Whereas, with respect to Communist Chinese trade and economic policy—

(1) the United States Trade Representative's 1996 National Trade Estimate Report on Foreign Trade Barriers noted that "China has continued to use standards and certification practices which the United States and other trading partners regard as barriers to trade;"

(2) the United States Department of Commerce has reported that "Despite its commitment under the 1992 market access Memorandum of Understanding to publish all laws and regulations affecting imports, the Chinese Government has failed to provide a large number of detailed import regulations that have traditionally been unpublished, and there is no published, publicly available, national procurement code in China;"

(3) the report finds that "China's market for services remains severely restricted;"

(4) the processes that limit American access to the Chinese market have contributed to an increase in the United States trade deficit with China from $10 billion in 1985 to $33,807,000,000 in 1995, according to the United States Department of Commerce;

(5) these unfair trade practices and tariff and non-tariff barriers result in lost opportunities for American companies and lost jobs for American workers, and harm the United States economy;

(6) the failure of Communist China to stop the piracy of intellectual property, including official and nonofficial software, has been evidenced by the January 16, 1992, agreement on intellectual property rights, is evidenced by the December agreements (signed on March 11, 1995 and June 17, 1996), and the threat of over $2,000,000,000 in sanctions as a means of achieving as yet hoped-for compliance with the agreements;

(7) according to the United States Trade Representative's 1996 National Trade Estimate Report on Foreign Trade Barriers, investment restrictions by Communist China are "abundant;"

(8) under so-called "export performance requirements," Communist Chinese authorities frequently force foreign manufacturers operating in Communist China to export 50 to 70 percent (and sometimes more) of their goods to other markets, as a condition of approving the investment;

(9) two-thirds of Communist China's exports are, in fact, manufactured by foreign firms operating in Communist China;

(10) the export requirements imposed by the Communist Chinese government serve to undercut domestic producers employing millions of Americans;

(11) Communist China has failed to liberalize its foreign exchange market, and to make the exchange rate the advantage of domestic exporting industries;

(12) Communist China maintains two exchange rates for the Yuan, an official rate for Chinese citizens and a swap rate for foreigners, and regulates manufacturing the exchange rate to the advantage of domestic exporting industries;

(13) even with the establishment of current swap rates between the official and swap rates serves as (a) a subsidy for Communist China's exporters to the United States, totaling nearly $15,000,000,000 in 1993, and (b) a nontariff barrier to United States exports, artificially raising the price of exports in Communist China's market;

(14) Communist China received over $4,000,000,000 in multilateral loans from the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank;

(15) the United States is the largest shareholder in these banks, and thus can exercise considerable leverage over loans to Communist China; and

(16) Communist China has continued to insist that its status cannot be admitted simultaneously, notwithstanding the differences in the status of their compliance with the criteria for WTO membership;

Whereas given the number and gravity of these issues, the debate over Communist China's membership in the World Trade Organization is a fundamental change in the United States and the People's Republic of China; and

(1) the resolution be promptly addressed by appropriate legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Committee on International Relations, the Committee on National Security, and the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services will each hold hearings on the matter delayed in the United States' decision in resolution insofar as those matters fall within their respective jurisdictions and, if appropriate, report legislation addressing these matters to the House of Representatives not later than September 30, 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 463, the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] and a Member opposite each will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gubitos] will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the vote we have just taken, the question we are faced with is, if not MFN, then what? What is our policy? Our current policy towards China, if it can be called a policy at all, is woefully out of date. Blind tolerance of Chinese communism comes from an era of Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev, when the Government of the United States played the China card as a check against Soviet communism. Embracing communism in China was a superior alternative because China in that era was not expansionist. It did not have global designs.

But today the Soviet Union is no more. In place of the generals who served under Brezhnev, we have General Alexander Lebed, who says that he would permit Chechen independence, who says that NATO expansion is not a threat to Russia, who says that he would not oppose the United States assisting Taiwan in constructing an anti-ballistic missile defense to protect against a threat from Communist China. Where is the policy for a Lebed instead of a Brezhnev? Where is the policy for a newly expansionist China that has arisen in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union?

Mr. Speaker, since we voted yes, I did not, the House did, to continue most-favored-nation status for China, is our intended message that this is a reward for China's Communist rulers? Is the message that, on balance, their offenses against human rights, global peace and security, and the international norms of behavior are tolerable? Or, to put it the other way, if we...
had just now denied MFN, would we even then have believed that our security problems are solved, that the Communist government would permit a free press all of a sudden; that they would stop brutalizing Tibet; or perhaps, because they were to deny MFN, they would let the Tibetans select their own Panchen Lama, in accordance with religious custom and law?

Maybe then we might think they would agree to nonproliferation agreements, on trade tariffs and trade barriers, on the theft of intellectual property. But I do not think so. I do not think, independent of how we might vote here on MFN, that the result would cause the Communists in Beijing to let Wei Jing Sheng go free, or in any way to permit democracy in place of a one-party state. I do not think that they would renounce the use of force against Taiwan.

A carefully tailored policy toward China, suited to the 1990's and to the next century, must do more than simply turn on the light switch of MFN, a binary choice, yes or no, on or off, we love you or we hate you. We should turn on the light switch of progress and resist military aggression, trade violations, and human rights abuses.

For example, if Taiwan is merely part of China, then we should reward Taiwan for ending its human rights abuses, for permitting a free press, for holding free and fair democratic elections for Parliament and for President, and for lowering its tariff barriers.

The United States should be admitted to the World Trade Organization forthwith. They are willing to meet its requirements. Keep in mind that membership in the WTO does not constitute sovereignty. Hong Kong is already a member of the WTO, and when it is absorbed by Communist China next year, it will retain its independent membership, because it was admitted only as a special customs region, the same basis on which Taiwan is now applying.

The People's Republic of China, which does not meet the requirements for WTO admission and is not near to doing so, should not be allowed to keep Taiwan out. Another example, we should end the charade of so-called trade with the People's Liberation Army. We all know that the People's Liberation Army is the largest military force on Earth. Communist China's military budget has more than doubled in the last 10 years, the result of the dissolution of the Soviet empire. They have been buying SS-18 intercontinental ballistic missiles from Moscow. They have fired nuclear-capable missiles toward Taiwan, seizing territory from the Philippines, and expanding into the South China Sea.

Where does the money come from for all of this military expansion? It comes from what the Washington Post has referred to as "PLA, Inc.": the People's Liberation Army, Inc. It is a commercial front, a commercial front, controlled by the People's Liberation Army as commercial fronts, with combined earnings in excess of 5 billion U.S. dollars annually.

If the People's Liberation Army were judged in this capacity as a commercial enterprise, it would fit neatly into the top fifth of the Fortune 500. Money from huge illegal arms deals is laundered by PLA commercial fronts, and through PLAF-controlled government, in violation of every rule of free trade, to make more money through nominally commercial enterprises for even more off-budget financing for more threatening arms for the People's Liberation Army.

This is not defense conversion, my friends. This is not turning swords into plowshares. This is turning swords into golf clubs and shoes and circuit boards so that the People's Liberation Army can make more money to buy more weapons. The two most notorious are the People's Liberation Army's commercial fronts, Poly Technologies and Norinco. Poly Technologies, you remember, has sold over 1 billion dollars' worth of arms to the military thugs who dictate Burma. Norinco has sold sophisticated technologies and Norinco recently had their representatives indicted for seeking to smuggle into the United States not just AK-47's, as we read, but also over 300,000 silenced machine guns, 60-millimeter mortars, hand grenades, and heat-seeking missiles capable of taking out of the sky a 747.

The United States should not embrace money laundering by the People's Liberation Army. We should pass the Gilman bill, sponsored by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and end this dangerous policy of so-called trade with commercial fronts of the Communist Chinese military.

We should pass the Solomon bill that would end United States taxpayer subsidies for China through the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank until the so-called loans to China no longer subsidize the arms buildup that I have just described.

Finally, we should enunciate an explicit and clear vision for our policy toward China. We should state clearly and the President should state clearly that we oppose communism in China. We seek an end to Communist one-party rule, and an institution of democratic governmental structure, an observance of human rights, an observation of the rules of free enterprise.

This we can do. When we pass this resolution, the committees of jurisdiction, not just Ways and Means, but Banking, International Relations, and National Security will be instructed to hold immediate hearings on the issues that I have raised and all of the issues spelled out in this resolution, and to report our recommendations promptly; in any event, no later than September 30, so that we can deal with these problems directly on the House floor.

It may well be that today's vote marks a watershed. Yes, we have once again permitted MFN to go forward, but this time the debate will not stop there. This time, in recognition of the fact that MFN can no longer bear the weight of all our policy disagreements in the United States and in the People's Republic of China, we will move on and do the right thing and create a new China policy for the next century.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Cox amendment, but reluctantly so. I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] for his thoughtful approach to the dilemma that the United States faces. It is a big challenge. I wish that this resolution was amendable, because there are many things that need to be added to it to make it a workable resolution and to give it depth and to give it direction. However, under the circumstances, I must oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I applaud my colleague from California [Mr. Cox], and I stand in support of his amendment offering this resolution, calling for hearings on China's trade policies, human rights record, military policy, and arms sales.

I was one of those that voted for most-favored-nation status a while ago, and I think that was the correct vote. I do not want to go back to the dark ages. I remember the time when the United States did not recognize China. I remember the time that we ignored them. I do not know how you ignore 1.2 billion people. We need to do everything we possibly can to bring about improved relations. I have always believed all of my life on a personal basis, professional basis, political basis, do not fight with anyone that has nothing to lose.

Well, if China keeps prospering and keeps getting stronger economically, it will bring about better relations among people, and I think that is what we want, because we do not want to go through another terrible war like we did with World War I and World War II. Congressional hearings, diplomatic negotiations, and threatening sanctions are the way to handle our differences with China, not revoking MFN. Rest assured, I will continue to encourage the administration and China to continue to work together for fair, ethical, and increased trade.

The best way to change China is to continue to engage China, not to deny it the status of a normal trading partner so as to undermine U.S. economic interests and jeopardize the jobs of millions of hard-working Americans.
Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Oregon.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the resolution, House Resolution 461. I commend my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] for his diligent work in crafting this legislation, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Solomon], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, for acting swiftly in bringing it before us at this time.

The administration's China policy has failed. It has failed to stop Communist China's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to such rogue nations as Iran and Iraq. It has failed to stop Communist China's unfair trading practices and piracy of intellectual property rights. It has failed to stop Communist China's persecution of Catholics, of Protestants, of Tibetans and human rights activists.

During the past year since President Clinton delinked trade to human rights and refused to adequately respond to Beijing's weapons proliferation, trade and human rights violations, things have become much worse in all of those areas. Just 2 weeks ago, Chinese Government officials were named in a Customs Department sting operation trying to sell 2,000 fully automatic machine guns, machine gun silencers, and stinger-type missiles to the Los Angeles street gangs.

How does the administration respond to these attacks? Instead of admitting something is radically wrong, it makes excuses for Communist China's behavior, and deflects criticism by trying to kill the messenger. We are told that any firm response would isolate or contain China and that we must remain engaged as if holding a party to a treaty that they signed is some sort of an unforgivable breach of ethics.

The administration's smokescreen has been designed to duck the hard questions of how to deal pragmatically and effectively with the totalitarian regime, a regime that is causing havoc on our economy, on our national security interests, and among our democratic friends and allies. Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the Philippines are all duly concerned by China's sword rattling and the building up of its military personnel. Just last week Communist China refused to grant the Ger- man foreign minister a visa into China unless his nation would forbid a conference on Tibet from being held on German soil. How arrogant can a nation become?

Beijing invades and occupies a country such as the Philippines and occupied Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia and then tells other nations that the invasion is an internal matter and must not be discussed. Tibet, a country the size of Western Europe, remains the only nation still occupied by foreign troops. Communist China remains the only nation we know of that has refused to stop all arms sales to hostile nations, military incursions, including spurious claims of incursions, and human rights violations.

If Communist China signs an agreement on weapons proliferation, or trade or human rights and then violates those agreements, then we must respond in such a manner that causes them not to violate agreements again and again. Because the administration appears incapable of even admitting to a problem, it is important now that the Congress step forward and take appropriate measures.

Accordingly, I am urging my colleagues to support this resolution directing the Congress to conduct hearings in the appropriate committees and to report proper legislation back to the Congress by September 30.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Wise].

Mr. WISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I have just put on record the vote for stance for America's workers against anybody in here. I voted against NAFTA because I thought it was a bad deal. I voted against the GATT treaty because I thought that the World Trade Organization presented too many problems and not enough benefits. But I rise today to support continuing most-favored-nation status for China, but, an important but, while at the same time guaranteeing stricter congressional monitoring.

Yes, I am aware of the problems that China presents. Nuclear proliferation, arms sales to hostile nations, military incursions, including spurious claims on the Spratly Islands and other areas of the Asian continent, human rights violations, unfair trade practices, whether in intellectual property or in other areas such as child labor.

Yes, I am aware of all of these, but I notice something very basic, that we have the remembrance also what most-favored-nation status connotes. It is not some kind of glorified treatment, it is not some kind of special privilege, it is simply saying to China as we have said to 100, at least, other nations around the world, of all stripes and colors, you only get a seat at the table. It does not guarantee you what you get, it just gets you in the door.

We have to remember this, that the United States, even by giving most-favored-nation status does not give up its most basic protective measures. We still have section 301 sanctions that we can impose unilaterally, such as almost occurred 2 weeks ago on China, where you can put tariffs on their goods when they are not engaging in free trade. We can deny China what it most wants, and that is entry into the World Trade Organization. That is the key, the golden key that the Chinese want, and we stand in the way of that key, but they comply with basic standards.

Now, what does cutting off MFN status do? What it would mean, cutting off most-favored-nation status with China is simply saying, we are going to stop all of our competitors, our Asian competitors, our European Union competitors, all of our competitors to take that market without us there. They are not making the same statements about human rights and military concerns and unfair trade practices. So what we will do is to abandon 1.2 billion people, that field to our competitors; we will not be engaged, they will.

Instead, I think a better policy is to be involved in bringing them along. The fact of the matter is that until Japan, until Germany, until Great Britain, until France, until a lot of other nations recognize the concerns that China presents to them, we do not have to worry as much about the Pacific rim as Japan, the ASEAN nations have to. Until they realize the concerns to them and we can engage in a concerted approach, is that the answer with China, and then China understands it has to come around.
Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I come to this podium with a slightly different perspective. I respect the position of the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox]. I would hope as I rise to support his resolution that we would recognize that our approach to China is not a Congress versus the President or a President versus the Congress. It is the American people standing up together to acknowledge both their disdain and outrage for human rights violations.

We recognize what China is today. 1.1 billion citizens, an object, an entity that cannot be ignored. However, we do a disservice to point accusatory fingers at an administration which is struggling and a Congress which has struggled as well. We must seize new economic opportunities, but we must also exercise responsibility of a world leader collectively, this Congress, this body, and this administration. We must find common ground on affirming human rights and pursuing economic prosperity.

Our Nation was founded upon the democratic ideal of freedom of speech and the right to petition your Government for the redress of grievances. As we debate this issue, the People's Republic of China continues to hold thousands of prisoners without due process. We must do our utmost to prevent political or economic leaks. In addition the continued insult of smuggling in AK-47 assault weapons to kill more of our citizens.

International attention has been most clearly focused on cases such as Wei Jingsheng, currently serving a 14-year term for speaking out on democracy and human rights during the brief 6 months of freedom he had between September 1994 and April 1995, or on Boa Tong, a senior Chinese official released in May 1996 after serving an unwarranted 7-year term as the immediate predecessor of a so-called government guesthouse. But businesspeople, bankers and Chinese representatives of overseas firms are increasingly becoming victims of the arbitrary exercise of power and the absence of rule of law.

The Chinese Government's recent crackdown on crime or strike hard campaign that began in April has already resulted in more than 500 death sentences and executions across the country. This kind of crackdown is nothing new. The Chinese Government has periodically engaged in anti-crime campaigns that have swept up tens of thousands in their wake. Intended to instill a sense of security in a public concerned about the crime that has accompanied economic growth, these campaigns often result in the unlawful arrest and wrongful execution of large numbers of people.

In addition to showing little regard for the civil and human rights for people within its borders, China has made Asia, the Middle East and indeed the entire world less safe by continuing to transfer nuclear, missile, and chemical weapons technology to unsafeguarded countries, including India, Iraq, Libya, and Pakistan, in violation of international agreements. As we face the recent seizure in California, I remind us, the Chinese Government has been involved in selling AK-47's and other military assault weapons on American streets, often ending up in the hands of violent street gangs.

During recent elections in Taiwan, China fired missiles and practiced military maneuvers in the Strait of Taiwan as forms of intimidation in order to disrupt Taiwan's free and open polity. And the Chinese Government has already taken several steps to curtail or strike hard campaign that began in April has already resulted in more than 500 death sentences and executions across the country.

As I list this long litany of human rights concerns, the question remains whether these problems prevent us from renewing the most-favored-nation trade status with China. Let us examine the other side of the issue. China is an immense country with over 4,000 years of continuous history and a deep sense of cultural identity and pride. China is a nation of deeply entrenched social, economic, and administrative and political institutions over the millennia and profoundly reshaped during three decades of Marxist-Maoist rule before 1979. How can we hope to affect
Mr. Speaker, I do not want to cut off the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] is giving us some alternatives and I appreciate the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

We need to send a strong message to the people in Beijing that these things are not OK, and that we must see progress on human rights matters and democracy in China and if they do not go the opposite way, they will never have a solid relationship with this country. Mr. Speaker, I encourage the Members to vote for the Cox resolution.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. Speaker, I feel like the old saying about closing the door after the cow has run out of the barn. The real vote was taken a few moments ago. With that vote, the flame of liberty and the flame of democracy and the flame of human rights that the United States, these things must go the opposite way, they will never have a solid relationship with those nations who look to us for leadership.

As the gentlewoman from California [Ms. Pelosi] said in her closing statement, one of the real questions we have not given us an alternative to MFN, but the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] is giving us some alternatives and I appreciate the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

We need to send a strong message to the people in Beijing that these things are not OK, and that we must see progress on human rights matters and democracy in China and if they do not go the opposite way, they will never have a solid relationship with this country. Mr. Speaker, I encourage the Members to vote for the Cox resolution.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. Speaker, I feel like the old saying about closing the door after the cow has run out of the barn. The real vote was taken a few moments ago. With that vote, the flame of liberty and the flame of democracy and the flame of human rights that the United States, these things must go the opposite way, they will never have a solid relationship with those nations who look to us for leadership.

As the gentlewoman from California [Ms. Pelosi] said in her closing statement, one of the real questions we have not given us an alternative to MFN, but the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] is giving us some alternatives and I appreciate the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

We need to send a strong message to the people in Beijing that these things are not OK, and that we must see progress on human rights matters and democracy in China and if they do not go the opposite way, they will never have a solid relationship with this country. Mr. Speaker, I encourage the Members to vote for the Cox resolution.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. Speaker, I feel like the old saying about closing the door after the cow has run out of the barn. The real vote was taken a few moments ago. With that vote, the flame of liberty and the flame of democracy and the flame of human rights that the United States, these things must go the opposite way, they will never have a solid relationship with those nations who look to us for leadership.
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America's workers continue to lose. Our trade deficit continues to lose. Our self-esteem about what we stand for continues to lose and be eroded. Unfortunately, this administration and now this Congress have been the great enablers of this policy, because we have always suggested that tomorrow, tomorrow we would have resolve about Tibet. Tomorrow we would have resolve about the trade deficit. Tomorrow we would have resolve about use of slave labor. Tomorrow we will get tough. That is why they have a 12-step program; because you have to deal with it today.

Now, unfortunately, we are left with this good-faith effort by the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox], but wrong with respect to the problem; that is, if we were doing our job and this administration were doing its job, what would the verdict have been over the last year? But if we ignore these issues, if we turn the other way when they threaten democracy, if we turn the other way and enter into agreements where it is done on a wink and a nod, what they did not say, what we can say publicly they did say, they did not say but will we say they did say, how does that ensure people's rights? How does that keep nuclear weapons from going to people who threaten us as a Nation? No, that is a very sad day. It is a very sad day for the people of China who aspire to democracy, to freedom, and it is a very sad day for the people of this Nation who pride ourselves that we send forth that beacon of fair play and democracy and liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sad that the House chose to say tomorrow. Perhaps the President and many Members of this House should try out for the Play Annie, because tomorrow, only tomorrow will we have a change in relationship with China, and we have a very serious and constant and engaged way that is demanded if, in fact, we are going to have a reliable partner for the future of this world, for the future of our trade, for the future of democracy, and the future in terms of national security. But that was not accomplished here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would announce the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] has 114 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] has 151½ minutes remaining.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, [Mr. Koblé], a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget, and a distinguished member of the policy committee.

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

Mr. Koblé. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I rise in support of the resolution offered by my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox], my friend and the chairman of the policy committee on which I serve.

Mr. Speaker, I would take some issue with some of the language that is in this resolution. I would disagree with some of the clauses. I might question whether some of the issues raised in this resolution have been substantiated. But I think the important point is that this resolution begins us down a path that we should be taking: a path we should have been taking a long time ago. That is, it specifically directs the committees of jurisdiction, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and other committees that have jurisdiction in this area, to focus on ways in which we can change the behavior of China, to determine how we can truly begin to deal with market access; to focus on the tremendous human rights abuses which we all know and which we all deplore; to deal with the problems of nuclear proliferation which threaten the security of the world; and to deal with all the other regional security issues. It directs these committees to hold hearings to look for the kinds of tools, the kinds of legislation, the kinds of resolutions that can actually change China and bring them into the family of nations.

What this resolution recognizes, in the context of the vote we just had, is the MFN, the most-favored-nation trade status, is not the way to bring about those problems, those changes, because, maybe even many in this body, would be surprised that we grant MFN status to Iran, to Iraq and some of the countries that we, as a friend, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Porter, mentioned, Burma, Turkey, and Sudan. All of those countries have MFN status with the United States. But what we have found is that these countries change their behavior. And we deal with them on a multilateral basis and in those basis with those that we are using the kinds of techniques that work. We have used selective embargoes. We have worked with our partners to try to secure the kinds of changes that we want to bring about in those countries.

So what we are saying here today is let us begin this process. With this resolution, we tell China we do not condone their policies, we do not accept human rights abuses, but we do intend to bring about a multilateral agreement with China on these issues that are so important to our relationship. I urge support of the Cox resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one in this Congress who has worked harder on this subject than the gentleman from California [Ms. Pelosi]. She is an intelligent and engaging person, and I know that she feels these things very deeply, and I join her in many of her feelings. I think if we have any differences, it is just on how we solve this problem, not about the problem but how we solve it. So it is with great pleasure that I yield to her, and I know her and respect her for what she stands for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. Pelosi].

Ms. Pelosi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for recognizing me, giving me this time, and for his kind words.

This is probably our last MFN fight together, Mr. Chairman. As I said on the day we had our special order for the gentleman, he is truly a gentleman from Florida and we have all benefited greatly by his service here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of what the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] referred to as the well-intentioned resolution presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox]. I call it the fig leaf. I said if there were ever a fig leaf, it is a fig leaf until it is something else in my view, then this could make the real difference, I would say to the gentleman. Once again, he will have provided a service.

One of the joys of working on the most-favored-nation status with China, human rights issues in China, trade, proliferation, et cetera, is the bipartisan coalition that we have formed, the relationships that have developed to help us solve other problems as well in the House. And the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Smith], I see over there, and you know the list, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilm-an], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wolf], the list goes on and on, it has been my pleasure to work with all of these gentlemen.

I want to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker. Of course I support the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox]. We have to make sure that it has teeth and it is real. But the fact is that those of us who have been working together all this long time on this issue did not
Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the focus will be on the idea that their thinking is being made by the People's Liberation coming into the United States, or raising the tariffs at least on those products. The People's Liberation Army occupies Tibet, crushes dissent in China and Tibet, proliferates nuclear, biological, chemical, and missile technology to rogue countries. The PLA has been for many years selling and now smuggling AK-47s and all kinds of other more dangerous weapons into the United States for use here or to be trans-shipped to other countries.

With all due respect to those who have talked about human rights here today, and with great respect, as I have said, for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cox], he said he knows I feel very strongly. He shares some of those feelings. Yes; I feel strongly, but I think about it a lot, too, and I make a distinction there. This is not about feeling. It is about analyzing what our options are and giving them priority. Yes: we all care about human rights. Let us stipulate to that. Who cares enough to give it some priority? Who cares enough to say to a country like China, repressing its people, and that repression has increased since President Clinton delinked trade and human rights, that this is important in our relationship.

The administration does not really talk about it much anymore. They talk about larger issues. In fact, the more time goes by, the older their thinking is on how we deal with China. We must insist that in all of our relationships we make the trade fairer, the political climate freer, and the world safer. The Clinton policy is doing just the reverse. I also want to make a comment about our colleagues who have said well, we give MFN to Iran and Iraq. We have an embargo on Iran and Iraq. We do not trade with them. Not only that, we have a secondary boycott on countries and we oppose US corporations in Iran. So this whole thing of we give MFN to everyone, so why not China. If we have a special situation as China is, where the President must request a waiver, and that is what gives us standing on the floor, and that country represses its people, violates our trade relationship, does not allow, by and large, most of our products in, does not play by the rules, uses prison labor for export, steals our intellectual property, our technology, and copyrighted items for use for manufacture to their own, industries with our copyrights. If a country does all of this, and at the same time has a $35 billion trade deficit with us, that is an opportunity where we can use our leverage.

To those who say well, some of that trade deficit came from other countries, those jobs used to be in other places. China is there in China now and that is why we have leverage. It does not matter where they were before, it is where they are now. The Chinese Government cannot afford to lose 10 million jobs that spring from the United States trade. They cannot afford to lose $35 billion, trade surplus that will be over $40 billion this year.

In my final minute, Mr. Speaker, in putting some of these thoughts on the Record, I do want to put a couple letters in the Record. One is a letter from Adam Yauch. Adam is with the Beastie Boys. He has been working very hard, lobbying Members to vote against MFN for China. A couple of weeks ago in San Francisco, he had 100,000 people gathered to support Chinese and Tibetan rights and to oppose the brutal oppression of the Chinese Government. Maybe the leadership of this House is afraid of what is going on out there, that people are catching on to this issue.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention as we go into the Fourth of July, a great champion of human rights and of liberty, hopefully inspired by the United States, certainly his thinking is in line with our Founding Fathers', Mr. Wei Jingsheng. Nothing drives the Chinese crazier than our talking about Wei Jingsheng, because he speaks the truth. He served a 14-year sentence. They let him out for a few months because they wanted the Olympics. As soon as he spoke up again, they arrested him for another 14 years

And here is what he said to get arrested:

From the moment he is born, a human being has the right to live and the right to strive for a better life. These are what people call God-given rights, for they are not bestowed by any external thing. They are bestowed only by themselves. Without equality, human rights must lose their real meaning. Without the protection of human rights, equality can only be an empty slogan.

In the spirit of our Founding Fathers, as we approach the Fourth of July, I want to commend to our colleagues the plight of Wei Jingsheng and hope that one of our priorities is to tell the Chinese that we insist upon his freedom. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the Record the letter referred to previously.

The information referred to is as follows:

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS:
I am currently in Washington, DC where I have been lobbying Congress not to renew Most Favored Nation trading status with China.

Last weekend I participated in the Tibetan Freedom Convention where over 100,000 people gathered to support Chinese and Tibetan human rights and to oppose the brutal oppression of the Chinese government. Twenty of America's most influential bands took the cause to heart and spoke about it on stage. 30,000 of the participants signed a letter to President Clinton demanding that he not renew Most Favored Nation status to China. The concert also helped to spread the word of a rapidly growing boycott of all Chinese products that is being endorsed by over 150 organizations including the AFL-CIO. This is a small example of a rapidly growing awareness amongst youth about our US government and US corporations' involvement and perpetuation of human rights abuses by continuing to trade with the Chinese. By investing US money we are financing the Chinese government's continued genocide of the Tibetan people.

As world leaders your responsibility is to all of humanity, not just your constituency, not just the Republicans or the Democrats, not the people from your state, not even just all Americans. You represent and affect all of humanity and are thereby responsible for your actions. It is your responsibility to cut through the bureaucratic rhetoric that has perpetuated the most unimaginable suffering and human rights violations that are still ongoing today.

Because the Tibetan struggle is non-violent it exemplifies the most clear-cut distinction between brutal violence and compliance that exists in a world that joins together and uses the freedom that we have as American citizens to bring freedom to all of the world.

The lies that having US business in China will help to change their policies on human rights have gone on too long. Many people are asking the question if the US takes a stand and will otherwise demand that is our responsibility to act first and other countries will follow. Regardless of what other countries do we must act in the interest of humanity and not our greed motivated corporations. We the people of America call on you as our world leaders to act now. Do not renew Most Favored Nation status to China.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Dreier].

[Mr. Dreier asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. Dreier. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Newport Beach, CA [Mr. Cox], my friend. By an overwhelming bipartisan majority, better than 2 to 1, 286 to 141, the House has gone on record stating what I have been arguing for the past 7 years, and that is the annual debate on trying to cut off MFN with the People's Republic of China is not the way to deal with the very serious problems that are outlined in this resolution.

What this resolution calls for is our looking into, through this process of the serious things that we have discussed over the past several hours: Human rights violations, O-ring transfer, the saber rattling with Taiwan, the treatment of Tibet, intellectual property rights violations, those very serious things.

That is why I believe the right thing for us to do is to continue trade, obviously, and this House has made that statement, but to move ahead with this
resolution that will call for commit-tees to look into the very serious ques-tions that we all very much want to address.

As a strong supporter of most-fa-vored-nation trading status with the People’s Republic of China, I join in supporting this resolution and urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSOHN). The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends for yielding me this time, and I also want to rise in support of this resolution and commend the author, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], and the House, for our brightest and most eloquent Members.

This is a very, very important reso-lution from my perspective as a Member of the Committee on National Secu-rity, because I, along with my friend, the gentlemen from California, E. CUNNINGHAM, and other members of the committee, received testimony from the Clinton administration representa-tives with respect to China and its par-ticipation in arms sales and the sales of chemical weapons components to non-arms sales countries in some cases that are unstable and in other cases considered to be adversaries of the United States.

We have just now started, really, this investigation. And when we asked the representatives of the Clinton administration whether or not there had been sales of the M-11 missiles to, for example, Pakistan, the answer was it ap-pears that that did take place. When we asked about the ring magnets in open session, systems that are used to enrich uranium for the nuclear weap-ons construction process, the answer was yes, that probably did take place. It appears that there have been transfers of chemical weapons compo-nents to Iran. That has taken place.

So we see a couple of things happen-ing. We live in an age of missiles right now, in which a number of Third World nations are acquiring missile tech-nology, the ability to deliver a payload to another country 300, 400, 500 miles away. Can we control these transfers of components that may be nuclear compo-nents or they may be biological or chemical components?

We see China now taking a very im-portant role in that proliferation of deadly technology to other nations, and we do not see any hesitancy on their part as a result of America’s en-terprises to stop it. We have asked them to stop it. They will not stop it just be-cause we have talked to them.

We do need to acquire points of lever-age. This is what we have done in the MFN debate, that we missed an impor-tant point of leverage, but in the ensu-ing months we will work in the Com-mittee on National Security, and I know the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, [Mr. SPENCE], finds this to be an important issue, and we will try to develop both the facts as to what China is doing with respect to proliferation, or as to the components and weapons to Third World na-tions and what we can do in the United States to stop it.

I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] and thank the gentle-man from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank] for giving me this time, and I look forward to working on this very important project.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massa-chusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Trade Commis-sion had jurisdiction over our legisla-tive processes, I think that this would probably be cited as a bait and switch proposition.

I read the resolution and it consists largely of a number of very good rea-ons why we should not do favors for the Chinese. China is a Communist country in these terms with the Chinese People’s Republic. It is a long list of the great grievances which we have against the Chinese People’s Republic. Then we come into the last page, in which, hav-ing shown them down and listed all the terrible things we do, we unleash our weapon: Hearings.

Now, I appreciate the fact that hear-ings can sometimes be a nuisance if you are the Secretary of an American Cabinet department. The notion that we are going to have hearings might be a problem. but the threat of hearings in this situation seems to me to be of quite minimal effect on the Chinese.

So I would have to say, and I will yield to the gentleman if he would yield me some of his time, because I only have two minutes and he had 8 and some odd minutes left, but at this point I would say it does appear to me that any resemblance between this and a serious piece of legislation is entirely coincidental.

The notion that the Chinese, having compiled this very long record of vio-lating agreements and abusing people and getting the better of us economi-cally, would really be upset because we are going to have hearings seems to me to be quite minimal.

If the gentleman wants to yield some time, he will be glad to have a colle-gue with him, but apparently he does not, so I will simply say that this may ease the conscience of those who voted for MFN. If in fact Members agree with ev-erything in this resolution, I do not know how they could have voted to give the Chinese Most-Favored-Nation treatment.

There is certainly nothing, I will say in closing, in the behavior, in the record, in the composition of the People’s Republic of China, that ought to give me any inclination to believe that the Chinese will pay any more attention to this than they have anything we ever did before.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may con-sume to say in response to my col-league and friend from Massachusetts, who normally is one of the most atten-tive during debate, that he must have missed the debate earlier on this be-cause the previous one was in favor of this resolution, from the gentle-woman from California [Ms. PELOSI] to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] to myself, in any way meant for this resolution to be a substitute for the previous vote.

To the contrary, I voted, as perhaps did the gentleman, I do not know how he voted, but certainly as did Ms. PELOSI and Mr. MILLER, and the others who have spoken, as did the Chairman of the Committee on International Re-lations, as did the chairman of the Committee on National Security, and that is to say serious in the one and only way we were given an opportunity to be serious, and that is with the reso-lution offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. ROHRABACHER.

What we now have an opportunity to do, having faced obvious defeat on the scoreboard, having seen the vote tally, is what we have not done before, and that is to go beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, to the Committee on National Security, to the Committee on International Re-lations, to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and again to the Committee on Ways and Means, and have not only hearings, because that is not all this resolution says, but also legislation dealing with the very topics laid out in the resolution so that we are on the floor here no later than September 30.

I have spoken personally with the chairmen of these committees, and this is not just a hortatory injunction reso-lution. These chairmen are committed to bringing legislation forward. The chairman of the Committee on Na-tional Security was himself here on the floor, the chairman of the Committee on International Relations was himself here on the floor.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLO-MON].

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his re-marks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the sponsor of this resolu-tion, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX]. I think it is a strong step in the right direction and I strongly sup-port it.

Mr. Speaker, having just extended MFN for Communist China for the 17th year in a row, it is time for the advocates of MFN to step for-ward and promote a viable alternative for dealing with the problem of Communist China, and they can start by supporting the Cox resolution. This resolution directs four committees of the Cabinet department to bring legislation forward. The chairman of the Committee on National Security was here. The chairman of the Committee on International Relations was here. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services was here. And the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend those committees and the advocates of
Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration's absolute delinking of trade from human rights in 1994 was a betrayal of an oppressed people of breathtaking tenacity. The record of the Clinton administration flip-flopped on promoting human rights in China. After issuing a comprehensive Executive order that laid out a number of threshold items that had to be reached in order to confer MFN to China. The bold, a performance—"significant progress in human rights" was the clear standard that had to be met. When the Chinese regressed and human rights violations increased, the President turned tail and backed down. The dictatorship won. And the courageous Chinese democracy advocates were sold out and abandoned.

I led a human rights trip to China midway through the Executive order review period and met with numerous high government officials. I met with business leaders. I met with high government officials. And every single Chinese Government official told me and our delegation that human rights would be delinked from trade. It was just a political stunt. The Clinton order to be bogus. They were totally cynical about it and viewed it as a joke. They thought it was window dressing, appealing to a domestic audience rather than a sincere effort to try to really rein in on the abuses of the People's Republic of China.

Unfortunately, the Clinton policy is only the worst example of a much broader policy in which the U.S. Government has brought about an almost total delinking of human rights from other foreign policy concerns around the globe.

I think Members will recall that this is a candidate, Bill Clinton justly criticized some officials of previous administrations for subordinating human rights to other concerns in China and elsewhere and he called it compelling dictators. I would submit to you this evening that Bill Clinton has coddled as few have coddled before.

The important legislation offered by my good friend and colleague from California, Mr. Cox, provides us with a sincere opportunity to seriously reconsider our trading relationship with the People's Republic of China in light of their egregious human rights record and their ongoing and flagrant empowerment of rogue regimes with weapons of mass destruction.

In the coming weeks, the PRC should be put on notice, this Congress is going to insist on scrutinizing China's record as never before. Yes, over the last 18 months my subcommittee held numerous hearings on China's human rights practices. The full committee has held hearings on nuclear proliferation. Other hearings have explored the western side. But now, four major committees of the House of Representatives will draw a bead and bring blazing light to bear on these deplorable practices. And
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I hope, we will leave no stone unturned in our probe.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I held a hearing on the human rights consequences of Mr. Clinton's misguided policy. Human Rights Watch, Freedom House International, Dr. Harry Wu—among others—all testified how abuses had actually increased since delinking MFN and human rights. Amnesty International testified, that the Clinton administration's human rights policy towards China is "confusing and weak". The administration is "aggressive only in a trade war with China. Amnesty International is unaware of any human rights war waged by this administration despite the worsening human rights situation in China."

Amnesty also testified that the human rights conditions in China, had "worsened since the delinking of human rights trade policy of MFN in 1994." Mr. COX's legislation gets us back into the ballgame. A bipartisan group of lawmakers will produce legislation, and I do believe that the various committees of Congress, including the one that I serve on, International Relations, will come forward with new policy proposals. Mr. GILMAN's bill is a good place to start. In the coming weeks, we will craft legislation—perhaps a hybrid designed to mitigate these egregious abuses. It's time to plan hardball.

Let me also point out that Amnesty testified, that so-called economic progress in China has not resulted in observer respect for human rights. That's really not that surprising. After all the Fascists in Italy made the trains run on time. The Nazis knew how to run a factory. Like those dictatorships, there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that the Chinese dictatorship has been tamed by economic growth. It has only become a glutton for more power and control. As a matter of fact, the evidence suggests that the PRC dictatorship is today more oppressive, and more determined to retain the reins of power.

The Clinton policy is empowering a repressive military by feeding it, gorging it, with dual-use-capable items and sophisticated technology. Our businesses are beefing up their PLA's offensive capabilities and making them more effective in controlling the people—and neighboring countries.

Amnesty told our committee that despite economic changes and a big jump in human years in China, there has been "no fundamental change in the Government's human rights practices."

Mr. Speaker, the Cox legislation suggests that with the revocation of MFN no longer a possibility, is there at least, that other means of registering our utter disgust with the dictatorship's cruel mistreatment of its own citizenry will be forthcoming, and we have a date certain by the end of September to produce those proposals and enact them.

We have leverage, I say to my colleagues, we need to use it and use it prudently and wisely. For those, my friends and colleagues who advocate the status quo and no linkage, I have a simple question: Is there anything a government, in this case a cruel dictatorial government, could do, is there anything so provocative that the united nations or the United States should say enough is enough. In light of China's barbaric and cruel treatment to its people can we pretend we just don't see and go on as if it is business as usual? Consider the inhuman and inhumane practices of the Beijing Government that are ongoing, pervasive, and getting worse by the day. The use of slave labor—or the laogai—the prison camps—where many of our products that find their way on the shelves in our stores are being produced by prisoners of conscience. The statement of the status quo say, no problem, the United States and China signed a memorandum of understanding during the previous administration. The MOU looks splendid on paper. But it's a Potemkin village—sanitized and free of any possible violation of the MOU.

In the early 1990's Congressman FRANK WOLF to one going after much persistence and tough negotiations. We discovered that Beijing prison No. 1 contained more than 40 dissidents from the Tiananmen Square crackdown. We were witnesses to the making of girls' jelly shoes and socks for export. We were shown a child. Chinese women are hounded by the population control police and even their menstrual cycles are publicly monitored as one means of ensuring compliance.

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

The central government also issued a law on eugenics which is now taking effect and which nationalizes discrimination against the handicapped. In a move that is eerily reminiscent of Nazi Germany, the Communist Chinese Government is implementing forced abortion against handicapped children and forced sterilization against parents who simply do not measure up in the eyes of the State. In this way, the United Nations Population Fund continues to provide funds, materiel, people on the ground and what no money could buy, the sort of shield of respectability that the PRC program so desperately wants.

I would just say parenthetically that the head of the UNFPA, the U.N. Population Fund, time and time again has defended the program in China as totally voluntary. This is not the case. A few women, children and women and children may be of no great matter for the Chinese Communist regime which has long regarded homicide and torture as among the basic tools of statecraft.

The Cox legislation represents hope. I truly believe that this Congress will work hard to fashion legislation designed to mitigate China's egregious abuses. We have a moral obligation to help our suffering friends in the PRC. I urge strong support for the Cox bill.

Mr. BERERUT, Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in support, but somewhat reluctant support, for House Resolution 461. This Member
voices reluctant support not because he opposes the notion of articulating United States concerns with the People's Republic of China. Indeed, it is extremely important to convey in specific detail the objections the United States has regarding PRC behavior with regard to human rights, proliferation, and questionable trade practices.

However, when this body raises concerns, it must be careful to speak with a high degree of accuracy. While the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Cox] did yeoman's work in compiling a list of concerns on extremely short notice, unfortunately there are a number of inaccuracies in the legislation. For example, on the whereas clauses related to commercial trade, the United States did not conclude, as alleged in House Resolution 461, a formal agreement with the People's Republic of China on intellectual property rights on June 17, 1996. Instead, the United States merely decided not to impose sanctions.

Also, regarding the convertibility of the People's Republic of China's currency, House Resolution 461 is outdated and does not recognize recent reforms.

In addition, the legislation states that the current anticrime programs has targeted political, religious, and labor activists in addition to common criminals in Tibet, Zinjiang, and in the whole of Communist China. In information available to me indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the campaign seems to have targeted only ordinary criminals.

The resolution also states that actions by the People's Liberation Army in the South China Sea have threatened the United States Navy's right of free passage in those waters. But the right of free passage of the U.S. Navy has never been challenged by anyone, either the People's Republic of China or any of the other nations vying for control of the disputed islands and atolls.

To the extent that this body is not wholly and completely factual in its representation of events, our message is undermined. It is quite possible that the People's Republic of China will react to House Resolution 461 simply by pointing to the inaccuracies. If that happens, they will be able to subvert the important message that their overall international and domestic behavior must improve.

Mr. Speaker, the body should be very cautious in considering legislation critical of any nation; we must be as accurate as possible. That is the reason that under normal legislative practice this body moves legislation through committees with specific expertise. When this body uses the existing committee structure as designed, it is far less likely that inaccuracies will find their way into legislation. Mr. Speaker, while this Member will vote for House Resolution 461, it is essential that this body can return to the practice of permitting the committees and subcommittees of jurisdiction to exercise their rightful role in the legislative process. By passing the authorizing committees, even to provide a last minute tandem resolution to assure the defeat the Rohrabacher resolution to deny normal tariff status to the People's Republic of China is not a good practice.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I oppose renewing most-favored-nation status [MFN] for China at this time.

I have supported MFN for China in the past. My support has been predicated upon the assumption that there would be certain improvements in China's conduct as a member of the international community.

The County Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1995 published by the U.S. Department of State states that "During the year the Government continued to commit widespread and well documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms, stemming both from the authorities intolerance of dissent and the lack of legal safeguards for basic freedom". This statement comes 7 years after the 1989 crackdown in Tiananmen Square.

Further, we have a trade deficit with China of $34 billion that suggests less than an open Chinese market for United States goods. In 1986 the United States had a trade deficit of $1.7 billion with China; that deficit now stands at $33.8 billion. We hear from representatives of three important sectors of the United States economy that China's policy in the auto, aerospace sector, and steel are working against the interest of the United States.

Representatives of three unions, the International Union, UAW, the International Association of Machinists, and the United Steel Workers state that their worker realize that there is a large gap in our bilateral trade and improvement of living standards. These representatives state however, that...this will not occur while Chinese workers are prevented from exercising basic rights and the Chinese government uses discriminatory policies to keep out the world-class products made by (U.S. workers).

In April 1996, the United States Trade Representative designated China as a priority foreign country for failing to implement an agreement on intellectual property rights. This problem exists since 1989 and it did not end with the recent agreement between China and the United States.

The United States has other problems with China that are enumerated in great detail in House Resolution 461 and I do not intend to enumerate them again here. However, the action called for in the resolved clause of the resolution should be implemented before we renew MFN to China, or under the present circumstances, we should extend conditional MFN to China contingent upon action by the PRC government in accordance with the guidelines set forth in House Resolution 461.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as we move ahead into the post-cold-war world, we find ourselves increasingly challenged to better understand the People's Republic of China which remained for so long closed to us, and to foster new relationships that will enable us to ensure our economic and national security.

The United States has greatly enhanced its trade, cultural ties, and influence on this once closed society. United States trade with China has increased from $4.8 billion in 1980—when we first extended most favored nation trading status to China—to $57.3 billion in 1995. These numbers reflect growing American economic influence on China—a stabilizing factor to a nation whose government has frequently demonstrated erratic, extreme, and inexusable behavior.

It is in our interest to build on our relationship with PRC. We want to encourage increased trade for our own economic benefit, and we want to bring the benefits of our thriving open society to the Chinese people.

While we should strive to foster stronger relations, we should never do so at the expense of our own national interests.

There is no need to provoke disputes just for the sake of flexing national muscle, but we cannot continue to ignore China's egregious violations in the area of arms control and basic human rights. If we want agreements and accepted international standards to have any teeth, we must be willing to risk dispute with bull in the butter.

In the case of China, that has unfortunately happened on too many occasions. Perhaps the most compelling example of this is the repeated transfer of M-11 missiles and technology to Pakistan, despite China's repeated pledges to adhere to the Missile Technology Control Regime. China has also sold cruise missile technology to Iran in violation of MTCR and transferred chemical weapons production equipment there in violation of its commitments to the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Then there's the transfer of ring magnets to Pakistan for the purpose of uranium enrichment, which is a violation of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

Compounding the problems posed by these transfers, the administration refuses to sanction the companies for the violations; as long as China pledges not to sell missile technology, the administration claims credit for a breakthrough.

Then, China again proceeds to sell the forbidden items. And the administration ignores—or when too much evidence piles up, denounces—the transfer. We have the same response for sanctions.

Then there's the transfer of ring magnets to Pakistan for the purpose of uranium enrichment, which is a violation of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

Compounding the problems posed by these transfers, the administration refuses to sanction the companies for the violations; as long as China pledges not to sell missile technology, the administration claims credit for a breakthrough.

Then, China again proceeds to sell the forbidden items. And the administration ignores—or when too much evidence piles up, denounces—the transfer. We have the same response for sanctions.

Sadly, this administration's arms control policy is like a movie set facade: It looks great from far away, but once you get behind it there's nothing inside to back it up. While the bill before us today will not ensure arms control and enforcement, we would be remiss if we did not note the violations and insist on accountability from China and when necessary, the administration. Fortunately, there are appropriate mechanisms outside of the MFN process that allow the administration to deal with the violations, and we must insist that they do so.

As we proceed with MFN, we must raise these concerns. House Resolution 461 recognizes the flaws in current United States-China policy and it seeks to adjust them by developing the precise legislation needed to influence China's inadequacies in trade practices, its terrible human rights record, its erratic military policy, and its proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. House Resolution 461 calls on the House Committees on Banking and Financial Services, International Relations, Ways and Means, and National Security to commence hearings and report appropriate legislation by September 30, 1996 to address these concerns.

In the past, I have consistently opposed extending MFN for China because I did not agree with Chinese policy on many different fronts. While I am still committed to changing China's ways, I believe MFN is not the best approach. We have worked with the guidance of House Resolution 461, legislation can be tailor-made to bring about these long sought-after changes in Chinese policy.

As Chairman of the House National Security Subcommittee on Research and Development, and as cochairman of the Congressional Missile Defense Caucus, I will be diligent in formulating ways that we can make China comply with international nuclear test-ban and
nonproliferation agreements. Meanwhile, we must continue to foster new economic opportunities that will give them the tools and resources that support alternative export opportunities for China. I believe that passage of MFN will do just that, and I urge others to join me in supporting the passage.

Mr. Oxley. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of engagement with China, in support of China MFN, and against the resolution of disapproval.

As I have said on this floor on other occasions, China is one of America’s top exporters of manufactured goods. China is not only the world’s most populous country, but also one of the world’s most rapidly expanding marketplaces. In fact, Ohio Governor George Voinovich has established a permanent office in Beijing to support the State’s commercial interests there.

Ohio’s farmers, especially the corn and soybean farmers found in my district, are exporting to China and hope to increase their presence in this burgeoning market. Ohio employers such as Whirlpool, the Limited and Harris Corp. have contacted me in support of MFN treatment. Indeed, numerous United States companies have joint ventures in China and are using cooperative efforts to gain access to China and other Asian markets.

Mr. Speaker, MFN merely gives China the same economic treatment enjoyed by the vast majority of nations. Frankly, the phrase “most-favored” is something of a misnomer, which opponents of engagement use to distort the nature of our trading relationship with the People’s Republic of China.

Engaging in normal trade relations with China would undermine United States economic interests in China and the rest of Asia. It would cost American jobs and sacrifice a great opportunity for American business interests.

If United States farmers and United States companies are denied the chance to do business with China, other countries—many with a weaker commitment to human rights and democracy—will gladly fill the void. A great deal must continue to foster new economic opportunities that will give them the tools and resources for their heartfelt commitment on the issue of most favored nation [MFN] trade status renewal for China—clearly the most pressing issue now facing relations between Washington and Beijing.

Although I have the greatest respect for those Members in Congress that sincerely believe that it is necessary to prod China into complying with its international obligations and for progress in human and political rights, I feel that they are misguided. Thus, I reluctantly urge my colleagues to oppose adoption of House Joint Resolution 182 and to support House Resolution 461.

I have long been a supporter of maintaining broad and comprehensive ties with the People’s Republic of China—a policy of China engagement that has been upheld in a bipartisan fashion by five previous administrations.

It is in America’s national interest to have a productive relationship with a China that is strong, stable, open and prosperous—a China that is increasingly integrated into the international community and global marketplace as a responsible partner.

Over the past two decades, we have seen tremendous strides forward in China on several fronts. Although China still has significant problems in several areas—such as human rights, nuclear and missile proliferation, and fair trade—nobody seriously questions whether today’s China is fundamentally different from the Communist China that existed before President Nixon’s triumphal opening.

Due to vigorous trade and the concomitant expansion of contacts with the West, China has evolved into a more open society with a government that is increasingly sensitive to international opinion. It is absolutely vital that the United States support the continued opening of China to the world via the medium of trade—not closing the door.

Denial of MFN to China achieves nothing while forcing American businesses to unnecessarily pay a great sacrifice. Moreover, the inevitable trade war to erupt between China and the United States over MFN denial would also adversely impact all of the economies of the Asia-Pacific nations. Is it any wonder that Hong Kong, Taiwan, and other Asian governments have begged the United States not to deny China MFN—a unilateral economic sanction that is clearly useless without multilateral support. We cannot isolate China by applying trade sanctions but, ironically, that action would result in the isolation of America, both economically and politically.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our Members to support renewal of MFN trade status for China, as it is in America’s national interest to maintain productive and positive relations with China—a nation that is destined to be the leader of Asia in the 21st century. United States engagement with China, opposite adoption of House Joint Resolution 182 and support House Resolution 461.

Mr. Archer. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 461, the Cox resolution concerning China, outlines a number of bilateral problems with China and expresses the sense of Congress that denial of MFN is necessary to prod China into complying with its international obligations and for progress in human and political rights, that they are misguided.

I urge all my colleagues to support MFN status for China, in support of China MFN, and against the resolution of disapproval.
Mr. MURTHA changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."  
Mr. BEREFTER and Mr. ABER-CROMBIE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."  
Ms. SLAUGHTER changed her vote from "yea" to "present."  
So the immediate consideration was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN.  Mr. Speaker, I was not present for the vote on passage of H.R. 3666. Had I been here, I would have voted in favor of final passage on the VA-HUD bill.

Providing for Consideration of Concurrent Resolution Providing for Adjournment of House and Senate for Independence Day District Work Period

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 465 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 465

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider in the House a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHRISTENSEN).  Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  Mr. Speaker, by my direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 465 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER.  The resolution is in order.  The question is its adoption.

The House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The House adjourned.  

Voting:

NAYS—7

A N S W E R E D  " P R E S E N T " —3

Frank (MA) Scarborough Slaughter

NOT VOTING—12

Brewster (MA) Roybal-Allard (CA) Petitioner (FL)
Chapman (CA) Hall (OH) Stockman (SD)
Flake (AZ) Lincoln (NE) Torricelli (NJ)
Gibbons (OR) Moore (WA) Weldon (PA)

Mr. Speaker, the House has completed as many of the appropriations bills as possible, and we are over halfway there. The House has approved the appropriations measures for military construction, foreign operations, Agriculture, Defense, Interior, and VA-HUD and tonight, we will work on the transportation bill, and the remaining appropriations and reconciliation measures are to be considered in a timely matter after next week. We have certainly made progress with the administration during this year's appropriations cycle over last year's process, and I am confident that the House will continue to make appropriate spending decisions after the Independence Day district work period.

Independence Day is a time to be back in our districts, celebrating the birth of this great Nation, and listening to what our constituents have to say about the issues that are important to them.

The Congress has very important spending decisions to make, with limited funds, and time spent in our districts listening to the priorities of our constituents will be very worthwhile. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is totally reasonable that the House return to our districts for the Independence Day work period, to reflect together with our constituents on the principles put forth by our Founding Mothers in 1776 that form the basis of our limited, representative Government.

I urge adoption of the resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to make something perfectly clear, we are voting on this recess rule because, once again, the Republicans have not done their job.

This rule will waive provisions of law that require the Congress to get its work done before it recesses for July 4. So, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues barely managed to fulfill their responsibility last year and it looks like they might not get it done this year either.

Congress' primary responsibility is to pass 13 appropriations bills so that the Federal Government can function.
Section 309 of the Budget Act says the House cannot leave for July 4 until all 13 appropriations bills are passed. But, since my Republican colleagues have spent their time cutting Medicare and education and pay to tax breaks for the very rich, they haven't finished all of those bills.

Mr. Speaker, after last year's budget fiasco I hoped my Republican colleagues would have learned their lesson.

After Speaker Gingrich closed the Government not once, but twice. After Speaker Gingrich had to pass an unprecedented 13 continuing resolutions last year in order to buy time, I hoped my Republican colleagues would decide to join us in putting families first this year.

But it looks like we're not there yet. Last year the Contract on America was holding things up. Now, despite the contract's fizzling out, my Republican colleagues have only finished 7 of the 13 appropriations bills they were supposed to finish.

That is not the way Congress is supposed to run, Mr. Speaker.

And that's not the way the Democrats ran this year. During the last session in which the Democrats were in charge, 12 appropriations bills had passed the House by June 29. The last bill passed the House 2 weeks later.

And contrary to what some may assert, the inability of the Republicans to get their job done has nothing to do with open or closed rules. This year, 60 percent of the rules have been restrictive. We haven't been spending time openly discussing and amending legislation.

Instead, my Republican colleagues have made enormous cuts in education, Medicare, and environmental protection, most to pay for tax breaks for the very rich.

Mr. Speaker, that's not what the American people want. They want their needs to be given priority over the needs of the special interests, and they want Congress to stay until it gets the job done.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this rule. My Republican colleagues should do the work they were sent here to do.

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

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that in one of his essays, George Orwell wrote that 'Hypocrisy is the British vice'. Our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, seems to adamantly wish to replicate that trait in this House. I went back just three sessions, 6 years, in reviewing the record on this issue of the Fourth of July recess. Not once, not once during those 6 years, not once were all 13 appropriations bills passed at the time of the July recess.

Mr. Speaker, do Members know how many times we, when we were in the minority, failed to grant the majority unanimous consent on this issue? Not once. So I maintain that George Orwell's trait, when he referred to it as a British trait is being replicated at this point in our history.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Solomon].

Mr. Solomon. I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. Mr. Speaker, it is a shame we have to be here wasting an hour on this adjournment resolution. I have never in my 38 years here heard such crybabies. What do the very rich have to do with this adjournment thing? On that side of the aisle, they seem to think that anybody with a job is very rich. Do Members know what I think? I think many of the Members who have never run a business ought to resign and ought to go out and meet a payroll. Then I do not hear this 'very, very rich' business anymore.

Let me just reinforce what my colleague on the Committee on Rules has just pointed out. That is that the Democrats, they have no grounds for complaints about this Fourth of July, Independence-Day-adjournment resolution, given their own track record.

Let us look at the facts. Our earlier studies show that not once in the last 6 years of the Democrat-controlled Congress in this House, did they meet the July recess deadline for completing action on the 13 appropriation bills, as the gentleman just said, not once. So what are they standing up here crying for, and making all these absurd statements?

Since I thought that might be unfair to the Democrats to only go back 6 years, today I had the staff go back at least 10 years. We can go back 40, if Members want to. Sure enough, in one of the 60 percent of the rules that actually did complete House action on all 13 appropriation bills by the July recess, once, back in 1988. Did the Members remember that? I was here, I remember it. I see the gentleman's hand go up, he remembers it. In all fairness to the Democrats, they did meet the deadline under the Budget Act at one time in their last decade in control of this House. That is a fact, Mr. Speaker.

How does that compare to the Republican 104th Congress? While the average number of appropriation bills the Democrats passed by the July recess in their last 10 years was 6.2, our average, counting today's transportation appropriation bill, which will finish about midnight tonight because of the wasted time here on this foolish bill, we have completed 7 last year, 6 this year. That averages out to more than they did over all those years, gentlemen.

So notwithstanding the fact that we still have rather new at all this, we have only been at it about 18 months now, we are still doing better than those guys did all these years. Mr. Speaker, what is really disturbing is the Democrats would take the time of this House of forcing this matter into the Committee on Rules for a special rule, just so they can say they are making some kind of an issue here.

Our survey of the last 10 years of Democratic control shows that in each year of that decade, the Republican minority, that was us then, permitted the resolutions to actually sit on the floor under a unanimous-consent statement. We did not waste all of this body and paying all of this overtime to all of these people on this foolish resolution. We acted instead in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation. That is comity. Remember what it used to sound like?

We used to have some comity in this body. So it is indeed sad that the Democrats have stooped to this to make a partisan issue on this Independence Day.

I am going to tell my colleagues something. I live up in the Hudson Valley. I represent the Catskills and the Adirondack Mountains. That is where the Revolutionary War was fought on that Independence Day, July 4. I want to come up and see where General John Burgoyne surrendered to Horatio Gates. That was the turning point. That was the battle that made this the greatest, freest Nation on earth.

What are we fooling around here for? All of us pack up our bags and let us go home. Let us see what it is really like back home, and let us stop talking very, very, very, very much. I never heard such goings on. I will back up with fact this study, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Moakley. Mr. Speaker, the reason I bring that up is because the Republicans said they were going to run the Committee on Rules completely different. They were going to run the Congress completely different. And they haven't. That is why 60 percent of the rules have been closed, and they have not brought the appropriation bills forward. So they are not doing what they said they would do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Obey], the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Obey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to not talk so much about the past but about the present and the future. The situation, as this chart shows, is that, if we take a look at what has happened to each of the 13 appropriation bills that we are supposed to be passing this fiscal year, so far 7 of them, those in red that reach this line here, 7 of those will be on the floor of the day will have passed the House. Only one will have passed the Senate. There are three more which are moving their way through the Committee on Appropriations, and there are three which have not even begun the move through the Committee on Appropriations. So that means that 7 out of the 13 will be passed through the House by the end of the day.
That is absolutely not the fault of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Livingston] or the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations. But I do think we need to look at what the problems are so that we can try to deal with the problem.

The problem, the main problem is that, first of all, the budget resolution was 2 months late. Because of that, the Committee on Appropriations has been forced to do in approximately 3 weeks time what the Treasury would take 10 weeks to accomplish. That is in my view the price that was paid for the extremism that was reflected in the general budget resolution. Even the Republican majority in the Senate could not take the extremism represented by the House-passed budget resolution, and they demanded substantial changes. It took a long time to get them. That put us behind.

Second, we also have what I would describe as the "my-way-or-no-way" mentality which dominates the majority party caucus in this House on a number of these appropriation bills. Example: Just last night we had an effort made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stokes] to offer an amendment which would have repaired the problem on the VA-HUD bill.

The subcommittee chairman, Mr. Lewis, graciously recognized that we had a problem and tried to deal with it, but he was overruled by the extremists in his own caucus. So they would up refuse to provide the major fix-ups that everybody knows are going to be necessary in that VA-HUD bill if the bill is ever going to become law. If those fix-ups are not made, we are simply going to have a bill that goes nowhere.

Just this morning in the Committee on Appropriations on the Treasury, Post Office bill, accommodation was reached on several items. But it has been made very clear by the Treasury Department and by the Committee on Ways and Means, for instance, if I could add that, that the committee is insisting on extreme actions with respect to dictating how the IRS goes about modernization. They are insisting on taking actions which the Republican leadership on the Committee on Ways and Means says will lead to a loss of revenue. And if you have a loss of revenue, you are going to have an addition to the deficit. Yet when efforts were made to cross the aisle, the fix that prevented them were all rejected. So it is "our-way-or-no-way."

Again, it is quite clear from my conversations with Treasury that that bill will not see the light of day. It will never become law because it is repaired so that we do not damage the ability of the IRS to collect the taxes that are due under law.

The interior appropriation bill, because we have not taken action provided, has already been put on the veto list. In addition to that, the Labor HEW bill, because of the woefully inadequate allocation winds up providing $2.5 billion less for education alone than the President is requesting. That is going to mean a long stalemate unless we have a much more flexible attitude exhibited by the majority party in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a little bit of history here. The last year that our party controlled this House, I chaired the Committee on Appropriations. We passed every single appropriation bill before the end of the fiscal year. The President would not do that because of any peculiar wisdom on my part. We did it because my party leadership allowed me to cross the aisle, to go to the Republican leadership on the committee and work out a bipartisan allocation under the 602 budget process under which we agreed on a bipartisan basis how much money would go into each of those 13 spending bills. Because we had reached bipartisan agreement, we were able to pass all 13 of those appropriation bills on time.

The House Appropriations Committee was never allowed to do that this year because of the extreme agenda already referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts, which requires that we squeeze every last dollar out of the budget that we are able to out of job training in order to fund tax cuts for people making $200,000 a year. That is the problem. Until that is gotten over by the majority party in this House, it is not going to be possible to pass any of those bills.

I would remind by colleagues that there are only 31 working days left before the end of the fiscal year. Can anybody tell me that they really believe we are going to be able to finish all 13 appropriation bills, half of which are not yet through the House, only one of which is through the Senate, unless we get a far more flexible and a far more bipartisan attitude from the majority than we have gotten to date?

Now, I know that the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations has tried everything possible to get their bills done on time, but they cannot be expected to perform legislatively impossible acts. When the leadership on the majority side does not understand the realities of passing appropriations legislation, then they put the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations in an impossible situation; and no matter how hard they try, they cannot deliver on an impossible set of orders.

So I would suggest, I know there is plenty of goodwill on the part of the majority on the Committee on Appropriations, and I know that people are used to being workhorses on the committee. They are used to trying to work things out in ways which make reasonable accommodations to people who happen to sometimes disagree with them. But I also acknowledge that we are in control of the House. I would suggest that the majority party needs to understand that we had to do it when we were in the House if we wanted to get things done on time and if we wanted to get things done in a way which brings credit to this House.

So I think it is essential that we have a more reasonable attitude demonstrated by the majority leadership in this House. I think it that we recognize that there are going to have to be major changes in the budget allowances provided these bills, because the President is not going to accept the country is not going to accept short sheeting education, short sheeting other programs that are needed by middle class working people in order to provide $11 billion more than the President and the Pentagon are asking for, and in order to salt away money for tax cuts for high-income people. That just is not going to happen.

So if my colleagues want to know what is in store for us, recognize we are only halfway home in passing the bills through the House. Our principal obligation under the Constitution in this Congress is to pass our appropriation bills. I plead with my colleagues, we cannot get that done unless there is a much more flexible attitude on the part of the top party leadership in this House. We need a far more bipartisan accommodation and get the job done the way the country expects us to get the job done.

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. Diaz-Balart asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. Diaz-Balart. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to realize the longer we take discussing this rule, the longer it will be until we can get to the seventh appropriation bill, the seventh appropriation bill, which we want to pass tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McInnis] of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McInnis. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for allotting me the time to address some of the statements that have been made previously.

First of all, I think we should start out with the preceding speaker, who keeps using on a routine basis the word short cheating, I am not sure what short cheating is, but I can tell the previous speaker that short cheating is exactly what he is doing to the American people by continuing to frivolously argue a procedural motion. This is a motion that, when we were in the minority for at least the 6 years that we have researched, we never had a debate like this. We did it on a unanimous resolution.

Let me give my colleagues the history behind what we have here. The criticism we are receiving. Let us first of all talk about what it is we are debating. What we are debating is a very simple management procedure, and
that is to put this House in adjournment so that the Members of this House can go back to their districts on July 4 and work in their districts. Very simple. Very noncontroversial. Every year except now. All of a sudden it is a golden opportunity to whine about the majority.

Well, let us look at what we did, when we were in the minority and they were in the majority on the July 4 resolution for adjournment.

In the 99th Congress, the first session, did we have a special rule for this? No. We did it on unanimous consent. Did they have their appropriation bills passed? No. The 99th, second session. Did we require a special rule? No. Did they have their number of appropriations bills passed? No. On the 100th, for the first and second session both, did we require a special rule? No. Did they have their appropriations passed? No. The same thing for the 101st. The same thing for the 102d.

Why are my colleagues trying to stall this? This is not a game. We need to get to work.

Last night Members on both sides of the aisle in this House worked until 2 o'clock. Tonight, by the way, the way it is going right now, we will probably be here until 2 o'clock again. These people need to get back to their districts. This is not a controversial issue.

What has happened is, some Members have captured this as an issue to cry about being in the minority, to stand up and whine and whine. Frankly, we are not accomplishing anything.

Let us make a couple of points of clarification. The gentleman preceding me is a very good speaker. He brought up a nice chart, it looks great. He talked about how when he was on the Committee on Appropriations, when he was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, why they were able to pass all of these bills by the end of the fiscal year.

Well, we are not talking about the end of the fiscal year on July 4. That comes on September 30. That is still several months away. We need to compare apples to apples. When we compare apples to apples, we find that the minority cooperated, and that is a word that we ought to use around here, cooperated with the majority when we were in the minority for the July 4 adjournment, so that Members could go back to their districts for the July 4 holiday, although, as all of us know, it is not really a holiday because we participate in parades and we want to work our districts, and I think we should work our districts.

I think it is also very important to note, and I hear it again from the preceding speaker, about on one hand the gentleman says we need to have more cooperation here. On the other hand, taking a look at the record of the gentleman's comments, probably every fifth sentence he turns around and calls it extreme positions, the extremists over here, the short-cheating these kind of verbal attacks. That is not going to get us anywhere. Let us cooperate. We have got a lot of work left yet to do tonight and I think we need to focus on that work. I think we should spend our time dealing with issues of substance instead of arguing about a simple management procedural resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Doggett).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am stunned genuinely to hear the last speaker refer to whining, to refer to crying. I find even more stunning the comments of the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee, referring to crybabies, and I thought that would be an incident that our Republican colleagues would just as soon forget, because all America knows there was only one crybaby involved in all this and that is what finally led to the Government shutdown. Mr. Speaker, I think that America can look at what is happening here tonight and can say in short, "Been there, done that." We had your hurry-up-and-stop approach to government all of the last year. Where did it lead America? It led us down the road to two very costly Government shutdowns, and when all was said and done and we followed your path, the American taxpayer got a bill for $3.5 billion because you wasted taxpayer's money because you did not do your job and then a crybaby came along and pouted and we ended up with a Government shutdown and no budget.

The law in this very clear. You are such revolutionaries apparently you would believe in flouting the law instead of following the law. The law does say anything to prevent Mr. Solomon from going to upstate New York and talking to all the other revolutionaries that he would want to talk to. It says you can take 3 days and have your watermelon and your apple pie and make your Fourth of July speech but if you do not have your work done, come back to Washington and get it.

The only reason that you are having to offer this resolution is you do not want to do that work. You do not want to follow the Budget Act that is written into our law. If you did that, you would not need this resolution. You profess, so much concern about the budget, about getting it balanced, about protecting future generations. I share that concern.

Mr. Speaker, it is unique that the gentleman from Cleveland would ask me to yield. He is the one who raised the crybabies point last November when a crybaby did lead to the problems that we have in this country.

Mr. DOGGETT. On your time I will yield for the full 30 minutes but on my time I want to talk about the way you are flouting the law, flouting the Congressional Budget Act. If you think that act is inappropriate, then change the law, but it is on the books.

Tonight we find that only half of the appropriations bills have been passed, and we further find that our Republican colleagues, including those who have asked me to yield, have boasted of the fact that they do not plan to complete their work, never planned to complete it, because, purely for political advantage, they have decided to wait until September, not until July as the House can go back to their districts on July 4 and work in their districts. Very simple.

Tonight we see the political calendar can do. Not once did we require a special rule? No. Did they have their appropriations passed? No. The same thing for the 101st. The same thing for the 102d.
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for the last time. They talk about Republican proposed changes in education, in job training, environment, and welfare. I want to talk about my perspective and how I came here and what I saw and what we tried to do.

First, Speaker, education. We did not propose any cuts over the next 7 years in education. We actually proposed an increase in expenditures of $24 billion. It is not just how much money you spend on education or any other program. We were spending more money, billions of hard earned taxpayers' dollars on education, we are spending more on programs for education. The question is how you spend the money and what results you get.

Let us look at the results. Our children have diplomas they cannot read. I have 71 percent of my students in central Florida in one community college requiring remedial education upon entering. Is that success? We are paying for more and getting less. Forty years of tax-and-spend. They tried taxing you even more here. We have had a recession. The American people feel like they have less is because they have less, because they have taxed you more in the past 3 years. You have less, you have less opportunity, and you have less left over in your paycheck. They want to get rid of any senior citizen and they taxed your Social Security, whether they gave more money to those who wash up on our shores illegally than they gave in benefits to our veterans.

That is what this is about. It took shutting government down. And then the President tried to embarrass us. He was as guilty as anyone in the process. He did not want to work together. He wanted to make political advantage of it. This is what Medicare is. They destroyed Medicare. They are watching it die on the vine and they do not care about it. I have family members who are senior citizens that depend on Medicare. We want to save Medicare. We want to protect Medicare. They want to destroy it. Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair tell me how much time the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] and I have remaining?

Mr. BALART. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 11 1/2 minutes remaining, and gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 11 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURAO].

Ms. DELAURAO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the gentleman who just spoke talk about how it took shutting the Government down twice, and to provide the American people with the pain that they felt in the United States Government being shut down. By their own admission, they deliberately shut the Government down.

As for withering on the vine, we know whose quote that is. The Speaker of the House has talked about Medicare withering on the vine, that "We cannot get a note from home, let them off the hook because they have not done their homework. This is the Republican revolution, and when will these revolutionaries grow up and take their responsibilities to the American people seriously? Commerce, State, Energy and Water, Treasury, Postal, Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, the list of unfinished business goes on and on and on for the last 3 months. They have not fooled the American public where they have said that what they truly want to do is to cut Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. That is what the last 19 months has been about, and in the last month, they capped it off with passing a budget that increases the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues, vote against this resolution. Let us get the facts straight. As a matter of fact, I would like to recognize for a couple of minutes at this point the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], for 2 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get in the middle of a balanced budget debate. Quite frankly, I
do not think either party is going to balance the budget. I think people are going to be looking for jobs in Mexico the way things are going around here. I have been here a number of years, and I think there was only 1 year under Jim Wright where we had all of these appropriation bills done by July 4th. The American taxpayers and workers have to work till July 3 to pay for Federal taxes, State taxes, local taxes, and for the regulatory burden they have; July 4th.

We have staff around here that is burned out. Democrats very rarely finish their programs by the Fourth of July. I dearly love the ranking chairman, the former chairman of the Committee on Rules. This is not a slight to the chairman. I am going to vote for the rule. I am going to vote for the resolution. I am going to vote to adjourn. The Republican Party is at least working on these particular issues. I think we have gone an hour on this. Quite frankly, I have never seen this happen before. Now, my last recollection was 1998, Jim Wright, we had all these appropriation bills done on time. We have no record of the rule. I am going to vote for the rule, and I am going to vote to adjourn.

I think as a body we should consider the staff that works here. Sometimes they go till 3 in the morning, get back at 7, and I think we should be a little more considerate.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. Speaker, there are times when we are in our office working away and we hear one of the speeches on the floor coming over that CSPAN channel and we are compelled to set the record straight. It is indeed this feeling of being compelled to set the record straight that brings me forward to address the rule before us.

While my preceding speaker, my colleagues and friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], acknowledged that it may be unusual to have all these appropriation bills done by this point in time, I would make the point that we have never, ever seen such a debacle with the handling of appropriation bills that we saw in the first year of this 104th Congress.

This House of Representatives has never, ever shut the Federal Government of this country down because it could not, would not get work done. That is the sorry legacy of the 104th Congress, and I do not think it is too much to expect that they would therefore try to get it done by the time the law says it has to be done, not have to come to the floor, ever chewing at the bit to climb on some airplane and fly home, will not waive the bill. I am going to vote for the appropriations business done.

In light of the record of this Congress, we have got to wonder, I think the American taxpayers have to wonder, just what is coming, what can they expect. Another shutdown when at the end of the fiscal year the work has yet to be completed?

There are some fact issues that have been widely misrepresented. Those include funding for education and training. In fact, I heard a preceding speaker allude to any suggestions that reductions in education funding simply are false statements. Well, let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, those statements are false statements. In fact, overall education and training budget authority is $60 billion below the President's plan for 1996 through 2002. The Republican funding cut for fiscal year 1996 through 2002 is $88 billion in this particular issue. Nineteen percent below the 1995 enacted level. Nineteen percent below the 1995 enacted level, and we have a suggestion that there has been reeducation funding. Hogwash. There is a record here, and a record some of our colleagues might want to deny, but the fact of the matter is a record very firmly established, and the record is there have been cuts to education.

Medicare, oh, we are going to hear a lot in the next few months about people's concern about Medicare, but the fact of the matter is there was a resolution that passed this Congress that cut Medicare $270 billion. Our colleagues say it had to do with fixing the trust fund. Well, we know what it had to do with. It had to do with funding a $245 billion tax cut, disproportionately benefiting the wealthiest people in this country. It is a record, a record of the 104th Congress and, if I was in the majority, not a record to be very proud of.

There are a number of other examples. The reduction in earned income tax credits, the 17 billion tax increase to working families. All of these have constituted the record of this Congress.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, all of this, with all of those failures, all those attempts to wreck education, to wreck Medicare, what they call reconciliation, which was the right name for that bill that they did that it, all of that and then they have come, have they not, this year and they are actually increasing the budget deficit with the bills that they have proposed and not passed, they are going to increase the budget deficit this year after we had it on the path the last 4 years coming down every single year under Democrat leadership.

This year they have passed a bill to increase the deficit this year, then to do it again next year. Maybe that is why they want to go home: they are not too proud of the increases that they proposed this year and next year.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

As we know, they barely passed that budget resolution, and now we read in the Washington Post today the Speaker has convened a team of Pentagon officers on loan to do an after-action review, military jargon for "how come it was such a close call." I could tell them if he would just listen. The bill was a close call because it did not drop the deficit toward a balanced budget, it raised the deficit. The Speaker is going to send home Members of his own caucus; the only record they will have in adjourning toward a budget is the deficit going up on their watch. That is why the Speaker barely passed his budget.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I believe that the more the American people find out about these failures of this Congress that some of these folks are going to have an opportunity to go home for a lot longer than 3 days.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGS
to], chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. LIVINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Speaker being one of those Members who just have to walk on the border of those Members who happened to be back in his office watching CSPAN and being compelled to come to the floor to respond to the last speaker and his comments, I have to say that I am compelled to set the record straight.

We have just completed six bills in the appropriations cycle. We are going to complete the seventh tonight, the seventh, I remind the Members, before the July 4 recess.

And how interesting it is I have in mind a record of the last 5 Congresses. I have to say the gentleman who preceded me might have been right; in the 103d Congress, both sessions, they did exceed the number of bills that we have had, but in the 102d, second session, the Democrats only passed six bills out of the House before the July 4 recess. In the 101st Congress, they missed in both sessions. In the second session, it was only three. In the first session it was only one. Now, they did all right in the 100th Congress, in the second session. But in the first session, they only passed six. And my goodness, in the 99th Congress, if I do recall correctly, the Democrats controlled not only the 99th but the 98th and the 97th all the way back for 40 years, and they had a lot of practice. They had a lot of practice, but they only passed one single appropriation bill in the second session and guess how many in the first session. I am shocked: zero. Zero appropriation bills before the Fourth of July.

Let us hear about this appalling record. In not only the 103d, the 102d,
the 101st, all the way back, do my colleagues know that since World War II, they only balanced the budget about three times, three single years? And all those other years they spent more than they received, sometimes as much as $100 billion a year, sometimes as much as $200 billion a year, sometimes as much as $300 or more billion dollars a year. And they aggregated about $5 trillion worth of debt.

Now, did they do anything about it? Did they sit in their office and feel compelled by their viewing of C-SPAN to come to the floor and condemn a record that accumulated $5 trillion worth of debt? Did they feel compelled to scream about the $200,000 debt imposed upon every man, woman, and child in America, of course not. They would pass another program. They would establish another agency. They would create another department. They would go home for the Fourth of July and say, “Look what I have done for you with your money. We are going to borrow more money.” That is what they accomplished. They accomplished a record of profligate spending unparalleled by any nation in the world. What they have accomplished is giving our children a legacy that they will not be able to repay.

Now, this July 4, we can go home because of the record of the 104th Congress and we can say we have passed a series of rescission bills in the spring of 1995 that cut $20 billion from what was appropriated by the previous Democrat Congress. In the fall, yes, the process took a long time, and I am sorry that it made all of us work so hard, and I am sorry that the President vetoed three bills, and I am sorry that the Democrats filibustered the biggest bill, the Labor-Health bill in the Senate. But the 1996 process saved the American people another $23 billion. We are midway through the 1997 process, and I hope we are going to save another $15 to $20 billion.

So below what was appropriated by the Democrats in the last Congress in which they had control, we have saved the American taxpayer some $60 billion. If you look at the budget projected by the President, had he had that, this President, we have saved about $80 billion. That is a record.

That is a record on which we can be very, very proud for the Fourth of July.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress the Republican majority claimed that the House was going to consider bills under an open process. I would like to point out that 60 percent of the legislation this session has been considered under a restrictive process.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following extraneous material for the RECORD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Resolution No.</th>
<th>Process used for floor consideration</th>
<th>Amendments in order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1*</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>H. Res. 6</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 6</td>
<td>Opening Day Rules Package</td>
<td>H. Res. 2</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 5*</td>
<td>Unfunded Mandates</td>
<td>H. Res. 38</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 2</td>
<td>Balanced Budget</td>
<td>H. Res. 44</td>
<td>Redistrict</td>
<td>2R; 4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 43</td>
<td>Committee Hearings Scheduling</td>
<td>H. Res. 43 (O)</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 101</td>
<td>To transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico</td>
<td>H. Res. 51</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 400</td>
<td>To provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park Preserve</td>
<td>H. Res. 52</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 440</td>
<td>To provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Klamath County, California</td>
<td>H. Res. 53</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 2*</td>
<td>Line Item Veto</td>
<td>H. Res. 55</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 665*</td>
<td>Victim Restitution Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 61</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 666</td>
<td>Exclusory Rule Reform Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 60</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 667*</td>
<td>Violent Crime and Incarceration Act of 1993</td>
<td>H. Res. 60</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 668*</td>
<td>The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 60</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 728</td>
<td>Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants</td>
<td>H. Res. 79</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 729*</td>
<td>Death Penalty/Habeas</td>
<td>H. Res. 83</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. J. Res. 81</td>
<td>To permanently extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed</td>
<td>H. Res. 88</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 830*</td>
<td>The Paperwork Reduction Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 91</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 839</td>
<td>Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority</td>
<td>H. Res. 92</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 459*</td>
<td>Regulatory Moratorium</td>
<td>H. Res. 93</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 102*</td>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>H. Res. 96</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 934*</td>
<td>Regulatory Flexibility</td>
<td>H. Res. 100</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 925*</td>
<td>Private Property Protection Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 101</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 926*</td>
<td>Medicare Select Extension</td>
<td>H. Res. 101</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 927*</td>
<td>Hydrogen Future Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 101</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 946*</td>
<td>Product Liability and Legal Reform Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 101</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 946*</td>
<td>Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions</td>
<td>H. Res. 101</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 937*</td>
<td>Term Limits</td>
<td>H. Res. 101</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 4*</td>
<td>Welfare Reform</td>
<td>H. Res. 101</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 177*</td>
<td>Family Privacy Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 119</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 669*</td>
<td>Housing for Older Persons Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 120</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 1215*</td>
<td>The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 129</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 483</td>
<td>Medicare Select Extension</td>
<td>H. Res. 130</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 655</td>
<td>Hydrogen Future Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 136</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 385</td>
<td>Conservation and Wildlife Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 140</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 961</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 140</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 535</td>
<td>Reintegration of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa</td>
<td>H. Res. 140</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 614</td>
<td>Convention of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility</td>
<td>H. Res. 146</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Con. Res. 67</td>
<td>Budget Resolution</td>
<td>H. Res. 149</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 151</td>
<td>American Overseas Interests Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 150</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>2D; 3R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 219</td>
<td>Military Construction Appropriations, FY 1996</td>
<td>H. Res. 167</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>3R; 4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 208</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 168</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>3R; 4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 1868</td>
<td>Foreign Operations Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 170</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>3R; 4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 1905</td>
<td>Energy &amp; Water Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 171</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 79</td>
<td>Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag</td>
<td>H. Res. 172</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 19</td>
<td>Appropriations Bill</td>
<td>H. Res. 175</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 386</td>
<td>Foreign Operations Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 177</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 387</td>
<td>Interior Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 180</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 388</td>
<td>Interior Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 181</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 389</td>
<td>Agriculture Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 188</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 390</td>
<td>Agriculture Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 189</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 2020</td>
<td>Treasury Postal Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 190</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 40</td>
<td>Domestic Welfare Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 191</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 202</td>
<td>Transportation Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 194</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 7</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 197</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 209</td>
<td>Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 203</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 210</td>
<td>VA/HUD Appropriations</td>
<td>H. Res. 204</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 24</td>
<td>To terminate the U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia</td>
<td>H. Res. 205</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Resolution No.</td>
<td>Process used for floor consideration</td>
<td>Amendments in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 155</td>
<td>Communications Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 207</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>2R/2D Bipartisan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 217</td>
<td>Labor/HHS Appropriations Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 208</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1946</td>
<td>To prohibit targeted investments</td>
<td>H. Res. 219</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1655</td>
<td>Intelligence Authorization</td>
<td>H. Res. 216</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1156</td>
<td>Defense Authorization for 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 211</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1670</td>
<td>General Federal Appropriations Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 219</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1813</td>
<td>To consolidate and reform workforce development and literacy programs</td>
<td>H. Res. 222</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2740</td>
<td>National Highway System Designation Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 224</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 927</td>
<td>Surface Revitalization and Economic Development Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 225</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 743</td>
<td>The Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 226</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1170</td>
<td>The Children's Health Insurance Program Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 227</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1108</td>
<td>Omnibus Authorization Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 229</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2405</td>
<td>Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 234</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 235</td>
<td>To approve certain sentencing guidelines amendments</td>
<td>H. Res. 230</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2472</td>
<td>Medicare Prescription Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 238</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2492</td>
<td>Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill</td>
<td>H. Res. 239</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2495</td>
<td>Omnibus Appropriations Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 240</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 109</td>
<td>7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform</td>
<td>H. Res. 243</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 133</td>
<td>Partial Birth Abortion Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 251</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2546</td>
<td>D.C. Appropriations FY 1996</td>
<td>H. Res. 252</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 115</td>
<td>Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996</td>
<td>H. Res. 257</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2586</td>
<td>Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit</td>
<td>H. Res. 258</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2510</td>
<td>ICC Termination Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 261</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1565</td>
<td>The Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996</td>
<td>H. Res. 263</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2598</td>
<td>Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt</td>
<td>H. Res. 262</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 350</td>
<td>House Gift Rule Reform</td>
<td>H. Res. 268</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2564</td>
<td>Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 269</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2606</td>
<td>Authorization for Loans on Bonds for Bosnia Deployment</td>
<td>H. Res. 277</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1788</td>
<td>Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 289</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 355</td>
<td>Maritime Security Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 287</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 263</td>
<td>To Protect Federal Trust Funds</td>
<td>H. Res. 293</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1745</td>
<td>Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 303</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Res. 304</td>
<td>Providing for Debate and Consideration Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia</td>
<td>H. Res. 305</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 309</td>
<td>Revised Budget Resolution</td>
<td>H. Res. 309</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 558</td>
<td>Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act</td>
<td>H. Res. 313</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2617</td>
<td>The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995</td>
<td>H. Res. 317</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the ranking minority member of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].
bills are going to pass, if they are going to be signed, and if we are going to wind up not having a repeat of the disgraceful performance of last year when the Government was shut down twice. So I would simply urge Members to quit shouting like they were attending a high school cheerleading session, grow up, recognize their responsibility, try to work in a bipartisan way and get those bills passed; and to the gentleman from Arizona—every time somebody says something you don’t like, you open your mouth and you start shouting from your seat.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOCO). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, is it within this Member’s domain to ask those words to be taken down? It is a personal attack and grossly unfair, and I would ask that those words be taken down in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona demand that the words be taken down?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the sanctity of this House, I demand those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words.

□ 1915

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOCO). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I guess my question goes to the matter of what are the House precedents as far as a Member who is speaking and when there are Members in the Chamber who are acting disrespectful towards that Member? What is the proper procedure for a Member to take?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will ask the gentleman to suspend until a ruling is made on the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Chair will admonish Members not to interrupt Members who are speaking. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the last sentence.

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope I do not have to object. I hope that this interlude has calmed down some of the heat that has been on the floor, and I remind Members that if I could, through this, we can finish our business tonight. I rise under my reservation to find out if the gentleman intends to apologize to the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would as I have informed the Speaker, I would be very happy to apologize to the gentleman for calling him impolite, if the gentleman would have apologized to me for interrupting me while I was speaking. He declined to do that.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words objected to. The Clerk reads as follows:

And to the gentleman from Arizona, every time somebody says something you don’t like, you open your mouth and you start shouting from your seat. You are one of the most impolite Members I have ever seen in my service in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, the last sentence of the gentleman from Wisconsin constitutes a personality in violation of clause 1 of rule XIV.

Without objection, the last sentence uttered will be stricken from the RECORD. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed in order.

Mr. DELAY. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Wisconsin, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for that apology.

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would be very happy to apologize to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] for calling him impolite if he would apologize for being impolite to me.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words objected to. The Clerk reads as follows:

Under my reservation, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for that apology.

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I would be very happy to apologize to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] for calling him impolite if he would apologize for being impolite to me.
The Speaker pro tempore. If a point of order is made, the Chair would rule on it, and the Chair did rule on it, and the Chair has tried to maintain decorum and comity throughout for those Members who were in the Chamber.

During the debate of this resolution comity has been maintained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LaHood) because I think the gentleman did make a noble effort throughout, and the many times that he has held the Chair he has made a noble effort in trying to maintain comity on the floor. But there is a serious question at hand here, and my question is this: that is, someone is speaking on the floor, and another Member is acting in a way that is disruptive—

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut is making a statement.

Mr. GEJDENSON. The parliamentary inquiry is: What actions can the House take against an individual, what are the parliamentary avenues available to a speaker when an individual, either verbally or physically, is disrupting his time in speaking on the floor; because, Mr. Speaker, where we find ourselves is in the situation that when an individual tries to take his time on the floor there is often conversation. But this went beyond conversation, and I just need to know for future parliamentary situations what avenues an individual ought to take if a Member is sitting in the first row trying to, by motions or statements, disrupt the speaker.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair will take the initiative to maintain order in the Chamber when Members are speaking.

Mr. GEJDENSON. So, it is my conclusion then that the proper course would be to stop speaking; that would not shorten one's time; and then ask the Chair to establish order?

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair would enlist the assistance of all Members in maintaining the spirit of mutual courtesy and comity that properly dignifies the proceedings of the House. Members who are under recognition should not be disrupted by other Members.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, in this case would it not be appropriate for the Chair to rule on the 365th or in similar instances of Jefferson's Manual, in which it is stated:

Nevertheless if a Member finds that it is not the inclination of the House to hear him and that by conversation or any other noise they endeavor to drown his voice, it is his most prudent way to submit to the pleasure of the House and sit down, for it scarcely happens that they are guilty of this piece of ill manners without sufficient reason or inattention to a Member who says anything worth their hearing.

Would that not apply in this particular instance?

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair will not rule on that. (By unanimous consent, Mr. HYDE was allowed to speak out of order.)

APOLOGIES SUGGESTED

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I was seated with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] when this incident occurred, and there was provocation. A high-spirited gentleman from Arizona gets caught up in the heat of the moment, and believe me there was heat. On the other hand, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is essential if we are going to do the transportation bill this evening. He is the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations. Both are reluctant to apologize to each other. Would I suggest that both gentlemen, both gentlemen, express regret that this incident happened, and then we can get on with the business of the evening. (By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYWORTH was allowed to speak out of order.)

CALLING FOR APOLOGY AND RESUMPTION OF THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, because I have the utmost respect for my colleague from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], although I might have a slightly different interpretation of the events as he portrayed them in front of this body, and because I realize that there is a schedule to be kept and that Members have many obligations, and taking into account the sensitivities of some other Members, I would be happy to say now that I am certainly prepared to move ahead this evening, and to those who misinterpret my actions as somehow being disrespectful, when, in fact, of course, we have the utmost respect for differences of opinion and differences in styles of speaking, and personal characteristics, and different points of view in this Chamber, I would say that I regret the interpretation of the incident.

I still lament the words of my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. I would hope we would apologize for those words and that we can move along to complete the people's business in this House, for the people's business should supersede personal, personal ambitions, or personal affronts.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

APOLOGIES

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me say that, like the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], I regret the incident that just occurred, and I will take the gentleman's comments as an apology. I would likewise extend an apology to the gentleman for the comments which he found troublesome.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] be allowed to proceed in regular order.

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

There was no objection. The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 3 minutes remaining on the debate on the rule, and the gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us House Resolution 465. We next week will be able to reflect together with our constituents on how to move forward in the perfection, the implementation of the principles put forth by our Founding Fathers over 200 years ago that form the basis of our limited representative government, and we are ready this evening to get to work on another appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 248, nays 166, not voting 13, as follows: [Roll No 296]
Mr. GUTIERREZ changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Pursuant to House Resolution 465, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 192) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns the legislative days of Thursday, June 27, 1996, or Friday, June 28, 1996, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until noon on Monday, July 8, 1996, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on the legislative days of Thursday, June 27, 1996, or Friday, June 28, 1996, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 8, 1996, or until such time of that day as may be specified by the Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—INSTRUCTING COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO IMMEDIATELY TRANSMIT REMAINING CHARGES AGAINST SPEAKER GINGRICH TO OUTSIDE COUNSEL

Mr. SAM J. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 468) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 468

Whereas the Constitution of the United States vests in the House of Representatives the responsibility to regulate the conduct of its own Members:

Whereas the House has delegated that responsibility, in part, to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which is charged with investigating alleged violations of any law, rule, regulation or other standard of conduct by a Member of the House:

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has failed to discharge that duty with regard to serious allegations of wrongdoing by the Speaker of the House:

Whereas, although an outside counsel has been appointed to investigate the Speaker, the Committee has failed to allow that outside counsel to investigate serious charges concerning the Speaker's political action committee, GOPAC, and its relationship to several tax-exempt organizations;

Whereas a formal complaint concerning these charges has been languishing before the Committee for more than six months;

Whereas new evidence of violations of federal tax law—indeed to the information contained in the formal complaint—has been recently reported by investigative journalists around the country;

Whereas the failure to take action on these matters has raised serious questions about the standards of Official Conduct:

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is hereby instructed to immediately transmit the remaining charges against Speaker Gingrich to the outside counsel for his investigation and recommendations.

PRIVILEGED MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is in order.

The Clerk will report the privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has failed to discharge that duty with regard to serious allegations of wrongdoing by the Speaker of the House:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States places upon the House of Representatives the responsibility to regulate the conduct of its own Members:

Whereas the House has delegated that responsibility, in part, to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which is charged with investigating alleged violations of any law, rule, regulation or other standard of conduct by a Member of the House:

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has failed to discharge that duty with regard to serious allegations of wrongdoing by the Speaker of the House:

Whereas, although an outside counsel has been appointed to investigate the Speaker, the Committee has failed to allow that outside counsel to investigate serious charges concerning the Speaker's political action committee, GOPAC, and its relationship to several tax-exempt organizations;

Whereas a formal complaint concerning these charges has been languishing before the Committee for more than six months;

Whereas new evidence of violations of federal tax law—indeed to the information contained in the formal complaint—has been recently reported by investigative journalists around the country;

Whereas the failure to take action on these matters has raised serious questions about the standards of Official Conduct:

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is hereby instructed to immediately transmit the remaining charges against Speaker Gingrich to the outside counsel for his investigation and recommendations.

PRIVILEGED MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is in order.

The Clerk will report the privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has failed to discharge that duty with regard to serious allegations of wrongdoing by the Speaker of the House:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States places upon the House of Representatives the responsibility to regulate the conduct of its own Members:

Whereas the House has delegated that responsibility, in part, to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, which is charged with investigating alleged violations of any law, rule, regulation or other standard of conduct by a Member of the House:

Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has failed to discharge that duty with regard to serious allegations of wrongdoing by the Speaker of the House:

Whereas, although an outside counsel has been appointed to investigate the Speaker, the Committee has failed to allow that outside counsel to investigate serious charges concerning the Speaker's political action committee, GOPAC, and its relationship to several tax-exempt organizations;

Whereas a formal complaint concerning these charges has been languishing before the Committee for more than six months;

Whereas new evidence of violations of federal tax law—indeed to the information contained in the formal complaint—has been recently reported by investigative journalists around the country;

Whereas the failure to take action on these matters has raised serious questions about the standards of Official Conduct:

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is hereby instructed to immediately transmit the remaining charges against Speaker Gingrich to the outside counsel for his investigation and recommendations.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.
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principal focus of my discussion to-
showing no charts or pictures of the personal privilege.
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Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be

Had I been in attendance, I would

So the motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. Dornan, I caught your speech on AIDS

tion a few lines from the end of Cecil B. DeMille's classic 10 Commandments

I was a 29-year-old hemophiliac who was

I think, warning about the spread of AIDS

The man, and my friend Newt GING-

So I showed him my remarks, I men-

I told him years ago:

I am not a hater, I am not a bigot and I am not a liar, and I for-

I am a 29-year-old hemophiliac who was

This is from a young man dying of AIDS

I think, warning about the spread of AIDS

He said, ``My friend, B OB, you. I am a 29-year-old hemophiliac who was

My friend, B OB, you. I am a 29-year-old hemophiliac who was

I am not a hater, I am not a bigot and I am not a liar, and I for-

I am not a hater, I am not a bigot and I am not a liar, and I for-

I showed him my remarks, I men-

I should have saved over. I told him I begin it with

If you want to have everything going for you, just say, Come, Holy

I showed HENRY a letter, I said, "How about if I open with this letter and then
take your advice?"

That's good, do that.

Well, I will open up with the letter, and, so help me God, Mr. HYDE, I will

Here is a letter from this month, June 7, about a speech I made on AIDS

This is from a young man dying of AIDS. His name is J ohn R. Gail, J.R. He

Mr. Dornan, I caught your speech on AIDS

night, because of a discussion I have had with sta ff and leadership and re-

A young Catholic man named Robert Mapplethorpe who had died of AIDS

We were using tax dollars to defend some of the nude photographs of this very,

But we were told that it would hurt the dec-

The man, and my friend Newt GING-

Henry just gave me some brotherly

and if he had won, he would be the Speaker today, and the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of an unforeseen conflict, I was not in

I am not a hater, I am not a bigot and I am not a liar, and I for-

Simply say, I am not a hater, I am not a bigot and I am not a liar, and I for-

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of an unforeseen conflict, I was not in

I showed him my remarks, I men-

I mentioned Moses, I mentioned that in God we trust, I mentioned Abraham, I men-

I do not want everything going for you, just say, Come, Holy

I showed HENRY a letter, I said, "How about if I open with this letter and then

take your advice?"

That's good, do that.

Well, I will open up with the letter, and, so help me God, Mr. HYDE, I will

Here is a letter from this month, June 7, about a speech I made on AIDS

This is from a young man dying of AIDS. His name is J ohn R. Gail, J.R. He

Mr. Dornan, I caught your speech on AIDS
was diagnosed with my first opportunistic infection cryptosporidiosis, an intestinal virus which causes severe stomach cramping, chronic diarrhea, and the wasting syndrome. I have lost more than 40 pounds and am on long-term disability from work. Obviously this infection, after 13 years of being asymptomatic, has made me another AIDS statistic.

Mr. Dornan, above being a hemophiliac or having AIDS, I am a Christian. And I must tell you, it is refreshing to hear the truth being said about homosexuality and the homosexual agenda, as you did last night. Not many representatives would stand up and say the things you did yesterday, which I applaud.

I am not a bitter person and have forgiven the man who infected me. I can forgive a homosexual, but not their sin. It was a homosexual’s perverse actions, polluting the blood supply, which will, without God’s intervention, bring about my untimely death.

I am here today to inquire about the status of the Richard Ray Relief Fund which could compensate the hemophiliac HIV-positive community for the wrongdoings of the pharmaceutical companies, the Red Cross, the CDC, the FDA and the National Hemophilia Foundation. The fraud and negligence perpetrated by these organizations and I am sure you are well aware, documented by the IOM in July of 1995. The bill has over 230 cosponsors, I think it is up to 240 now, but it seems to be stalled by the leadership. Please help us move H.R. 1023. I hope you are on it.

I have been on it for months. I appreciate your attention to this great matter of importance to me and thousands of innocent hemophiliacs infected with the HIV virus. God bless you, John R. Gail, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim my privilege to discuss this subject with you, Mr. Speaker, after a fair evaluation of all the facts, I can unequivocally state, I have been down to the Mellon Auditorium, the eyewitness, multi-corroborated by even some homosexual journalists in the Washington Times the day after Mr. GUNDERSON’s point of personal privilege. They were waiting with their evidence for somebody to trigger it. They thought I would do it with a special order. Mr. GUNDERSON did it.

Mr. Speaker, I now step out into the minefields of political correctness, even if it kills me. I believe, alone, but hope and pray alone not for long. Come, Holy Spirit.

On May 2 last month, here in our awe-inspiring Rotunda, which is our secular cathedral nave, this 104th Congress, at a very, very moving ceremony, awarded our congressional gold medal to the Reverend Billy Graham and his wonderful, devoted wife of 53 years, Ruth. During that inspiring ceremony, while thanking us and addressing the Vice President and his beautiful wife Tipper and all of our leadership, Mr. Gingrich, Bob Dole, our former Senate leader, and his wife Elizabeth, and Messrs. Army, Gephart,
DELAY, BONIOR briefly, Senators LOTT, DASCHLE, all the Senate leaders and dozens of Members of both Houses. I see some of the faces here that were there.

Reverend Billy Graham stated with great emotion, great emotion, "We are a Nation on the brink of self-destruction." He was not talking about most-favored-nation status for China. He was not talking about another B-2 bomber, and he was not talking about a 4.3-cent gasoline tax. He was not even really talking about the budget deficit, the debt, which is immoral to do this to our children yet unborn. We know what he was talking about, partly the subject matter that brought me to the floor tonight, I repeat, Dr. Graham, "America is a Nation on the brink of self-destruction."

A national poll last month stated that 76 percent of our fellow Americans believe that our country is in spiritual and moral decline. This Member agreed. Of the 76 percent, I love my country. Who here does not? Who here could not? And I am sick at heart at its lack of direction in moral matters, in State and civic affairs involving character. No references to -

I beg my colleagues to read carefully this cover article in the June 17 edition of the Weekly Standard. It is titled, "Pedophilia Chic: The Norming of Foul Perversion, Child Molestation." It seems to be the third time this conduct considered a flat-out evil. In our Hollywood-type popular culture, there are hardly any taboos that remain. The words "objective disorder" fall on deaf ears at the networks and at the New York Times.

It was just 12 days after Reverend Graham's warning that Mr. GUNDERSON rose on the House floor. In a "Dear Colleague" and at this lectern, he repeatedly called me a liar, of course using other words. He impugned my character with the direct use of words like "smear," "lies," "biased conduct" and "an international effort to personally destroy." Here is one quote: "The gentleman from California has no right to misrepresent the facts in this, his latest attempt to smear the homosexual community."

Of course he used the adjective "gay" as a noun, in place of the perfectly neutral term "homosexual." Seven times he said "misrepresents the facts." Mr. GUNDERSON's words or variations thereof were in the Washington Times, the Post, Congress Daily, Associated Press; moved to slander from community to shining sea. In my home county, a young reporter embellished on the slander and put words in his mouth. Said he called my effort a character assassination. Then the reporter went on repeat the obnoxious charge that I was out to "smear the homosexual community."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is kind of low-life, this tactic. I know Mr. GUNDERSON was prodded to do it. He said in his opening that he was going to let sleeping dogs lie, or words to that effect, and I think I am entitled, the "impo-lite" cost us 40 minutes tonight, then I think I am entitled to make my case for my motivation.

So let them speak for themselves. He says that I and others unfairly used stereotypes when analyzing conduct. Well, just what would be considered typical versus stereotypical conduct? Being fired from a Federal job for a crime, which was a misuse of power, with the chief of staff. How about a 1991 public report of drink-throwing at an inside-the-Beltway bar that was to be closed and was closed for pornographic pictures on its walls? How about another recent drunk-throwing rerun at a sodom and masochism bar December 16, last December, 6 months again. Again, the altercation created sleazy newspaper stories involving a Congressman. Is that considered classy conduct of one? Does it harm the integrity of our House as a whole? You bet it does. What would happen to an officer of the military involved in similar squabbles? Is this stereotypical behavior or just typical?

Mr. Speaker, no one believes that any Member of Congress is risking his or her life by serving in this Senate or House. Out in the field, yes, sir. Leo Ryan comes to mind, Larry McDonnell. No, we risk flew on the aircraft that killed Ron Brown and 34 other people, with SONNY CALLAHAN and two or three Members I see here tonight, four flights less than a month before that killing took place, that terrible accident. But there are people who serve under us that we make adhere to a tougher standard that do risk their lives. A slim majority of Members of Congress, eight people, swing four other way, sent thousands of tons of weapons and hundreds of thousands of soldiers to Division by Clinton into harm's way in Bosnia. And yet Congress is going to ignore this cherry romp of hedonism right down here on Constitution Avenue? □

Our toleration of low standards here in Congress over the years that I have observed is at the core of my challenge today, Mr. Speaker. Our Federal buildings, and I have been told today they are going to do it again next April for the third time, our Federal buildings must never, never be used to facilitate, if not glorify, immorality.

We in Congress are culpable for any immorality taking place on public citizen-owned property in Washington. And if we fail as custodians of these beautiful citizen-owned buildings, you bet, culpable. And what dangerous policy are we following if we dismiss the consequences of glorifying homosexual right here in our Capitol?

My colleagues need only reflect on the lives of those Members of Congress, past and present, who found or still find alluring, if not addictive, this lifestyle. I say this with no joy. Three of our Members have died from AIDS, another barely escaped expulsion.

I will leave the rest for the written record because it involved a child, a 16-year-old teenage page, in Spain. I never heard of a page going on a domestic CODEL. How do you get to go on an overseas congressional delegation and lose your innocence? Another Member honored with a very severe House reprimand; involved a pimp/prostitute. A lot of pity from people from a West Point sense of honor. Leave the rest for the record.

Two other Members have their careers ended by election defeats after they were discovered trolling for teenagers at so-called hot action bars. One of them, a friend of mine, was the father of three teenagers. The other, first Republican in 100 years in his seat, looked like a brother of mine, redhead, busted by our Capitol Hill police in one of the men's rooms in the Longworth Building. Sad. At a porno theater, where people were diving out of windows, some died, and eventually died himself of AIDS.

Now, there is another word, Mr. Speaker, that I learned in preparing for tonight. It is a Greek word. Ephebophilia. E-p-he-b-e-p-h-i-l-a. It means someone who targets 18- and 19-year-olds. Say, our Appalachian Mountain States, where the age of consent is 15 or 16, you target that narrow band, kind of the way Hugh Hefner does with heterosexual baby faced young girls for his little lap dogs who are younger than their 18 that they have to be legally. He has been caught twice using a minor.

Now ephebophilia, like pedophilia, is a mortal sin of seduction, a transgression in Greece against 18 and 19-year-olds. Why do you not study the decay of classical Greek culture, my colleagues? Whether it is ephebophilia or pedophilia, in God's eyes it is all the same.

But we have a lot of Members who stay in privacy. I respect that. I respect when they are using it to advance an agenda, trying to have it all ways, kind of like truth in advertising that I got upset once on this floor. I am going to leave the rest for the record.

I have a Member on our side, could be a chairman of a major House committee next year. Given today's tragic loss, one of my best friends in the cloakroom, who, by the way, told me that Mr. GUNDERSON's words or variations thereof were in the Washington Times, the Post, Congress Daily, Associated Press; moved to slander from community to shining sea. My colleague, who found or still find alluring, if not addictive, this lifestyle. I say this with no joy. Three of our Members have died from AIDS, another barely escaped expulsion.

Now, there is another word, Mr. Speaker, that I learned in preparing for tonight. It is a Greek word. Ephebophilia. E-p-he-b-e-p-h-i-l-a. It means someone who targets 18- and 19-year-olds. Say, our Appalachian Mountain States, where the age of consent is 15 or 16, you target that narrow band, kind of the way Hugh Hefner does with heterosexual baby faced young girls for his little lap dogs who are younger than their 18 that they have to be legally. He has been caught twice using a minor.

Now ephebophilia, like pedophilia, is a mortal sin of seduction, a transgression in Greece against 18 and 19-year-olds. Why do you not study the decay of classical Greek culture, my colleagues? Whether it is ephebophilia or pedophilia, in God's eyes it is all the same.

But we have a lot of Members who stay in privacy. I respect that. I respect when they are using it to advance an agenda, trying to have it all ways, kind of like truth in advertising that I got upset once on this floor. I am going to leave the rest for the record.

I have a Member on our side, could be a chairman of a major House committee next year. Given today's tragic loss, one of my best friends in the cloakroom, who, by the way, told me that Mr. GUNDERSON's words or variations thereof were in the Washington Times, the Post, Congress Daily, Associated Press; moved to slander from community to shining sea. My colleague, who found or still find alluring, if not addictive, this lifestyle. I say this with no joy. Three of our Members have died from AIDS, another barely escaped expulsion.
Mr. Speaker, I do not know what my colleague does in his free time to educate himself about the worldwide aspects of this, but I have been carefully tracking this nightmare for 13 years. Just last month I visited the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center at Fort Detrick where I received a startling and tragic update about the exponential spread of AIDS worldwide.

In just 3½ years from now, I told you this, 60 million will be infected, 12 million full-blown AIDS. Sadly, most of them with little or not health care. And dead? Nobody really can track the dead worldwide. No one knows for certain how many millions by 2000 in the year of our Lord will be gone.

I also learned the following stunning, shocking medical fact. The military forces of Zimbabwe were 75 percent infected. Not 7.5, not 17. Three out of every four of that officer corps, their sergeants and their kids are infected with AIDS. You know what this did? It forced everyone of this, their forces are rejected permanently by the U.N. for any future peacekeeping assignments. And at least six more nations are going to be stigmatized any day now on a no-go list with unacceptable for peacekeeping forces.

Zimbabwe peacekeepers brought the specter of AIDS infection and death to Somalia. How sad. Death in the name of peace. Make love, not war. That means more pressure on our American infection-free forces to travel worldwide on peacekeeping missions? Is that not obvious, Mr. Speaker? It is a powerful reason to keep our own military mercifully 100 percent HIV-AIDS infection free.

A 100 percent non-AIDS infected military is my proper goal as the chairman of Military Personnel. And I take a lot of, to quote a four-star, bovine scatology from the homosexual lobby for my perfectly logical and fair legislation of, to quote a four-star, bovine scatology from the other body.

Where was Mr. Gunderson or any other Member of the 99th Congress back in 1985 when I gave the first of almost 200 of my floor speeches warning about how our blood supply was contaminated and was beginning to spread the epidemic that year at a ferocious rate? Who came to this floor anywhere and discussed unsanitary promiscuous behavior or debated using infected needles? The悬崖吊杆 of both cohorts? Where have the homosexual activists been over the last 15 years?

Well, there are now thousands of homosexuals who are working tirelessly and heroically to comfort and, yes, love the ill with a pure philos love, a Christian love, a Judeo-Christian love, and God bless them. But other than telling us we are all culpable, these are the leaders, and all at risk, for some it has been just business as usual. Trying to get money out of Congress, to give most generously, and I have been there 100 percent, and they still push, some of them, public relations mumbo-jumbo.
where he left hundreds behind under a
Republican hero, a five-star general, Presi
dent Eisenhower? What does he
know about my empathy for human
suffering? J esus died for sinners, actu-
ally for each individual sinner. I am
certain that somewhere far away I
commit at least little, small sins on a
pretty regular basis, do we not. Every
one of us, every day with every sugh-
fering person can and should say, there
but for the grace of God go I. My mo-
tives are based on compassion and on
love. Let us not lose that desire to de
fend innocent youth and chil-
dren.
I resent anybody out there hiding be
hind the facade of caring, thinking
about other things. Does every Member
truly grasp the enormity of the suffer-
ing that was involved with those 360,000
Americans slowly wasting away, and
counting. I can't absorb the enormity
of that level of suffering. Who but a
handful among us in Congress, I repeat,
even knowing that 1 million are going to
be infected at the turn of the century.
What a way to enter into that millennium,
I repeat. And the calamity is behavior-
driven, conduct-driven in the main. No
ifs, ands or buts about that harsh argu-
ment.
Notwithstanding the pandemic na-
ture of this worldwide plague, the
truth is, and honest reporters have
known this for years, AIDS simply is not,
not everyone's disease. Is it a
plague? Of course it is. Is it an epi-
demic, an international pandemic? Be
yond question, but it simply is not
everyone's disease.
Read the May 1 story which will be in
my full remarks in the Wall Street
Journal. Almost everybody in this
room has a better chance of being hit
by their own personal lightning bolt, a
direct message from God to come home
as fast as you can, a lightning bolt, be
tore they have a chance of becoming
HIV positive.

Let us apply some logic. Two
thoughtful leaders from AIDS Project
LA in my office last night told me that
if AIDS is everybody's disease, then it
is nobody's disease. They just do not
want it to be called totally, to use
their words, a gay disease. They say it
is not everybody's disease. Is AIDS
your disease, Mr. Speaker? I did not
mean to single you out. No. Is it my
disease? No.

How about all of the floor staff and
clerks around us? Of course, probably
not. How about the entire membership
of Congress, all 435 of us? Okay, here is
where we pick up a few at risk. I was
told a long time ago that there were
some HIV positives between the House
and the Senate; the person is long gone
who told me that. He said that only
about 50 Members had even been test-
ed.

So if we include all of our staffers,
about 30,000 of whom would probably
pick up a handful who are infected. That is
also because government, like Hollywood,
like Broadway, like big cities, it at-
tracts a disproportionate number of ho-
mosexuals who want to work here for
their country beyond the 1 or 2 percent
estimates nationwide.
I am sure you get my point, Mr.
Speaker. But if you say that this group
or that group is a high risk, you have
just stigmatized a small percentage
of our population and alienated an en-
real disease. The only fatal sexually
transmitted disease in the United
States is AIDS. So by accepting logical
truth, you can be called a bigot, a
hater, or prejudiced.

Those are the vile words hurled at me
by an African-American columnist,
at a hard-working reporter, and my
good friends at the Family Research
Council and at you who instinctively
believed Mark Morrano's report about
illegal conduct at the Mellon audi-
torium.

By the way, would it not be equally
scandalous to rent out this architec-
ture on the subject of AIDS eight times. Un-
believable for a self-proclaimed person
who is involved. If you do not count
the House, a few years ago, to close those
to city, and slowly killed so many midnight
bathhouses, the afore-
mensioned is-on the wall that broke
and slowly killed so many midnight
cowboys in New York City and San
Francisco.

Frankly, given the contrast and the
attention we both have given to this
tragic retrovirus nightmare, the widely
used and now protect bumper cover
er "silence equals death" has a special
resonance, don't you think. I have
never been silent because I truly be-
lieve in tough love. Meaningful com-
passion demands positive action.
When Mr. GUNDERSON attacks my be-
ief system on what constitutes serious
and what constitutes the corrup-
tion of youngsters through bad ex-
ample, he also attacks my religion. The
Catholic Church and Pope John Paul II
are unrelentingly slandered by the top
and the middle management of the
homo sexual food chain, to see the dis-
gusting, apocryphal scene in Berlin
with stark naked people throwing
blood red paint on the holy father's ve-
hi cle. Mainly a raging force is this issue
to that atrocity. However, thanks to
God's unrelenting love, and I have seen
this when death is near, it is back to
the arms of holy mother church,
Dominus vobiscum.

When Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say,
nightly illuminated by this Supreme
Court decision, will lend itself to a res-
olution of the question before us today.
That is, Mr. GUNDERSON questioning
my motives, my character. For the
pursuits of law, you could debate this
for days. There is no such thing as ho-
mosexual orientation in law. It does
not exist. In law, homosexuality is no
more nor less than a sex act. Loving
friends living together for years can be
bonded by philos love with never even
a thought of eros love. So under the
law, you cannot be H-O-M-O without
the S-E-U-A-L, any more than under the
law you can be hetero without the sex-
u al.

This is a crucial distinction in the
law. Why? Because laws and public
policies are based on human actions,
not the penumbras of orientation, inclinations, tendencies or temptations never acted upon.

President Jimmy Carter comes to mind. That is what you get for giving an interview like Bill Buckley to Playboy. In the thousands of years of the human brain, that is not law. Law involves conduct, behavior and, yes, sometimes, rarely, speech, such as treason, libel or yelling fire and in a crowded enclosure.

The issue against what a man or woman thinks not will there ever be in a truly free country. In the eyes of the law, thoughts do not rape or molest. Desires do not sexually exploit another person or spread disease. Only human actions can do those things. All of the consequences pertaining to the behavior of male homosexuality center on sex acts. In James Carville-speak, it is the conduct, stupid.

Unfortunately, Colorado's amendment 2 carried the terrors of orientation. It allowed Justice Kennedy and five others to perpetuate the myth of some kind of innate homosexual personhood. I do not have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculously inane that notion is. Imagine of you, Mr. Speaker, one of the most beautiful boys or girls Occasionally held in their parents arms or in our cloakroom of late, imagine those babies. Can any one really make a scientific case that somehow those parents are holding bisexuals, cross-dressers or pedophiles just waiting for puberty to reveal their true orientation?

Such arguments are made regularly, usually by homosexual priests or homosexual scientists or homosexual doctors and are rarely, if ever, exposed as the pseudo-science, certainly not by my friends at Newsweek. Time or the other liberal weeklies, including in the law concepts of orientation and class of persons like amendment 2, it spawned the death of the whole movement.

But the argument with which I took the greatest exception in the flawed Kennedy-written majority decision and the focus that is most relevant to this question of privilege here tonight, Mr. Speaker, is Kennedy's use of the words animus and animosity to describe the motivation of the framers of amendment 2, 53 percent of Colorado's voters who voted for the amendment, and the beliefs of the polling of the overwhelming majorities.

Animus, this is the same charge that Mr. GUNDERSON has leveled at me, giving bad example to the youth of our Nation by sending them the destructive message that promiscuous sex, hetero, homosexual, bi-, tri- or commune sex is normal and healthy and regularly allowed to showcase itself in our taxpayer-owned buildings.

I remember seeing the hard way that the wages of that sinful message is death, 360,000 and counting. And so Mr. GUNDERSON tells this Chamber and, through C-SPAN, the Nation that I am out to smear.

I read to you, Mr. Speaker, what Justice Scalia said in his dissenting opinion about this animus. Scalia writes in his opinion that Coloradoans are entitled to be hostile toward homosexual conduct and that the court's portrayal of Coloradoans as a society fallen victim to pointless, hate-filled gay bashing is so false as to be comical. Comical, he writes.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Scalia thought his opinion to be so important he took the time to read it in its totality aloud to the Supreme Court, and it was much longer than the majority decision. Please reflect on Justice Scalia's words, Mr. Speaker. He is saying that you and I and all Coloradans are entitled, he even italicized that word in his opinion, entitled to hostile toward conduct, not hostile toward any person but hostile toward the conduct.

Only craven, cowardly bullies hurt or bash individuals, and they should be severely punished with the force of the law. A law-abiding citizen does not even physically abuse a guilty drunk driver at an accident scene involving the death or injury of a child, and that is a pretty tough provocation. He makes a citizen's arrest and grits his teeth and cries and waits for the police.

So let me state for the Record again, Mr. Speaker, before a million or so people at this time of night watching, and I am not referring to any individual in particular. It is the conduct, stupid, or it is the animus.

Mr. GUNDERSON knows in his heart of hearts, I hope, that, if he were being physically assaulted out there on the street, Bob Dornan would be one of the very first, if not the first, to defend and protect him even at the risk of my life, even limping all the way. And if you doubt that, just ask Congressman Cunningham, Congressman Moran and about a half dozen of our Capitol Hill Police Officers.

Mr. Speaker, before a million or so people at this time of night watching, and I am not referring to any individual in particular. It is the conduct, stupid, or it is the animus.

But I, like most Americans, I am sorry, I do have an animus toward homosexual conduct and at that ostentatious, in-your-face conduct that was exhibited at the Cherry Jumble group grope.

In his floor statement, the gentleman from Wisconsin attempts to portray the homosexual conduct at that stately building as, quote, a gift of love, not a weekend of illegal activity. Even the remotest touch of common sense is going to tell any American, Mr. Speaker, that in the 16-foot Melon auditorium this beautiful hall is only 7,600, Senate Chamber 4,300, 8,160.

When filled with 2000-plus writhing, bumping and grinding dancers, hundreds of them half naked, that is anything but a gift of love.

I would like to show you that non-offensive picture in color there, blowup of one of the slides, unless of course you define lust as love, which is kind of the whole theme of Mr. GUNDERSON's remarks, using love as an excuse to responding to an ad in a homosexual newspaper which was signed off by ‘hot bottom’.

That is not love, that is lust. Just why would I have animus and not a homosexual jamboree? Fair question, easy answer.

The gentleman from Mr. GUNDERSON, claimed the Cherry Hop raised about $50,000. Forty-five; I have just talked to the Whitman-Walker Clinic. Again he claimed, or he said that, and think about this, Mr. Speaker, $45,000. If just one person after a night of, quote, cop- ping feels; that is the description by an anonymous homosexual columnist re- porting on the hop for the homosexual metro weekly paper quoted in the Times after Mr. GUNDERSON's remarks, after a night of copping feels on the dance floor, if just one human being being sexually active shared, and it is all in the report, with an all too friendly drug tripper in a latrine stall, if only one person after that gala back in a motel or a hotel shared the virus that keeps on giving, the fatal AIDS virus, then that mere $45,000 raised is but a drop in the bucket. It is not even half a year.

For one person who does not even have AIDS yet, if they are in one of our hopeful Government programs, they would not even cover the fraction of the cost that one single AIDS patient would require through his medical decline and death.

I hope you get that because the head of the Whitman-Walker Clinic, Jim Graham, in a very pleasant conversa- tion tonight, did not get it. He said it is not where you get it, it is if you got it. You come together in a Federal build- ing and one person gets it, there goes all the money from the whole event, and Mr. GUNDERSON said they spent $4,000 on the lights alone, just on the lighting. You should have seen the place that night. All those six massive door columns lighted with the lights of the rainbow.

Now, God demands compassion and protection for the infected patient and for the dying. Jesus commands it. What you do for these the least among you, do for me. Every AIDS victim lying in a bed is jesus Christ. Every little finger you lift to help them, you are helping Jesus. It is right there. Of course we have to have love and compassion, but focused animosity is logical when it is directed at the behavior of arrogant risk takers. Jim Graham agreed with me on this. Those hell-bent for leather parties in the long life, folks, and therefore they overload, if not bankrupt, their whole systems.

Dr. Tony Fauci told me just a few weeks ago up at NIH—I met some of
the lucky patients up there, they called themselves lucky; I had to wince at that one—he told me that there are now many young homosexuals becoming HIV-positive because of mere frustration, mere annoyance, at having to avoid sex. This is less if they are really mentally exhausted with safer sodomy, they succumb to high-risk lust for this inevitable fate.

Mr. Gunderson says we must not lecture one another if there is to remain any element of mutual respect, unquote. Well, if lecturing is out, fine. Then I simply plead with young Americans at risk stop hurting one another, stop killing one another, stop the promiscuity. This goes for young heterosexuals: Stop the dangerous and the unhealthy conduct. Stop holding up homosexual conduct or heterosexual sleeping around before the youth of our country as wholesome and normal and healthy.

Yes, there should not be hostile Roscoe—I am sorry, using the first name on military bases—thank you for that amendment. I think it is going to survive.

Let me turn around another Gunderson insult. He accused me of trying to portray those with whom I might disagree. Well, those of us who truly believe that we are our brother's keepers, and I thought that is why we all ran for election here, to help our brothers and sisters. I am not trying to destroy your risk-takers; I am trying to save your immortal souls and your mortal lives in the measure.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Gunderson, said I had a large hand in intentionally misrepresenting facts and falsifying information. He repeated that 6 times. For the record, these salacious advertisements—I was going to show them—at my side are exactly what I am talking about when I criticize the melee at the Mellon Auditorium.

Mr. Speaker, I will put in the Record the 3 phases of this weekend. I will call to people's mind the Tailhook incident; as ugly as that was, the outrageous double standard that we tolerate, given the code of honor that we Americans demand from our military, how pathetically low our standard of ethics is here and in the Senate. Even Packwood avoided being expelled for over a year. Then we quit, among tearful goodbyes: Goodbye, Mr. Rep. Portrait, good bye, Mr. Womanizer, good riddance.

I talk about the second event, the main event, talk about my going down there, talking to this wonderful lady who had the main stewardship under the GSA, not, as Mr. Gunderson said, Commerce, the GSA how they balked at her asking him to wrap it up at midnight. Then she tried to compromise, 3 o'clock, and finally it was 9 hours till 6 a.m., on the Lord's day.

They put the rest in the record here. Continues the description of that whole wild night. Sad.

And Mr. Gunderson tells me they are going to do it again next April in one of our Federal buildings. Think Tailhook. The careers of four-star admirals, one of them with 400 combat missions in the most dangerous air environment in the history of mankind, had his career ended.

"No sink back for you, war hero, and you weren't even at the event."

Well, we do not think you were tough enough on it, and that is 5 years ago, when a little kid who declared in the courtroom of people who put their lives on the line to die for freedom of speech. But nobody pays attention to this majestic auditorium down there.

Eyewitnesses. Boy, Mr. Speaker. I have got a great close here about Abraham, Moses, a couple of lines from, as I said, the Ten Commandments. It will all be in the Record tomorrow. I hope some of my colleagues assign a staffer to help them out if they do. It lays out the whole case with other eyewitnesses, and then it comes to Mr. Steve's words, that this was the love of God personified. Wow. That is not my American tradition, to paraphrase him, or my American family. It sure as hell is not my Christian ethic or code of ethics. This does not represent the God of Abraham or Moses up there in the central place of honor, full-faced, marbled, looking right at me right now.

He is looking at you too, Mr. Speaker. This does not represent the God of love, certainly not the Father of Jesus or love in any faith I have ever heard of. This is pagan in every sense of that word. This is a bad rerun of worshiping Milk and Baal.

Mr. Speaker, the tension between me and three of our colleagues here, I guess, is a reflection of the national debate on our moral spiritual decline. It is a debate that seems to have been temporarily. I pray stifled, if not snuffed out, in the great Democratic party, very much alive in my Republican party. Some people rub their hands waiting for a big fight in San Diego, but there can be no compromise in this struggle.

Members in this institution, a lot of them, on all the moral issues, even partial-birth infanticide to go away; there are some even more laid back, if not cowardly, who say, so what? That is a Carvillean quote, I guess, "So what?" And I pity the children in the love department with people who say, "So what?"

Unfortunately, a struggle over the virtue, the future of our Nation as a land of godly people who can only subsist when one side wins and the other loses, and history tells us that the battle will wax and wane until the Second Coming.

I know what I am doing by getting out of here, I know the danger it holds for me and my large family. I will finish in an hour special order next week. Enjoy your Fourth of July, and I welcome anybody to come over and debate me and see if we can slow down the death of 360,000 and counting.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim my privilege under House Rule IX, section 1, to address the House in reply to the scurrilous attacks on my honor, my truthfulness, and my motives by the retiring Member from Wisconsin's Third District, Mr. Gunderson.

His verbal attacks on me last May 14, from this very lectern, have worked their way throughout the national media. He has added his insults by telling a stringer for The Washington Post according to her puff piece on him, printed on, Sunday, June 2, that I am, quote, full of prejudice and hatred. That's so far over the line, Mr. Speaker, that...
it necessitates a 40-cannon broadside in response.

Mr. Speaker, it’s worth noting that in more than 16 years of service together, Mr. GUNDERSON and I have never exchanged cross words off this floor, nor have we ever been impolite, nor unkind, though we differ on almost every other—not one. Mr. Gunderson will confirm this. Just ask him. In fact, ask anyone around here and, if they’re honest, they will tell you that I am one of the most cheerful, optimistic, enthusiastic, upbeat, irresistible, good natured, and affable members with whom one can serve. And loyal. Yes, for certain, I am passionate at times, and, yes, unrelenting in my deep concern about the deterioration of our culture.

And that concern is sometimes dismissed in a negative way by a few adversaries around here, and often spun negatively by doctrinaire liberals in the media who care little about objective truth or the real intent of a heart that even some detractors have called a brave heart. As I’ve pointed out occasionally to supportive friends, my passion is only seen as unusual, even in this historic debate chamber that’s weathered a civil war, because today so many Members of Congress lack passion about anything, in spite of that violent world out there. Also because there are so many here, who, while aspiring to be nobles, have no heart, let alone a brave one, and turn a deaf ear to the words of William Butler Yeats warning that “everywhere the ceremony of innocence is drowned.”

First, a brief prolog. The trigger for Mr. GUNDERSON’s point of personal privilege was my “Dear Colleague” letter, circulating a factual report documenting the so-called “Cherry Jubilee” homosexual circuit party of more than 2,000 bummy and grinding partyers misusing the largest Federal auditorium our capital on April 13 to celebrate licentious and lewd behavior, at the mockingly named “Cherry Jubilee.”

Mr. Speaker, after a fair evaluation of all available facts, I can unequivocally state that the report issued by journalist Marc Morano is true and accurate. Let me repeat that. Contrary to Mr. GUNDERSON’s absurd, second-guessing behavior, at the mockingly named “Cherry Jubilee” Main Event of more than 2,000 bumping and grinding partyers misusing the largest Federal auditorium our capital on April 13 to celebrate licentious and lewd behavior, at the mockingly named “Cherry Jubilee.”

Mr. Speaker, after a fair evaluation of all available facts, I can unequivocally state that the report issued by journalist Marc Morano is true and accurate. Let me repeat that. Contrary to Mr. GUNDERSON’s absurd, second-guessing behavior, at the mockingly named “Cherry Jubilee” Main Event of more than 2,000 bumping and grinding partyers misusing the largest Federal auditorium our capital on April 13 to celebrate licentious and lewd behavior, at the mockingly named “Cherry Jubilee.”

An all-night homosexual circuit party called Cherry Jubilee ‘Main Event’ took place in Washington, D.C. on April 13, 1996. The dance party featured public nudity, illicit sexual activity and evidence of illegal drug use. The sponsors of the homosexual festivities included * * * American Airlines, Snapple, Miller Lite Beer, Starbucks Coffee, and Ben & Jerry’s Ice Cream. The ‘Main Event’ was followed by a ‘Capitol Hill Recovery Brunch’ in the Rayburn House Office building.

The ‘Main Event’ was being described by the City Paper as a ‘New York style homosexual circuit party’ * * * ‘usual drug infested.’ “Main Event’ tickets were very hard to come by. The event sold out, which left a scramble for ticket scalpers outside the entrance. Two and three-quarters thousand between the ages of 25–35 years old. Many of the men who attended were of obvious affluence. Limousines and even a Rolls Royce lined Constitution Avenue as the partygoers arrived.

The clothing was trendy with skin tight black jeans and tanktops. The bartenders wore bright neon underwear and nothing else. Many of the men arrived with leather and rubber pants and neon rubber loin cloth under-wear only. Most of the shirts came off as the men headed for the dance floor.

Body piercing was ubiquitous with piercing in nipples, navels and ears. Chairs and dog collars were also prevalent. Cross dressing was common sight, as a heavy presence of transvestites and other ‘transgendered’ men attended. Men with wigs and dresses in heavy make up strolled through the auditorium. Several pairs touched hands as well, parading in very skimpy clothing.

Most attendees greeted each other with open mouth kisses. No fights or altercations * * * the men were generally very neat, with meticulous hair and clothing. There were no men who could be described as overweight.

As the constant thump, thump, thump of the techno music heated the crowd, the danc-ing became increasingly loud and suggestive. As the night went on, the dancers began simple sexual overtures. The dance floor became a torrent of intense groping and stroking. Some couples dancing on table tops, mimicked anal sex through their clothing while others pantomimed oral sex. At one point while dancing on a table top, one of the lesbians lifted her bra and exposed her breasts. Meanwhile, several inflated condoms were batted about like volleyballs.

At about 4 am, two men proceeded engage in illicit sexual behavior in the main auditorium. One man towered his head (onto the crotch of another male) as the other person performed oral sex. This act occurred just off the dance in full view of the crowd. No one seemed to be fazed by it one bit.

The restroom stalls at the Mellon Auditorium were constantly being occupied by two men at a time. (Gropes and groans) could be heard emanating from the stalls with double occupancy. Stall doors would open and two men would nonchalantly exit.

Every conceivable isolated spot became a dilemma for security. Security officers had to guard the entrances, exits, balconies, stairwells. The Auditorium is the most impressive lobby of the Interior Department. I was diverted from reporting this latter outrage by the pace of House business on Capitol Hill needs to explain how an ‘Main Event’ of more than 2,000 bumping and grinding partyers misusing the largest Federal auditorium our capital on April 13 to celebrate licentious and lewd behavior, at the mockingly named “Cherry Jubilee.”

Mr. Speaker, after a fair evaluation of all available facts, I can unequivocally state that the report issued by journalist Marc Morano is true and accurate. Let me repeat that. Contrary to Mr. GUNDERSON’s absurd, second-guessing behavior, at the mockingly named “Cherry Jubilee” Main Event of more than 2,000 bumping and grinding partyers misusing the largest Federal auditorium our capital on April 13 to celebrate licentious and lewd behavior, at the mockingly named “Cherry Jubilee.”

Last year, throughout the month of June, in the impressive lobby of the Interior Department, there was an in-your-face display glorifying homosexuality. A large, lavender painted, free-standing billboard praised, with large photos, four homosexuals high in our Government and held them up as role models. One, a female, is no longer in Washington having left to lose an election in San Francisco. Another is still an Assistant Secretary at the Interior Department. And the other two are homosexuals serving here in Congress. Unfortunately, the short bios under the Congress-men’s photos were lies. The bios deceptively stated that both Congressmen courageously came out of privacy and voluntarily, with great pride revealed their homosexuality here on the floor of Congress. Of course, the truth is quite different, Mr. Speaker. One of them was censured by this House for his statutory rape of a 16-year-old boy, one of our pages, and Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt knows that; and the other ‘member was secretly rep-resented by the House for conduct unbecom-ing a Congressman because of his involve-ment with a male prostitute-pimp who was running a full service procurement operation
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Event was followed by a ‘Capitol Hill Recovery Brunch’ in the Rayburn House Office building.

Representative Gunderson secured the Rayburn building for the ‘recovery brunch.’

The ‘Main Event’ was a taxpayer funded and federally operated building complete with classical ornate Doric columns directly across the street from the Museum of American History on Constitution Avenue. The ‘Main Event’ was the 253rd anniversary of Thomas Jefferson’s birthday.

Now, ironically, Mr. Speaker, this disgraceful manner of taxpayer-funded money might never have happened if I had come to this well and alerted Congress to a growing phe-nomenon of misuse of Federal facilities to ad-
out of the Member’s D.C. apartment, that and much more. The eccentric Bruce Babbit also knew that ugly tale. Babbitt authored the homosexual propaganda display knowing that neither Member of Congress came out of secrecy freely, but were brought out of privacy by crimes. This outrage at the Interior Department challenged here Congress, and therefore went unknown to American taxpayers. If I had protested those prior abuses of taxpayer-owned facilities, just maybe, 10 months later, a similar outrage wouldn’t have taken place on Constitution Avenue, again at the beautifully gilded Mellon Auditorium.

Better late than never.

So Mr. Speaker, I now step out into the minifields of evil political correctness, alone, but I hope and pray, not alone for long, I come Holy Spirit. On May 2, last month, here in our awe-inspiring Rotunda, America’s secular cathedral, this 104th Congress, at a very, very moving ceremony, awarded our Congressional Gold Medal to the Rev. Billy Graham and to Ruth Graham his devoted and wonderful wife who brings the inspiring message of salvation, while addressing Vice President Gore and his wife Tipper, Speaker Newt Gingrich, former Senate Leader Bob Dole and his wife Elizabeth, and all of our congressional leaders including Mr. Arbery, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Delay, Mr. Daschle and all of the other Senate leaders, and dozens of Members of both Houses, Rev. Billy Graham stated with great emotion, “We are a nation on the brink of self-destruction.”

I repeat Dr. Graham: America is “a nation on the brink of self-destruction.” A nation just last month stated that 76 percent of our fellow Americans believe that our country is “in spiritual and moral decline.” This Member of Congress agrees. I am one of the 76 percent.

I love my country and I’m sick at heart at its lack of direction in moral matters, in state and civic affairs involving character. For example, I beg my colleagues to read carefully this cover article in the June 17 edition of the Weekly Standard. It’s titled “Pedophilia Chic.”

The norming of foul perversion. It seems that no longer is there any conduct considered a flat out evil. In our liberal popular culture, hardly any cultural taboo remains. The words “objective disorder” fall on deaf ears at the networks and at the New York Times.

On May 14, 12 days after Rev. Billy Graham’s warning, Mr. GUNDERSON, rose on this House floor to a question of personal privilege. In a “Dear Colleague” and at this lectern, Mr. Speaker. And it wasn’t even true.

Now, whom do you think that old congressional ally was, Mr. Speaker? That so-called ally, “billy” of the Post and the Times’s words are green and go! The Badlands—do they really know in their hearts that trolley bars is “bad” for them? How about the bars with hot tubs and private two-man cubicles in upper rooms and side chambers—the same type of bathhouses I helped to close with near unanimous legislation on this floor back in 1985—those non-Glory Holes had particularly offensive names such as: “The Mineshaft,” “The Anvil,” and worse. Are those bathhouse dives typical or stereotypical?

Mr. Speaker, since Mr. GUNDERSON said I questioned his integrity, let us thoughtfully analyze this word “integrity.” In the May 13, 1996, edition of one of our military newspapers, the following powerful words were expressed by a four star leader in an article on page 12. His article also covered “honesty” and “courage” and “professionalism.”

I want to quote a few germane paragraphs for this reason: the so-called Tailhook Scandal, still bedeviling and ripping our great U.S. Navy, is 5 years old, 5 years old, and it is still destroying careers. Imagine for a moment, Mr. Speaker, if the out-of-control homosexual rump that we judge today had happened on any U.S. military base or post anywhere throughout the world. What would the repercussions have been? Batten down the hatchets. That thought gives new, sickening meaning to the words “double standard.” But, first, those powerful words from a real leader, a four-star, combat-tested Chief of Staff. Apply his challenging thoughts to U.S. Congressmen and Senators.

The majority of our members understand well that integrity is essential in [military] an organization where we count on fellow members and that honesty is the glue that binds the members into a cohesive team.

“... And they easily take responsibility for their actions and exhibit the courage to do the right thing.”

“Yes, most [Air Force] professionals place service before self and willingly subordinate personal interests for the good of their unit,
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Mr. Speaker, I now step out into the minifields of evil political correctness, alone, but I hope and pray, not alone for long, I come Holy Spirit. On May 2, last month, here in our awe-inspiring Rotunda, America’s secular cathedral, this 104th Congress, at a very, very moving ceremony, awarded our Congressional Gold Medal to the Rev. Billy Graham and to Ruth Graham his devoted and wonderful wife who brings the inspiring message of salvation, while addressing Vice President Gore and his wife Tipper, Speaker Newt Gingrich, former Senate Leader Bob Dole and his wife Elizabeth, and all of our congressional leaders including Mr. Arbery, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Delay, Mr. Daschle and all of the other Senate leaders, and dozens of Members of both Houses, Rev. Billy Graham stated with great emotion, “We are a nation on the brink of self-destruction.”

I repeat Dr. Graham: America is “a nation on the brink of self-destruction.” A nation just last month stated that 76 percent of our fellow Americans believe that our country is “in spiritual and moral decline.” This Member of Congress agrees. I am one of the 76 percent.

I love my country and I’m sick at heart at its lack of direction in moral matters, in state and civic affairs involving character. For example, I beg my colleagues to read carefully this cover article in the June 17 edition of the Weekly Standard. It’s titled “Pedophilia Chic.”

The norming of foul perversion. It seems that no longer is there any conduct considered a flat out evil. In our liberal popular culture, hardly any cultural taboo remains. The words “objective disorder” fall on deaf ears at the networks and at the New York Times.

On May 14, 12 days after Rev. Billy Graham’s warning, Mr. GUNDERSON, rose on this House floor to a question of personal privilege. In a “Dear Colleague” and at this lectern, Mr. Speaker. And it wasn’t even true.

Now, whom do you think that old congressional ally was, Mr. Speaker? That so-called ally, “billy” of the Post and the Times’s words are green and go! The Badlands—do they really know in their hearts that trolley bars is “bad” for them? How about the bars with hot tubs and private two-man cubicles in upper rooms and side chambers—the same type of bathhouses I helped to close with near unanimous legislation on this floor back in 1985—those non-Glory Holes had particularly offensive names such as: “The Mineshaft,” “The Anvil,” and worse. Are those bathhouse dives typical or stereotypical?

Mr. Speaker, since Mr. GUNDERSON said I questioned his integrity, let us thoughtfully analyze this word “integrity.” In the May 13, 1996, edition of one of our military newspapers, the following powerful words were expressed by a four star leader in an article on page 12. His article also covered “honesty” and “courage” and “professionalism.”

I want to quote a few germane paragraphs for this reason: the so-called Tailhook Scandal, still bedeviling and ripping our great U.S. Navy, is 5 years old, 5 years old, and it is still destroying careers. Imagine for a moment, Mr. Speaker, if the out-of-control homosexual rump that we judge today had happened on any U.S. military base or post anywhere throughout the world. What would the repercussions have been? Batten down the hatchets. That thought gives new, sickening meaning to the words “double standard.” But, first, those powerful words from a real leader, a four-star, combat-tested Chief of Staff. Apply his challenging thoughts to U.S. Congressmen and Senators.

The majority of our members understand well that integrity is essential in [military] an organization where we count on fellow members and that honesty is the glue that binds the members into a cohesive team.

“... And they easily take responsibility for their actions and exhibit the courage to do the right thing.”

“Yes, most [Air Force] professionals place service before self and willingly subordinate personal interests for the good of their unit,
[the Air Force] and the Nation and, if called upon, are willing to risk their lives in defense of the United States.

"Furthermore, professionals in our service strive to excel in all that they do, always understanding that our responsibility for America's security carries with it the moral imperative to seek excellence in all our [military] activities.

"Because of what we do, our standards must be higher than those that prevail in society at large. [Shouldn't this mean Congress, Mr. Speaker?] The American people expect this of us, and rightly so. In the end, our behavior must merit their trust, respect and support.

"[Air Force] leaders [commanders] and supervisors must ensure that their colleagues [troops] understand the requirements of our [military] profession—and measure up to them.

"* * * when an individual exhibits personal negligence, misbehavior (or disobedience), this is not a mistake! That is a crime, and crimes are matters of serious concern for superiors.

"In short, if a service member willfully ignores standards, falsifies reports, engages in inappropriate off-duty behavior, then we must immediately take appropriate disciplinary action—certainly that would include hitting on teenagers.

"* * * as a force, we must insist on disciplined and principled behavior.

"When an individual fails to meet the higher standards expected of [military] professionals, then we must hold him or her accountable and document his or her fiscal records * * *

"And revisit it if provoked again.

"Ours is not a 'have it your way' kind of service. Members cannot be allowed to pick and choose which aspects of our [Air Force] standards, [Air Force] instructions, Defense Department directives or the Uniform Code of Military Justice laws they will comply with.

"That would undermine the good order and discipline that is so crucial to any outfit. If you are unwilling—to comply with our [Air Force] standards; to embrace the values of our profession; to meet the unique requirements of [military] service; or to accept the resulting limits on individual behavior—then get out.

"Our responsibility for safeguarding America is far too important and too critical to allow it to be jeopardized by those unwilling to measure up."

"Mr. Speaker, I will revisit in my closing words three of those powerful sentences and identify the flag officer who delivered them. Mr. Speaker, no one believes that any Member of Congress is risking his or her life by serving on the Senate or the House, so how dare we live by a lower, a much lower, standard of ethics and professionalism than we demand of our younger military men and women who serve under our jurisdiction, and who do risk their very lives. A slim majority of Members of Congress allow thousands of troopers of our 1st Armored Division to be sent by Clinton into harm's way in Bosnia, and yet our Congress ignores garbage like this "Cherry bomb" of hedonism right here down on Constitution Avenue. Our toleration of low standards by Congress is at the core of my challenge today.

"Our Federal buildings must never, never be used to facilitate and glorify immorality. We in Congress are culpable, for any immorality taking place on public property in Washington, if we fail as custodians of these beautiful citizen owned buildings. And what dangerous path are we following if we dismiss the consequences of glorifying homosexual behavior here in Washington, DC, our capital.

"My colleagues need only reflect on the lives of three congressional leaders past and present, who found, or still find, homosexuality alluring, if not addictive. Three of our Members have died from AIDS. Another barely escaped expulsion while suffering the dishonor of a severe House censure for seducing a minor, i.e., for the statutory rape of the two pages sent here by his former wife, our care. And, by the way, that young page was seduced on a codet to Spain. How was that outrage put together?

"

"I've never heard of a page traveling with a domestic congressional delegation let alone with an overseas congressional delegation.

"Another Member was dishonored with a severe House reprimand for sponsoring and using a pimp and is pitied by those who have a West Point sense of honor. Both Members should have been expelled so as to maintain the world's respect for our U.S. Congress, not to mention their respective subordinates.

"Members saw their careers ended by election defeats after they were discovered trolling for teenagers at so-called hot action bars, one of them a father of three teenagers. Even if they had only hit on 18, 19, or even 20-year-olds, that is still child abuse.

"[Air Force] leaders [commanders] and supervisors must ensure that their colleagues [troops] understand the requirements of our [military] profession—and measure up to them."

"Mr. Speaker, how can I, a God-fearing American, a very lucky husband of 41 years, a father of 5 stalwart, God-loving adult children, a grandfather of 10—No. 11 is in the hanger—and a very hard-working double House chairman who is trying his best to slow the AIDS death toll, how could I possibly sound homosexual activists, as Mr. GUNDERSON accuses, given what they've done and continue to do to themselves?

[In June 2 Washington Post Magazine story, Mr. GUNDERSON asserts, "[DORNAN is] full of prejudice and hatred." That one quote alone would justify my point of personal privilege. And in another Post attribution, apparently in the same breath, Mr. GUNDERSON accuses, and I quote, "Is [DORNAN] dangerous? Sure. Because he can use passion to intimidate and to roll over those who are unwilling or unable to stand up to him."

Pathetic, Mr. Speaker. I pray for STEVE GUNDERSON, and all others who like my colleague, live on the edge, but I must fight back. Mr. GUNDERSON's charges have been a destruction of my reputation by branding my work in Congress as driven by the twin evils of hatred and bigotry. Well, it won't work, because it's not in my nature to allow lies to go unanswered. I went through jet pilot training when Mr. GUNDERSON was 2 years old, I marched with Dr. Martin Luther King when Mr. GUNDERSON was 12, and the next year, 1964, I put my life on the line against bigotry. Mr. Speaker, in the 1800's, when immoral dueling was commonplace, Mr. GUNDERSON would never have assaulted my honor with such vile language. It's beyond butch, to coin a phrase."

"Mr. Speaker, the impact of casual sex prop- aganda and the mainstreaming and in rare cases even the romanticizing of AIDS have death statistics about 20,000 individuals who succumbed to AIDS in the early eighties and whose physicians, attempting to understandably face family embarrassment, reported those deaths as the result of final condition such as cancer or pneumonia, rather than report them as AIDS-related. This tally makes those 20,000 in the aggregate total, then in just a few days, by June 30, 1996, 360,000 Americans, including more than 4,000 defenseless children, will have died a horrible death brought about by an infectious fatal venereal disease known by the bland sounding acronym, AIDS. Mr. Speaker, World War II total combat deaths, total killed in action, were 292,131; U.S. AIDS deaths toll 360,000 and counting.

"U.S. Civil War combat deaths, both sides, North and South because all combatants were Americans, our War Between the States killed in action, 214,938; U.S. AIDS 360,00 and counting. And all seven of our other wars from the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, war with Mexico, with Spain, World War I, Korea through Vietnam, total killed in action, 143,346. That's 7 wars of KIA, 1,750. U.S. AIDS cases 360,000 and counting. And the death toll is far worse in Asia and Africa—worldwide over 5 million dead, and counting. And this unparalleled killer has been driven, in the United States, in the main, by homosexual behavior. Except for those 4,000 defenseless children and innocent victims of infected tissue or infected blood products, such as hemophiliacs, it's conduct driven. And, except for, sadly, the innocent victims of lying philanderers, who callously infected their unknowing partners in the name of love, the conduct driven.

"Furthermore, professionals in our service strive to excel in all that they do, always understanding that our responsibility for America's security carries with it the moral imperative to seek excellence in all our [military] activities. And they periodically threaten to expose—out he calls it—these 4 or 5 Members—actually he claims 12 or more, if they don't vote the right way he insists on certain security risk issues.

"He also threatens to out them if Chairman DORNAN dares to hold hearings on whether people are a security risk if they conceal scandalous personal secrets such as alcoholism, financial chicanery, adultery, or bisexuality. Isn't that a can of not-so-subtle blackmail, Mr. Speaker?

"Yes, my colleagues, homosexuality is sad, not happy or gay, even when someone's career has brought them to these hollow Chambers.

"And why do we fear discussing, here in Congress, what spreads the AIDS virus? How many will have died by mid-year 1996? Dr. C. Everett Koop advises us to include AIDS
add, my colleagues say, I forget little, if anything. According to the June 2 Post article, Mr. GUNDERSON has had four of his six closest friendswest away and die from AIDS and another is HIV positive. That’s heartbreaking, but obviously he has kept these tragedies within the family. He has never publicly warned anybody, young or adult, that the wages of promiscuity is death. He certainly never warned anyone from this lectern. Does he defend the Magic Johnson rationale that “I’m simply an innocent victim, and we’re all in it together.” It’s every last day, or rather championing an honest approach of heavyweight prizefighter Tommy Morrison, who stated through tears, “It’s my fault. My conduct. My immoral behavior. If I can save one young person from doing what I did and stop them from becoming infected with this killing disease, then my suffering will not be in vain.”

Where was Mr. GUNDERSON or any other Member in 1986 when I pleaded with colleagues to come to Paris with me to visit the Louise Pasteur Clinic to investigate the exploding cases of AIDS? When was the District of Columbia, was any Member, to gain AIDS knowledge, visited the National Institutes of Health, just a short 20-minute drive north from Capitol Hill to Bethesda, MD. I have made these informative trips several times over the last decade, another to NIH just last May.

What did Mr. GUNDERSON do with his unjustified, Jim Wright-initiated, 2 years worth of congressional pay raise back in 1989 and 1990? Which would now be illegal, by the way, since we passed James Madison’s 27th Amendment. Well, my 2 years of those raises went to AIDS hospices.

Mr. Speaker, I don’t know what Mr. GUNDERSON does in his free time to educate himself about the worldwide spread of AIDS, but I have been carefully tracking this health nightmare for 15 years. Just last month, I visited the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center at Fort Detrick where I received a startling and tragic update about the exponential spread of AIDS worldwide.

In just 3½ years from now, 60 million people will be HIV infected and 12 million will be suffering with full-blown AIDS; sadly most of them will die with little or no medical care. And dead? No one knows for certain how many millions by 2000 A.D. I also learned the following stunning, shocking medical fact: the military forces of Zimbabwe are infected. That means three out of every four soldiels, three out of every four officers will die of AIDS. Because of this, Zimbabwe’s forces are rejected permanently by the United Nations for any future peacekeeping assignments, At least until these not-so-gay-nineties.

As a result of this most distressing news, Mr. GUNDERSON said that the District has the largest concentration of HIV/AIDS positive people in the country. True. Where was his voice of warning over the last 16 years to stem or slow that AIDS growth right here where we work? Since 1981, his first year, the last 15 years? Other than telling NIH discovered and defined AIDS, he has offered no coherent public advice to slow this plague. No tough love—mostly silence. No support for heavyweight fighter Tommy Morrison’s prayerful, humble plea for morality in behavior. A call for abstinence. Hardly.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it’s interesting to note that over the last 10 years Mr. GUNDERSON has spoken on this House floor about AIDS...
only eight times! Unbelievable for a self-proclaimed compassionate and caring man. If you don’t count a one-sentence-passing mention of AIDS in 1989, then, amazing as it seems, his very first speech, and a short one at that, was his amory March 24, 1994, “Christian-second-class citizen” speech. That’s only 2 years ago! Bob DORNAN, on the other hand, has addressed this Chamber on the subject of AIDS just under 200 times. That’s Mr. GUNDERSON’s rate times 24. This speech today alone contains more references to AIDS, both in quantity and quality, than any other speaker. That’s only 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that Wall Street Journal conclusion, “For people facing these risks, it was fair to say that worldwide, in just 3 years, 60 million people were more in danger of being hit by lightning than being zapped by AIDS.”

I continue quoting the Wall Street Journal: “A major study that was just being completed [in 1987] put the average risk from a single act of anal sex with an infected partner, or a single injection of full blown AIDS! And Mr. GUNDERSON’s friends claim the all-night scene at the Mellon Auditorium raised a mere $50,000, actually $45,000? That’s one-half of 1 year of care for just one government patient who is only HIV positive. Not much to brag about, a single act of sexual partying cost over an admitted $80,000! And again, according to Mr. GUNDERSON, $14,000 was for the lighting alone. I wonder did that include the multicolored rainbow lighting of those magnificent Mellon Auditorium Doric columns along Constitution Avenue?

By the year 2000, the AIDS plague will have cost our national economy about $107 billion. It has already cost us over $75 billion, about $35 billion of that in research. Since 1986, insurance claims involving AIDS have increased more than 500 percent totaling an estimated $9.4 billion! Children orphaned by AIDS will reach 4 million youngsters worldwide by the year 2000—80,000 in the United States alone. That’s 4 million innocent babies, toddlers and other precious children of tender age left without both parents! And homosexual publications like the Blade or the Advocate question my motives—my passionate concern. How arrogant.

To me, it simply is not everyone’s disease. Beyond question. I have a simple question for Mr. DORNAN and Mr. UNDERSON and that is not ricocheting around our nation * * * a national disease. Our president didn’t do it. Congress didn’t do it. The lighting alone. I wonder did that include the multicolored rainbow lighting of those magnificent Mellon Auditorium Doric columns along Constitution Avenue?

The decision didn’t go the way I expected. Naturally, I stand with Justice Scalia brilliantly logical and hard hitting dissent. Anthony Kennedy’s six Justice to three Justice opinion represents just a part of the raging debate that involves DORNAN and GUNDERSON and that is not ricocheting around our nation * * * a national Rev. Graham says is “on the brink of self-destruction.”

For example, homosexual pedophilia has cost my Catholic religion, a faith I dearly cherish, one billion * * * dollars and counting. Those are tithing dollars, God’s money, spent trying to erase the pain and stem the outrage of the victims of clerical homosexual pedophilia. Who is to blame? Besides the molesters themselves to whom Jesus would take this belt to drive them from His Father’s house? Well, try the liberal rectors of Catholic seminaries who decided years ago to reject common sense and accept homosexuals who merely promised to be good, or promised to try to be good. And how about the same type of prudish social experimenters who are constantly shopping for liberal judges trying to force homosexual acceptance on our military forces.
Pro-family folks, especially those in Colorado who crafted their amendment 2, ought not to be discouraged by what I am about to explain, but, sadly, Colorado’s amendment 2 was imprecisely written and its inexact wording is what allowed six Justices to choose process over substance in handing down their majority opinion.

Amendment 2 unfortunately used modern homosexual terminology. It stated: "No Protected Status Based on Homosexual, Lesbian, or Bisexual Orientation. Neither the State of Colorado, through any of its branches or departments, nor any of its agencies, political subdivisions, municipalities or school districts, shall enact, adopt or enforce any law, ordinance, rule or regulation, or any policy whereby homosexual, lesbian or bisexual orientation, conduct, practices or relationships shall constitute or otherwise be the basis of or entitle any person or class of persons to have or claim any minority status, quota preferences, protected status or claim of discrimination. This Section of the Constitution shall be in all respects self-executing.

The problem with language, Mr. Speaker, is the use of the terms “orientation” and “class of persons.” And let me just say at this key point, Mr. Speaker, that what I am about to explain, brightly illuminated by this current Supreme Court decision, will lend itself a resolution of the question before us today—that is, Mr. GUNDERSON questioning of my motives and his attacks on my character.

For the purposes of law, there is no such thing as homosexual orientation. In law, it doesn’t exist. Homosexuality is a state of mind and no less than a sex act. Loving friends living together for years can be bonded by Philos love with never even a thought of Eros love. So under the law, you can’t be HOMOSEXUAL without the S±E±X±U±A±L any more than love. So under the law, you can’t be HOMOSEXUAL without the S±E±X±U±A±L any more than love. So under the law, you can’t be HOMOSEXUAL without the S±E±X±U±A±L any more than love.

Why? Because laws and public policies are sexual. This is a crucial distinction in the law.

John Paul Stevens wrote in his dissenting opinion about this animus: "The Court’s portrayal of Coloradans as a society fallen victim to pointless, hate-filled ‘gay bashing’ is so false as to be comical.” Unquote. Comical, Scalia wrote, Mr. Speaker, he thought his opinion to be so important that he took the time to read it aloud to the U.S. Supreme Court, to read aloud his entire dissenting opinion which was much longer than the majority opinion.

Mr. Speaker, please reflect on Justice Scalia’s carefully chosen words. He is saying that you and I, and all Coloradans, are entitled—he italicized this word in his opinion—entitled to be hostile toward homosexual conduct and that the “Court’s portrayal of Coloradans as a society fallen victim to pointless, hate-filled ‘gay bashing’ is so false as to be comical.”

I, like most Americans, do have animus towards homosexual conduct. I do not have animus towards homosexual doctors. But if, for example, I were to say, “I don’t consider homophobia a bad thing,” I’m sure you would be shocked. I don’t have animus toward any other kind of prejudice. But there is a difference.

The problem with language, Mr. Speaker, is the use of the terms “orientation” and “class of persons.” And let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that what I am about to explain, brightly illuminated by this current Supreme Court decision, will lend itself a resolution of the question before us today—that is, Mr. GUNDERSON questioning of my motives and his attacks on my character.
Mr. Speaker, please think again at this point about Tailhook and the outrageous double standard that we tolerate, especially given the code of honor we Americans demand from our military, and the pathetically low standard of ethics enforces, and I yield. Mr. Speaker, I mention this because of a recent report and a video record of journalist Marc Morano, who was an eyewitness of the Saturday night event. According to what I'm talking about when I criticize the promoters at Friends Being Friends have the grandaddy of a debutante's ball as suggested by Mr. GUNDERSON—but the hypnolic, psychedelic lighting so belling the hedonism that it was partially illuminating.

The third event comprising the package weekend was the Sunday Recovery Brunch hosted by Mr. GUNDERSON in our House Rayburn Courtyard. This function was initially advertised in a 17th St. bistro advertised here, Mr. Speaker, probably the oldest homo-bar in town. Mr. Speaker, Mr. GUNDERSON's, quote, "unique Agriculture Committee Room located inside the Longworth House Office Building." I assume Mr. GUNDERSON decided a much larger site was needed.

The Washington Blade newspaper wrote a post-mortem newspaper, quote, "Cherry Jubilee kicked off Friday, April 12, with a 'Welcome Cocktail Party' at 'Trumps'"—that's the 17th St. bistro advertised here, Mr. Speaker, with this cowboy dressed in woman's undergar. Back to the Blade, "Trumps was followed by a 'Welcome Dance Party' at Lafayette, a 14th Street club. (The Washingtonian Magazine says it's D.C.'s "best bar for the scene.") The 'Main Event,' an all-night dance attended by over 2,000 people, took place at the historic Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium" (note that this blow up reminds me of The Cherry Jubilee Weekend consisted of three inclusive events; First, a Friday, April 12, Welcome Party held primarily for this homosexual circuit party's out of town guests, as the promoters at Friends Being Friends have explained. The Welcome Party was advertised as being held in the courtyard, or as the promoters say, two of Washington's popular local hangouts, the homosexual bars Trumpets and JR's. Mr. Speaker, I have here advertisements for these bars as printed in the city's premier homosexual newspaper The Washington Blade. Note, Mr. Speaker, alongside the ad with these advertisements, or as the participating bars report and video record of journalist Marc Morano, who was an eyewitness of the Saturday night event. According to what I'm talking about when I criticize the Brady's keeper, . . . are not trying to destroy you risk-takers, we're trying to save your immortal souls, and your mortal lives in the measure.

Mr. Speaker, let's address the central allegation of Mr. GUNDERSON's May 14 floor speech; that I had a large hand in intentionally "misrepresenting the facts" and intentionally "falsifying information" surrounding the "Cherry Jubilee Weekend." I repeat, he actually used those false words "misrepresenting the facts" six times.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, these salacious advertisements at my side are exactly what I'm talking about when I criticize the melee at the Mellon. The Cherry Jubilee Weekend consisted of three inclusive events; First, a Friday, April 12, Welcome Party held primarily for this homosexual circuit party's out of town guests, as the promoters at Friends Being Friends have explained. The Welcome Party was advertised as being held in the courtyard, or as the participating bars report and video record of journalist Marc Morano, who was an eyewitness of the Saturday night event. According to what I'm talking about when I criticize the Brady's keeper, . . . are not trying to destroy you risk-takers, we're trying to save your immortal souls, and your mortal lives in the measure.

Mr. Speaker, let's address the central allegation of Mr. GUNDERSON's May 14 floor speech; that I had a large hand in intentionally "misrepresenting the facts" and intentionally "falsifying information" surrounding the "Cherry Jubilee Weekend." I repeat, he actually used those false words "misrepresenting the facts" six times.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, these salacious advertisements at my side are exactly what I'm talking about when I criticize the melee at the Mellon. The Cherry Jubilee Weekend consisted of three inclusive events; First, a Friday, April 12, Welcome Party held primarily for this homosexual circuit party's out of town guests, as the promoters at Friends Being Friends have explained. The Welcome Party was advertised as being held in the courtyard, or as the participating bars report and video record of journalist Marc Morano, who was an eyewitness of the Saturday night event. According to what I'm talking about when I criticize the Brady's keeper, . . . are not trying to destroy you risk-takers, we're trying to save your immortal souls, and your mortal lives in the measure.

Mr. Speaker, let's address the central allegation of Mr. GUNDERSON's May 14 floor speech; that I had a large hand in intentionally "misrepresenting the facts" and intentionally "falsifying information" surrounding the "Cherry Jubilee Weekend." I repeat, he actually used those false words "misrepresenting the facts" six times.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, these salacious advertisements at my side are exactly what I'm talking about when I criticize the melee at the Mellon. The Cherry Jubilee Weekend consisted of three inclusive events; First, a Friday, April 12, Welcome Party held primarily for this homosexual circuit party's out of town guests, as the promoters at Friends Being Friends have explained. The Welcome Party was advertised as being held in the courtyard, or as the participating bars report and video record of journalist Marc Morano, who was an eyewitness of the Saturday night event. According to what I'm talking about when I criticize the Brady's keeper, . . . are not trying to destroy you risk-takers, we're trying to save your immortal souls, and your mortal lives in the measure.
only know the first names of about 20 spouses, and not the single maiden name of a Member’s spouse. Enough already with Rob and Herb’s family values.

Mr. Speaker, an important point. Mr. GUNDERSON was adamant that there were no orange construction cones, public sodomy, nor only to warn of construction hazards. Well, Mr. Morano told me, and I personally confirmed this on a visit to this impressive building, that the outside orange construction cones were not for hazard warning of construction work as Mr. GUNDERSON stated, but were indeed to ward off hard partyers seeking the remote and dark refuge of an outside dead-end stairwell that they themselves dubbed “Screw Alley.” Again, I personally observed that it is not an alley, but an elegant arched side carriage entrance and courtyard—there is a courtyard carriage entrance with handicap ramps on each side of the magnificent auditorium. This is where much of the reported public urination was taking place, right there next to our historic Constitution Avenue. The two-carriage entrance courtyards were also the smoking sections for the risk-fast-laners. One eyewitness said that so many people were up and down the dark stairwells that orange cones were set up by an APEX rent-a-cop, to quote, “detour the traffic.” Unquote. Mr. Speaker, there was no construction work outside and certainly nothing “constructive” going on inside.

In the course of his floor statement, Mr. GUNDERSON said, quote, “Mr. Dornan uses an article to portray a recent series of events held in this town, in Government buildings, as a party of numerous illegal activities. Nothing could be further from the truth.” Unquote.

So, to again use Mr. GUNDERSON’s very words, “It’s time to set the record straight.”

The very day after he delivered his statement, the Washington Times, May 15, corroborated the charges of illegal drug activity independent of reporter Marc Morano and his associate’s eyewitness accounts. Illegal drugs were used at the taxpayer-owned and GSA-operated historic Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium. And, by the way, Mr. Speaker, Mr. GUNDERSON or the Commerce Department runs the Mellon. Another of his misstatements. It’s run by the General Services Administration. This proves again that community lawyers or Whitman-Walker wrote his May 14 protestation.

I met personally with the very professional lady who has been the principal GSA supervisor there for over 10 years. She told me when she came to the Mellon Sunday morning it was filthy, with mixed-drink-sticky-slime covering most of the auditorium floor. She demanded, and got Whitman-Walker to pay for a cleaning crew on Sunday, at a triple overtime rate.

As for displays of public sex—who among the participants would come forward and incriminate themselves? As for the one off-duty officer, still unidentified and probably nonexistent, and the six APEX rent-a-cops—wouldn’t you expect six or seven people to be overwhelmed by 2,000-plus undulating and mock-humping revelers? And the fact remains that, for many homosexuals, the attraction to partiers who are strangers for public sex is pathologically, perhaps even non-existent, and the six APEX rent-a-cops—wouldn’t you expect sex or seven people to be overwhelmed by 2,000-plus undulating and mock-humping revelers? And the fact remains that, for many homosexuals, the attraction to partiers who are strangers for public sex is pathologically, perhaps even non-existent.

Just listen to Mr. GUNDERSON’s own words, quote, “The sponsors intentionally took steps to prevent even an atmosphere conducive to illegal activity.” Unquote. This is definitely not standard party protocol at your American Legion Hall dance or at any NCO Club dance or a Kiwanis or Rotary Club night out. How about our own Capitol Hill? Can we think Tailhook again, Mr. Speaker, and the price paid by heroic combat pilots who have lost their careers. Why would Mr. GUNDERSON have to tell us all of this, if these so-called homosexual circuit parties, drawing thousands, weren’t traveling, drug-laced, hard partying, national drug activities? Why would they need, as he describes it, quote, “strategically placed security personnel”? Or why would they need, as Mr. GUNDERSON says, quote, “Three-foot-by-four-foot posters placed throughout the auditorium and throughout the restrooms with the message: ‘The possession or use of illegal substances is strictly prohibited.’” Again, the infamous Tailhook mess did not require signs posted around the Vegas Hilton. Why would these posters be needed to control partiers described by Mr. GUNDERSON as—and the Speaker knows that I’m not making this up, check the May 14th RECORD—“the love of God personified” (pause) and a people whom, quote, “every conservative and every Republican should applaud.” How Mr. GUNDERSON kept a straight face through all of these sacrilegious comparisons I’ll never know.

It reminds me of their new and equally offensive gambit of referring to an obsession with an unnatural sex act as a “gift from God.” What small “g” god would that be, the god pan? What sacrilegious, errant nonsense. This transparent propaganda is usually advanced by homosexual clerics and phony sex therapists of the “if-it-moves-mate-with-it” school.

Here’s Mr. GUNDERSON’s next claim: quote, “My sole role was to serve as the congressional guide the use of Federal property on this Hill—in this case, the Rayburn Courtyard where Mr. GUNDERSON’s April 14 “Sunday Recovery Brunch” was held. That was its actual name, a “Recovery Brunch.” And isn’t it fair to ask, “recovery” from what? Could it be—oh I don’t know—that devolving at the palatial Mellon Auditorium, lasting for 9 hours from 9 p.m. until 6 a.m. in the morning on the Lord’s day?

House regulations governing the use of our taxpayer-owned meeting rooms state that these rooms, or space such as the Rayburn Courtyard, “shall not be used for fundraising.” Well, Mr. GUNDERSON stated in his words that fundraising was the entire purpose for the “Jubilee” which included his Recovery Brunch, all on one E-ride ticket. Nor are our rooms to be used for “entertaining tour groups.” Again, the “Cherry Jubilee Weekend” was reported in the Washington, DC city paper as travel- ing “homosexual circuit party.” Would that be a tour group, Mr. Speaker? What do you think, Mr. GINGRICH?

And groups using our rooms are not permitted to charge an “admission fee.” Mr. GUNDERSON stated in his floor speech that the Recovery Brunch cost $25 per person. That’s in addition, because our ticket for the “Jubilee,” entitling a participant to brunch at Mr. GUNDERSON’s recovery, cost $100, not $25. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that Brunch sponsors were collecting last minute unofficial admission fees at the door that Sunday afternoon? Who ran the accounting for that money collection?

Do you also think for a moment that if someone did not pay the admission fee for the brunch they would have been allowed in, Mr. Speaker? It simply does not compute.

A guest list is required to be submitted by the sponsor of any event when held during “off-hour periods,” such as Sundays. And even in the Rayburn Courtyard, you were not allowed before 4 p.m. Was a list of attendees submitted, Mr. Speaker? I doubt it. And why was the event allowed to begin at 1 p.m., 3 hours before the authorized hour of 4 p.m.? Was Mr. GUNDERSON given a waiver to go around the rules this way? I doubt it. But if so, by whom?

To those Members who may be toying with the thought that I’m splitting hairs, let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the nature of the procedural question of privilege involved here. Mr. GUNDERSON over and over accused me of being the primary distributor of false information and deliberate untruths.

If the chair will recall, there was a previous Dornan-Gunderson dust up here on the House floor 2 years ago. It was prompted by his self-serving comment that he places himself among the Christian avatars in Congress, and these are his exact words, quote, “I’m second-to-none-in-quote-unsqueak, advocating Christian values around here.”—and as part of banning Federal property on this Hill. Some may recall my truth-in-advertising response to Mr. GUNDERSON’s words. And now, in this latest go-round, here he is
again invoking Christianity, but this time implying that I am somehow un-Christian, and implying that I and others were attacking defenseless individuals. Mr. GUNDERSON describes as "those in need of these services"—meaning AIDS services.

Speaker!—and Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone will take note of his exact words—"Cherry Jubilee represented the best of this American tradition." Then "Cherry Jubilee represented the best of the American family." And, a few sentences later, "Cherry Jubilee represented the best of America's pro-Christian ethic." Excuse me? Give us struggling believers a break. I repeat his most offensive statement. Mr. GUNDERSON states that the participants at Cherry Jubilee "became the love of God personified." "The love of God personified!" How outrageously offensive! How sacrilegious! These odious comparisons make the next weird comparison a belly laugh. . . . the half naked dancers and prancers were, quote, "Newt's shining lights on a hill." Unquote. Are NEWT's lights anything like Governor Winthrop's "shining city on a hill"? I wonder if he is still spinning in his grave? He probably hasn't stopped spinning since that infamous 1983 censure of the Member from Plymouth Rock.

Mr. Speaker, as I said I'm a grandfather who treasures the innocence of American young people. I sure accept our "in loco parentis" role with our idealistic young pages, so I will refrain from discussing reporter Marc Morano's weakest descriptions of the so-called "love of God personified." But this picture gives us a tiny, tiny hint.

And the segment from Marc Morano's video camera was taken very early on the night of April 13. All I can say is, this is not my American tradition or my American family. And this is sure as hell and heaven not my Judeo-Christian ethic or code of ethics. This does not represent the love of God, certainly not fear of the God of Abraham, the Father of Jesus, or love in any faith that I've ever heard of. This is pagan in every sense of that word. This is a bad rerun of worshiping Molech and Belial. This is a bad rerun of the non-sexual bonding of dear friends, and homosexuality is that the latter is grounded in a sex act, and variations on that eros theme, in conduct that is defined in that dictionary behind me as "sodomy," and sodomy can never be anything but a selfish, hedonistic, and impotent ritual that bears only the lifeless fruits of disease and emotional distress. I pray for all those, Mr. Speaker, who continue to choose a lifestyle and conduct, so sad and so devoid of true happiness, which is the joy of life * * * joie de vivre * * * the gaiety that flows from God's love.

Mr. Speaker, to our traditional friends who may be listening right now—those who are often maligned and ridiculed in liberal media for their constancy and courage in defending decency and virtue—Remember that our forefathers paid a terrible price to win their liberty * * * our liberty. It cost most their fortunes or and many their very lives, but never their honor. Every tiny segment that we give up of the innocent. I will always challenge the child hearted because we refuse to be "positive" about sodomy or abortion-on-demand just to please liberal reporters. The hard reality is that in this decency battle, the hedonists win something every time we compromise, and the rest of us lose a bit more of our virtue, another one of the foundations of our freedom. Mr. Speaker, the unforgiving battle in the moral tradition by our adversaries succeeds only when we are complacent or when we continue our delusional trips to that big three-ring circus tent, a tent that some want to be so large that it will allow practitioners of any perversion to sit in and even be welcomed. Today the Ephebephiles, heterosexual ephelaphiles or homosexual ephebephiles, tomorrow, Hello Pedophiles! Come on in, it's a very big tent.

We, who know what objective truth is, must make a firm commitment every day * * * to never, ever compromise in this intense conflict to preserve a culture that is not just safe for children in our organization where * * * count on with virtue, a culture that pleases God.

And what possible claims can homosexual activists make toward Christian loyalty. A true Christian must be able to say with believability, "I try to walk in the footsteps of my Savior Jesus Christ." For someone to claim without shame, that the disgusting display of hedonism at the majestic, publicly-owned Andrew W. Mellon Auditorium had anything to do with Jesus Christ or his followers is to exercise raw evil egotism. Dr. Billy Graham had it exactly right. We are "a nation on the brink of self-destruction." But we need not self-destruct if we let our national soul save. Lin- coln, at only age 38, warned us to steel ourselves against national self-destruction.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat those words from a four-star general that I used in my opening, "we must insist on disciplined and principled behavior. * * * The majority of our members understand well that integrity is es- sential to our organization where * * * count on fellow members and that honesty is the glue that binds the members into a cohesive team.

And they easily take responsibility for their actions and exhibit the courage to do the right thing.

"Yes, most professionals place service before self and willingly subordinate personal interests for the good of their unit, the Air Force and the Nation and, if called upon, are willing to risk their lives in defense of the United States."

Thank you, General Ron Fogelman for inspiring me in a period when I certainly find myself on a solo deep-strike recon mission.

Mr. Speaker, true love will always protect the innocent. I will always challenge the child corruptors, my shield is always the chastening and fearful words of Jesus Christ in Matthew 18:6, "Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it was better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." . . . I will do a post mortem on these matters, if I have to, in a Special Order, so as to clear up, with the truth, any late breaking developments. Thank you for your attention and may God truly bless and watch over our bountiful land. I yield back the balance of my time, but I will never yield my sense of decency.
Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of H.R. 3675 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaHood). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 456 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. 3675.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3675) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, which was referred to United Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of H.R. 3675 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaHood). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 456 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. 3675) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, $53,816,000, of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available as the Secretary may determine for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation up to $1,000,000 in funds received in user fees established to support the electronic tariff filing system: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available may be used to maintain custody of airline tariffs that are already available for public and departmental access at no cost; to secure them against detection, alteration, or tampering; and open to inspection by the Department.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have an amendment printed in the RECORD, which I will not offer if I can engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy.

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

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to engage in a colloquy with my friend, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS. I thank the chairman. I would tell the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, I have received assurances from the administrator of the Federal Highway Administration that he intends to undertake, on behalf of the District of Columbia, a comprehensive transportation needs assessment for the District. Such a study is desperately needed by the District, and it would benefit the entire Washington area, because of the interconnection of all of our transportation systems. This study will be paid for with Federal funds.

The administration is willing to conduct this study for the District but was concerned about the serious impact on traffic of the closure of Pennsylvania Avenue. I seek assurance from the chairman of the committee that he will work with the Federal Highway Administration to ensure that this study is conducted, that Congress and the District of Columbia government are consulted on the parameters of the study, that we are able to review the results before they are final, that it will be as comprehensive as necessary, and that it will be finished within a year.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his concern on this important matter. Indeed it is a matter of regional importance, and I share his interest. I want to commend him for bringing this to the committee's attention.

I will tell him and guarantee him that I will work with him, the District, the Federal Highway Administration, and anybody else we have to work with to make sure it is done. I understand the Federal Highway Administration may take anywhere from 6 to 12 months and it will cost up to $1 million, but it is a great idea, and I am glad the gentleman brought it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. DAVIS. I thank the chairman for his assurances. I too understand that this is a major undertaking that may take as much as a year and $1 million to complete. That is why I wanted to raise this matter on the floor. Again, I thank the chairman of the committee for his assurances and assistance.

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

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to engage the gentleman from Illinois in a colloquy.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, in the 103rd Congress we passed the Swift Rail Development Act, which directed the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations regarding the sounding of train whistles or horns when trains approach and enter public highway-rail grade crossings. This authority has been delegated to the Federal Railroad Administration.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, railroad safety is of the utmost importance to me and to all Members of Congress. At the same time, it seems clear that the FRA is expected to take into consideration the quality of life concerns of affected communities in developing and implementing regulations.

Mr. WOLF. Yes, safety is of paramount importance to me as well, and we would expect the FRA to take such concerns into consideration.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, this would include an expectation that the FRA would document the impact on communities of any new requirements for the sounding of train whistles or horns at highway-rail grade crossings, and that in exercising its statutory authority to provide for exceptions to the horn sounding requirement, the FRA...
would consider the safety records of individual highway-rail grade crossings and provide exceptions where there is no significant history of loss of life or serious personal injury.

And further, this would include FRA’s consideration of comprehensive local rail safety enforcement and public education programs as supplementary safety measures, and that, where it is determined that new physical supplementary safety measures are necessary, that the particular characteristics of each crossing and the views of the affected community would be considered in determining the practicality of a proposed supplementary safety measure.

Finally, I would understand that this would include an expectation that the FRA would work in close partnership with communities affected by this law and provide such communities with technical assistance.

Mr. WOLF. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. It is the committee’s intent that the FRA should incorporate the gentleman from Illinois’s recommendation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the distinguished chairman of the full committee and the ranking Members, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Obey], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Coleman], for the high level of consultation and cooperation with our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in developing this bill. Our committee’s concerns have been addressed in a very fair manner, and I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1997 Transportation Appropriations Bill.

First and foremost, I want to thank Mr. Livingstone, Mr. Coleman, and their staff for the high level of consultation and cooperation with the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in developing this bill. The committee’s concerns have been addressed in a very fair manner.

Overall the bill balanced the need for a strong Federal role in transportation safety with the need to continue to invest in our Nation’s infrastructure. At the same time, the committee had to develop a bill in a climate of tight budgets. They have done an admirable job and I commend them.

For the Federal Aid Highway Program, the funding level is being kept at the fiscal year 1996 level. The obligation limitation is kept to $17.5 billion—the highest level ever enacted but not at the ISTEA authorized level of $18.3 billion. There is no change to the exempt highway programs.

Despite this level of funding, in fiscal year 1997 outlays from the highway account of the trust fund will still be $700 million below tax receipts. As I have repeatedly stated, it is unethical for us to collect dedicated user fees and not use them for their intended purpose.

For the transit program, the overall level is also kept at the fiscal year 1996 level of $4 billion. This program helps modernize, and maintain our transit systems. It also helps build new systems. Good transit has an important role to play, especially in our large and congested cities. This bill will continue the Federal role in this mode of transportation.

For aviation, the bill funds an increase of $254 million for operations. This increase will fund important safety functions and initiatives. The bill also provides funds to continue the modernization of the air traffic control system—a critical safety issue.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments. The gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Chairman, as the House takes up consideration of the fiscal year 1997 transportation appropriations bill (HR 3675), I want to explain the current law provisions governing expenditures from the Mass Transit Account and to clarify that HR 3675 does not amend current law with respect to those Trust Fund expenditures.

By way of background, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over provisions which amend the Internal Revenue Code Trust Funds, including the Mass Transit Account within the Highway Trust Fund. The Committee’s jurisdiction is not limited to the financing of the Trust Funds. The Committee’s jurisdiction includes the expenditure purposes of the Trust Funds. The role of the Committee on Ways and Means over the expenditure purposes of the Trust Fund Code acknowledges the long-standing agreement that Trust Fund spending purposes should be approved by the Committee responsible for raising dedicated revenues.

The statutory provisions governing expenditures from the Mass Transit Account within the Highway Trust Fund were established in the 1982 Surface Transportation Assistance Act. The Trust Fund expenditure purposes have been revised subsequently to reflect the purposes contained in authorizing legislation, most recently in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991.

The expenditure purposes of the Mass Transit Account are found in the Internal Revenue Code section 9503(e)(3) which provides that “(A)mounts in the Mass Transit Account shall be available, as provided by appropriate Acts, for making capital or capital-related expenditures before October 1, 1997—incorporating capital expenditures for new projects—in accordance with * * * specified sections of Title 49 * * * as such Acts are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991.” (Emphasis added.)

As my colleagues will note, the Internal Revenue Code is very clear that expenditures from the Mass Transit Account are limited to capital and capital-related purposes. Interpretations of current law or proposed law which would expand expenditure purposes of the Mass Transit Account to include transit operations under the Section 18 Federal Assistance program are without statutory authority or Congressional intent. Finally, any new expenditure purposes from the Mass Transit Account would necessitate a conforming Internal Revenue Code amendment with the consent of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the privilege of entering into a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, as an early supporter of efforts to eliminate the Interstate Commerce Commission and to deregulate the motor carrier industry, I am committed to eliminating needless regulatory and paperwork burdens on that industry. As we know, last year Congress and President Clinton signed into law the Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act, which eliminated virtually all economic regulations to the motor carrier industry. The Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations played an important role in that process by eliminating the funding for outdated and unnecessary regulatory functions.

However, I am concerned that one burdensome and costly element of the old regulatory regime remains: the requirement for financial reporting. The original requirement for financial reporting was to facilitate the ICC’s statutory obligation to review and approve a motor carrier’s rates. That function, rate regulation, no longer exists, and consequently, there is no longer a need to file this data for regulatory purposes.

Federal law requires all trucking companies to have insurance or be approved as a self-insurer following a detailed financial review by USDOT. Neither of these provisions would be affected by eliminating financial reporting.

It is my understanding that the insurance companies do not rely on these
Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I pledge I will give it every serious consideration. I commend the gentleman for his interest in this. I think Congress ought to know that the number of high school kids that are using drugs is probably much higher than we actually think. We had a drug conference in my district this past weekend with General McCafferey and a number of other people. In some of the schools, the use of drugs is up to 60 and 65 percent. Drugs are running rampant in this country. But the gentleman said the best idea, but I will give it every consideration. I think the Congress, though, in dealing with this issue, ought to also look at the possibility of setting up strike forces which will go down into South America, into Bolivia, into Colombia, and into Peru, and seize the leaders of these drug cartels and bring them back to the United States, and put them on trial.

But I commend the gentleman for his efforts. My colleague, the honorable gentleman from New Hampshire, [Mr. ZELIFF], I believe the Department should include this aspect in its review, and the committee looks forward to receiving the information from the Department of Transportation and working with the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. I appreciate very much the gentleman’s willingness to work with us.

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that the funds provided for Kalkaska are to be used for an intermodal facility. I do agree with that.

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will continue to yield, he is exactly right. One study showed that when asked, in one area there were 34 percent of the children using drugs, and their parents were asked did they think drug use was around, and only 34 percent though drug use was around. So it is coming back big time, and it is spiking. I think the gentleman for raising this issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I seek to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations. I appreciate his acceptance in allowing this colloquy or short discussion.

I would also like to personally thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California. However, I am concerned that streamlining these reports could jeopardize or change the current levels of safety. The gentleman knows, safety has been personally my number one and the number one issue for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN]. I believe the Department should include this aspect in its review, and the committee looks forward to receiving the information from the Department of Transportation and working with the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. I appreciate very much the gentleman’s willingness to work with us.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New Hampshire, [Mr. ZELIFF], I believe the Department should include this aspect in its review, and the committee looks forward to receiving the information from the Department of Transportation and working with the gentleman from California.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I share the interest of the gentleman from California. However, I am concerned that streamlining these reports could jeopardize or change the current levels of safety. The gentleman knows, safety has been personally my number one and the number one issue for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN]. I believe the Department should include this aspect in its review, and the committee looks forward to receiving the information from the Department of Transportation and working with the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. I appreciate very much the gentleman’s willingness to work with us.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yielded to the gentleman yield.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOLF] for his, at the outset, agreeability to allow this colloquy or short discussion.

I would also like to personally thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Hampshire, [Mr. ZELIFF] for his, at the outset, agreeability to looking at an issue that is very, very important to many people on this floor. It is also very important to our children and our grandchildren. That is the problem of illicit drugs coming into this country, both through our southwest border and through the Caribbean transit area through Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

We also understand that the Coast Guard plays a very important role in the interdiction effort, and I would like to continue to work with the chairman to find ways we can increase efforts in interdiction; that the Nation must again identify and properly fund an effective drug interdiction effort, and especially in the Caribbean transit zone, as well as in the southwest portion of this country, and to look at the Coast Guard, how we can better work together and find those solutions.

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

Mr. HASTERT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I pledge I will give it every serious consideration. I commend the gentleman for his interest in this. I think Congress ought to know that the number of high school kids that are using drugs is probably much higher than we actually think. We had a drug conference in my district this past weekend with General McCafferey and a number of other people. In some of the schools, the use of drugs is up to 60 and 65 percent. Drugs are running rampant in this country. But the gentleman said the best idea, but I will give it every consideration. I think the Congress, though, in dealing with this issue, ought to also look at the possibility of setting up strike forces which will go down into South America, into Bolivia, into Colombia, and into Peru, and seize the leaders of these drug cartels and bring them back to the United States, and put them on trial.

But I commend the gentleman for his efforts. My colleague, the honorable gentleman from New Hampshire, [Mr. ZELIFF], I believe the Department should include this aspect in its review, and the committee looks forward to receiving the information from the Department of Transportation and working with the gentleman from California.

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

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

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

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

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that the funds provided for Kalkaska are to be used for an intermodal facility. I do agree with that.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.
Mr. LOBIONDO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LoBiondo] bringing this to our attention. Coming originally from Philadelphia, Avalon is Kohler’s. And if he gets to Avalon, the best bake shop in Avalon is Kohler’s. And if he gets to Avalon, the best bake shop in Avalon is Kohler’s. And if he gets to Avalon, the best bake shop in Avalon is Kohler’s. And if he gets to Avalon, the best bake shop in Avalon is Kohler’s. And if he gets to Avalon, the best bake shop in Avalon is Kohler’s.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Wolfr] in a colloquy.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman’s caution about the half-cent source, and I do not disagree with that. I also appreciate the gentleman’s caution about this particular issue. I think it is going to take the efforts of all of us to come to the rescue, and in particular circumstances as we change away from operating to doing the capital funding. I would not look at that legislation. There ought to be a half penny, a half cent for Amtrak, but it ought not be in competition coming out of mass transit. If we begin to do that, we are then going to be pitting the gentleman from Philadelphia, Avalon is Kohler’s.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate him bringing this to my attention.

This year we are going to vacation, though, in Avalon. But the language that was included in the budget request is a way to save money. We were not made aware of the local opposition to the coast Guard’s proposal until the gentleman brought it to my attention.

I understand the serious consequence of the proposal. I want to assure the gentleman that I will do whatever is necessary to correct this problem in a manner that protects the normal GSA property disposal procedure and is satisfactory to the local community by the time this bill comes out of conference with the Senate.

I thank the gentleman for his hard work on this matter. In fact, if we were not for the gentleman bringing this to our attention, this could have sailed by. Without his intervention, I am sure the Coast Guard proposal would have received little scrutiny, if any analysis. Now that we are aware of the problem, we will work over the coming weeks with the gentleman and his staff to satisfy the community’s concern as we work toward a final solution.

I was told the gentleman, when he gets to Avalon, the best bake shop in Avalon is Kohler’s. And if he gets a chance, stop by Kohler’s.

Mr. LOBIONDO. I know the location well. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I do want to do what is necessary to correct this problem. I look forward to working with the gentleman on this matter in a way which addresses the serious concerns of my constituents.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think there are many here in this body who did not know that the proposed regulation in the Federal Hazardous Materials Transportation Act would most likely cost the average farmer in America approximately $3,200. The overall impact of the regulation could exceed $7 billion.

The Department of Transportation has proposed a regulation that would supersede every State exception granted to agriculture industry in transferring hazardous materials from either retail to farm or farm to farm.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Transportation Administrative Service Center, not to exceed $124,812,000, shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: Provided, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities with the Department of Transportation: Provided further, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: Provided further, That no funds in this Act shall be transferred to the Transportation Administrative Service Center without the approval of the agency modal administrator: Provided further, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS
(QUALIFICATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for payments to the beneficiaries of so much of the compensation fixed and determined under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, as is payable by the Department of Transportation, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Airway Trust Fund: Provided, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs in excess of $15,000,000 for the Payments to Air Carriers program in fiscal year 1997: Provided further, That none of the funds in this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Transportation to make payment of compensation under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, in excess of the appropriation in this Act for liquidation of obligations incurred under the "Payments to air carriers" program: Provided further, That none of the funds provided for "Small Community Air Service" by Public Law 101-508, $28,600,000 in fiscal year 1997 is hereby rescinded.

PENALTIES TO AIR CARRIERS
(RESCSSION)

Of the budgetary resources remaining available under this heading, $1,133,000 are rescinded.

RENTAL PAYMENTS

For necessary expenses for rental of head-of-quarter and field space not to exceed 8,380,000 square feet and for related services assessed by the General Services Administration, $127,447,000: Provided, That of this amount, $2,022,000 shall be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, $39,113,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, $840,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Trust Fund, $393,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund: Provided further, That in addition, for assessments by the General Services Administration related to the space needs of the Federal Highway Administration, $17,294,000, to be derived from "Federal-aid Highways, reimbursement of liability on general limitation on General Operating Expenses".

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

For the cost of direct loans, $1,500,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: Provided, That such loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $15,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, $400,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

For necessary expenses of the Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, $2,900,000, of which $2,655,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1998: Provided, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

COAST GUARD
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for, purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 429 note), and section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402 note); and recreation and welfare; $2,609,100, of which $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund: Provided, That none of the funds in this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Transportation to make payment of compensation under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, in excess of the appropriation in this Act for liquidation of obligations incurred under the "Payments to air carriers" program: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for expenses incurred for yachts documentation under 46 U.S.C. 12109, except to the extent fees are paid by yacht owners and credited to this appropriation: Provided further, That the Commandant may dispose of property in Wildwood, New Jersey, which the Commandant has determined that none of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended to continue the "Vessel Traffic Service 2000 Program".

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the available balances under this heading provided in Public Law 104-50, $3,400,000 are rescinded. Of the available balances under this heading provided in Public Law 103-331, $355,000 are rescinded.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the Coast Guard's environmental compliance and restoration functions under chapter 19 of title 33, United States Code, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ALTERATION OF BRIDGES

For necessary expenses for alteration or removal of obstructive bridges, $16,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations therefor otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, and for payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 52) $608,004,000.

RESERVE TRAINING

For all necessary expenses for the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; maintenance and operation of facilities; and supplies, equipment, and services; $65,890,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for applied scientific research, development, testing, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, $19,000,000, to remain available until expended, which may be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund: Provided, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds provided in Public Law 104-50 received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries, for research incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 10, line 20, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point. The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to that portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:
Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word from the rule.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my distinguished colleague's remarks. The safety of our ports and waterways is of extreme importance, and this committee feels strongly that the Coast Guard should be more active in using this grant program to promoting safety, rather than simply sending checks out by formula, as is currently the case.

I understand that this program must be reauthorized next year, and I would ask that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] take a look at the establishment of the discretionary grant program which will receive strong consideration by the subcommittee next year going to reauthorization. Such a program will not cost any more money, and it could improve boat safety, because it would put money where the problem is.

A distinguished gentleman from Texas knows, we increased boat safety money by over 50 percent in this bill. We thought this way it would get the Coast Guard more involved to be much more aggressive working in the boat safety program.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to engage in continuing that dialogue with my friend from Virginia on this issue.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities and the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, and expenses of operating and maintaining sea level pressure barometers as provided for in sections 705 and 709 of title 49, United States Code, or other provisions of law authorizing the obligation of funds for similar programs of research and development, or improvement, lease or purchase of four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $4,900,000,000, of which $1,642,500,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $30,000,000 from additional user fees to be established by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for necessary and authorized expenses under this heading: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar for dollar basis as such offsetting collections are reduced during fiscal year 1997, to result in a final fiscal year 1997 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $2,273,798,000; Provided further, That the only additional user fees authorized as offsetting collections are fees for services provided to aircraft that neither take off from, nor land in, the United States: Provided further, that any funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and, for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificate, or for tests related thereto, or for inspection and repair station forms: Provided further, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a non-profit standard setting organization to assist in the improvement of fliers' and pilots' standards:

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word from the rule.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word from the rule.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for bringing this to our attention. The air traveling public relies to a great extent on the quality of the training of our air traffic controllers.

I assure the gentleman from Oklahoma, I will work with him to assure that the final appropriation provided adequate funding for this contract, while not undermining support for the MARC program in Minnesota. I believe this can be accomplished, and I will work with the gentleman to achieve that goal as we go through the process. I appreciate the fact that he was alert and caught this. I thank him very much. We will work together to solve the problem.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for that assurance and I appreciate his efforts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Mr. LUCAS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATTS] for bringing up this matter, and I thank Chairman WOLF for allowing the colloquy. I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by Mr. WATTS, and would like to reiterate my support for retaining the $1.7 million for the academy in Oklahoma City. I hope this can be addressed during conference and that Members will have the opportunity to discuss the matter.

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

Mr. Chairman, I seek this time to bring to the attention of the distinguished subcommittee chairman a matter of great concern to many of my constituents.

First of all, I would like to say I am a supporter of the mission of the Coast Guard. They do good work. They have saved many lives and prevented injuries to people and prevented property damage by their fine efforts. However, I believe the Coast Guard has overreached in one area, that is, its efforts to enforce the Commercial Fishing Industry Safety Act.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, the Coast Guard has issued regulations which are totally inflexible. They do not distinguish between large, deep water boats that operate all year and boats that are 50 feet or less in length, carry three or fewer people, stay 12 to 50 miles offshore, and operate only in the less dangerous summer fishing season.

These regulations are so complex and extensive that compliance is virtually impossible. One particularly egregious example is the requirement that these vessels be equipped with a life raft, sold only by 1 manufacturer, that is, extremely costly.

I also question, Mr. Chairman, the way in which these regulations are being enforced. Coast Guard personnel on the West Coast have harassed law-abiding commercial fishermen by conducting armed safety inspections at sea.

This show of force is, in my view, unnecessary—and that is as a former police officer and deputy sheriff—and places an unproductive burden on these individuals who are already having a hard time making a living. One alternative approach apparently not given serious consideration by the Coast Guard is voluntary dockside inspections with fix-it-type tickets instead of fines.

Mr. Chairman, the important commercial fishing industry along California's north coast is suffering already from a downturn in the industry and, in my view, overregulation by the Federal Government. I call this to your attention, and I hope that my colleagues on this subcommittee can be aware of how some of the Coast Guard's resources are being applied.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. OBESTAR:
Page 11, line 17, before ", of which", insert the following: "(increased by $1,000,000)".
Page 36, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(decreased by $1,000,000)".

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

Mr. OBESTAR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take $1 million from the $40 million appropriation the bill provides for the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Transportation and transfer that $1 million to the Operations account of the Federal Aviation Administration to increase the funding for FAA training of its inspector work force. This amendment responds to concerns expressed by the Inspector General herself, it responds to concerns and alarms expressed nationwide in the aftermath of the crash of ValuJet and to concerns that I expressed over 2 years ago about the adequacy of FAA’s inspector work force in inspecting new entrant carriers.

The President’s budget for the Inspector General’s office included $1.9 million to contract out auditing. The Appropriations Committee bill cut that President’s request. The appropriation for the Inspector General was increased to $321,000 and, concurrently, prohibited the Inspector General from contracting for audits. The Appropriations Committee instead directed DOT’s various operating units to pay the cost of these contract audits out of their own funds. The result is that the Inspector General’s office is reduced by $1.6 million in funding for that program.

The IG has $1.6 million in excess funding that would be increased by $1 million by this amendment. That $1 million is in excess of what IG is spending to do that contracting. It is not being spent to do aircraft inspections. The IG has $1.6 million in excess funding to do that training that $1 million will allow for.

I was astonished when I looked closely at the IG’s office to find that they have 440 full-time equivalent employees, slightly more than the 400_ full-time equivalent employees of the National Transportation Safety Board. I question the need for such a large staff when DOT and its various modal administrations are already under scrutiny and oversight by the National Transportation Safety Board, by the General Accounting Office, and by the Congress.

An internal watchdog agency certainly is necessary within the Department to keep all modal administrations on the straight and narrow. We need to have adequate funding for that function, and provide effective oversight. But in these times of fiscal constraints, when money is being shifted very tightly among accounts, where we have to come in, we in the authorizing committee, and identify needs that require more funding and then take it from the existing pot, here is a piece of the existing pot that has an excess amount for it that has been identified, and shift that amount to where it will do an enormous amount of good.

The committee has already made a number of increases in the funding for the accounts of FAA, but not for this training function. The need is real. I want to take a moment to just explain how real and how important.

Over the last 10 years, GAO, the Inspector General’s office, internal FAA groups, and our own Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure have focused on needs for technical training within the FAA, training for its inspectors.

In 1992, GAO reported that inspectors who did not have appropriate training or current qualifications were doing flight checks of pilots. An operations inspector asked for Airbus 330 training when a carrier responsible for that training began using that aircraft. He did not get that training until 2 years after that air carrier went out of business.

Mr. OBESTAR. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBESTAR] has expired.

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

Mr. OBESTAR. Another maintenance inspector responsible for overseeing air carriers and repair stations that operate 737s, 757s, 767s, and McDonnell Douglas MD-80s said he had not received a course on maintenance and electronics in 5 years. There are ramp maintenance deficiencies that exist because they do not have enough money to do that training. This $1 million is only a part of $8 million that GAO said is needed to meet the unfunded training needs for the FAA.

All of us fly in this body. All of us take aircraft, whether major airlines or commuters or regional carriers. We all want to know that those carriers are being inspected carefully, responsibly and effectively and that those aircraft are safe and that they are being maintained in a safe manner.

Members who believe that ought to support this amendment, to shift the money where it will do a great deal of good into the training function, provide adequate training and recurrent training for maintenance and avionics inspectors in the FAA to oversee those air carriers, especially the new entrant carriers. That is where the need is. That is where the contracting out of maintenance is being done and where it is not being properly supervised with people who have adequate training. A modest $1 million out of this excess amount in the office of IG will address this vital funding deficiency. I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

First of all it does not put the money in training. It can be used for coffee, co-op, travel, or any other thing. Second, it would viewed as a way of punishing the inspector general for giving the opinions that Congress may not like. I have not always agreed with the IG’s of the Department. But if they start doing this and we do not like what they have done, it looks like we are punishing the IG for their opinions which could be a grave mistake. We ask for them to be independent, we ask for tough opinions, and then when we punish them, the political process stands this whole ethical thing upside down. This would undermine the IG process, not in this department but government-wide. It would send a devastating message to IG’s, everywhere. They would say, “Uh-oh, if I report, they don’t like it, we better be careful, we’re going to get a budget cut. It would be very, very bad. Don’t rock the boat. They’re going to offer an amendment. They’re going to cut my appropriation.”

If we adopt this amendment, we are punishing the IG who raised the whole issue of ValuJet. Maybe the FAA should have listened to here before they did it. You recall Secretary Peña got up and said ValuJet is wonderful. They went on and on. This IG is the one who brought this to our attention.

Second, this is the IG that brought out the training problems which ended up in Gregory may, New Age cult-like, going to jail. This IG, for those of you who fly, is the one who found out and raised the issue of bogus parts, that are now being used in major airlines which may very well result in airplanes crashing. This IG is the one that came out with the division of money from airports around the country.

I just think it would be sending a message to the American people that here is an IG that the gentleman, and I know he does not mean this in a mean-spirited way, does not agree with him, maybe there are times that I will not agree with her, but just because they come up with this idea, you punish them.

The IG’s budget is not fat. In fact over the past 3 years the IG has taken a 40-percent reduction in administrative staff, more than any other part of the Department of Transportation. Let me just say it again. The IG has taken a bigger hit than any other area of the Department of Transportation. They have taken an overall cut of 11 percent in staffing. Again, more than any other area. They have met the President’s downsizing goals 3 years ahead of schedule. In fact, this administration, some may say, has been unfair to the IG. This is what she said during the hearings:

We led the department in meeting the Vice President’s ‘reinventing government’
downsizing goals. Instead of being rewarded for that, we were on many cases heaped with more cuts. We think those additional cuts were unfair because we willingly, and quite in addition, the rest of the department took those cuts that the rest of the government was supposed to be taking. Unfortunately, it only worked to our disadvantage.

It is lean, it is careful, the appropriation can be used percent below last year's level, 1 percent below the administration's request.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment. We can almost argue that this is a major safety issue. This is a safety amendment, in some respects. The gentleman's amendment does not put it in training. It can be used for anything else. This IG's office has been the one on ValuJet, the one on bogus parts and on many others, and I urge the defeat of the amendment because we do not want to play politics any more for being honest and courageous and candid.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear, this is not punishment. This is not chilling. There is $1,900,000 more than the President's request in this account, a $321,000 cut, a net of $1.6 million not identified, not targeted, no explanation, no justification, and over here on the other side is the FAA with a need for training.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota so that he could clarify that point if he would like.
Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, on that score, it was the Subcommittee on Aviation and prior to that the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation that uncovered that issue. Senator this in depth and had documentation on it, brought it up with the IG who said, “Oh, we are on to this issue also. We have some criminal investigations underway.” This is over 2 years ago. Three years ago prior to that our committee had serious questions. I cast no aspersions on the IG, but much of what the IG’s office has uncovered and has taken credit for the appropriate and responsible committees of the house and the Senate have already been focused on.

Mr. COLEMAN. Reclaiming my time, let me only suggest that in any event, should the Committee of the whole make a determination that we wanted to shift $1 million from one account to another, I think we should all agree that the goal of the House of Representatives is to do what amendment seeks to do, and that is to provide the necessary dollars to get the necessary training in the new technology. For 3 years we would have had adequate personnel that we ask to be certified in order to get the additional training for FAA certification.

So I would hope that the Members, whether they agree to shift this $1 million from one account to another, that the author of the amendment would suggest or not, understand that and I know it will be the intention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wolf] and me in the conference. We do not know, of course, what any Senate numbers are and what they will be of the other body. So I think that we will certainly be looking to do all that we can possibly do in trying to get the kind of certified staff the training they need to ensure their competence in new technologies.

I hope the majority in this House will help enhance the safety of the traveling public by adopting the Oberstar amendment. As I say, in conference, whether we do or we do not make this shift from the IG’s office is not really of paramount importance.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Oberstar].

It promotes safety. It does so by shifting only about 25 percent of the IG’s budget to a side of the budget that clearly, both in the ValuJet hearings and at other times, have been raised as a real concern, which is the training of safety inspectors and what that means to the traveling public.

Mr. Chairman, I think that he is right on point in that regard, and I associate myself with his remarks and those of the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. Lipinski] the ranking member of the subcommittee on aviation. But I think having heard some of the comments, it is often a good trial tactic to raise questions about chilling effects, and anybody’s budget, is cut or somehow altered can claim that they are going to have a chilling effect.

It was interesting to me to hear the IG come before the committee and in her comments say, “Well, I hear that I am going to have to get a piece of my hide,” and in doing that, it is sort of like chilling the members of the committee not to raise certain questions or, in this case, chilling the members of this body not to consider a serious and well-thought-out amendment.

During the hearings on safety issues raised by the ValuJet accident, and I am sure that the body is aware of the allegations made by the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation, this individual stated that the Everglades crash was preventable and that the DOT IG office had made six reports which pointed out the problems. The testimony to me sounded heroic and prophetic.

But under scrutiny it was merely the verbal tricks of a false profit. Under questioning from me and others, I asked the IG if she had ever raised these questions with Secretary Pena or Administrator Hinson. The answer was no.

Would any Member of this body in possession of information that would have prevented an airplane crash hesitate to raise this issue and call for a meeting? There were no meetings because there were no unheeded predictions. The notoriety of the IG is based on vague generalizations that could have applied to any accident. It is an old trick to boldly assert the vague and then take credit for special insight when anything remotely related occurs.

If that was not bad enough, the DOT IG then relied on the tactics of the witch hunter by making vague references of criminal investigations and by innuendo casting a false light on Secretary Pena and the FAA. This IG then demonstrated, I think, the most blatant attempt for Congress by refusing to elaborate because of the pendency of an alleged criminal investigation.

Well, let us talk about the facts. The fact is that Inspector Generals are not empowered to make criminal investigations. They have no independent criminal prosecutorial authority. They can make referrals when they have evidence of waste, fraud or abuse, just like any other citizen can, but they have no special privilege to refuse to answer congressional inquiries.

Fact. Subsequently, the Assistant IG for Investigations of the DOT issued a clarification that “The Secretary is not and has not been a subject of the investigation.”

I think that the carnival atmosphere that we saw in the committee and this whole way the person who we believe should be the voice of investigating has created around the ValuJet et has a downside. Given the pendency of litigation related to the grounding, I think the injudicious remarks of the DOT IG may have totally compromised and prejudiced the case, hardly the result a true investigator or a guardian of the public’s safety and welfare.

I believe the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure should compel the IG’s testimony that she refused to give us. She has made a lot of broad statements. I think we should see the specifics. But until such time as the committee acts to get answers, I believe the Oberstar amendment is totally appropriate by providing the resources to airline safety inspector training that clearly was identified as one of the major issues, whether it be ValuJet or a problem of the FAA in general. And that is the essence of his amendment and, in fact, we should proceed forward with it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Was it not true within the hearings, irrespective of what the IG insinuated or what others may have insinuated, the preliminary report by the National Transportation Safety Board clearly states that they do not think it was the fault of ValuJet for the accident that happened in the Everglades, but that of a mistake of an out source contractor?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it certainly appeared, although the National Transportation Safety Board has not given a final answer, it certainly appeared from the testimony that was elicited this was not a question per se, on this specific incident, of the question of the safety issues but rather a question of the canisters put on board.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should be supporting the Oberstar amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Oberstar].

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

Mr. WOLF. 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 House Resolution 460, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Oberstar] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, Amtrak is an essential part of our National Transportation System, providing 22 million
inner-city passenger trips per year with over 500 destinations in 45 States. Last year the Congress and the administration agreed that Amtrak must reduce its reliance on Federal funding.

The budget resolution and the authorizing committees directed Amtrak to operate without Federal funding support by the year 2002. However, as you are aware, the funding recommendations in this bill are below the authorization levels that is in the budget resolution and the level that Amtrak is in need of to stay on the path to operating self-sufficiency.

Between 1995 and 1997, Amtrak received $1.2 billion less than their proposed transition plan called for. Unfortunately, next year’s capital funding level is again drastically cut and inadequate to sustain Amtrak’s capital expenditures.

To facilitate Amtrak’s transition off Federal assistance I have introduced H.R. 2799, creating a dedicated funding source for Amtrak which would allow it to make the necessary capital infrastructure investments during this period of transition.

H.R. 2799 does not create a new tax, does not increase the deficit, and does not cut any other programs. With an estimated $4 billion needed for capital improvements, H.R. 2799 will allow Amtrak to improve its rolling stock, upgrade its maintenance facilities and prevent the deterioration of track and signal equipment. These improvements will cut Amtrak’s cost to customers, to consumers, reduce air pollution, fuel consumption, highway congestion, and urban sprawl.

We can make Amtrak self-sufficient, but only if we adhere to our budget plan transitioning Amtrak off Federal assistance and only if we create a temporary capital funding source for investment.

On a final note, Mr. Chairman, the Senate recently passed a sense of the Senate resolution with a two-thirds vote to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee for his recognition of the essential need for a source of capital funding for Amtrak and for his support of the concept of a dedicated revenue stream and to also express my agreement with the gentlewoman from Connecticut when she talks about the necessity for adequate capital funding for Amtrak.

This country went through a long period of time in which we left railroads, in which we had abandoned, the highway system and leaving railroads, which people who want to go from one town to another, that many cities are fewer, many cities are deteriorating. The routes are fewer, the routes are deteriorating. The routes are fewer, the routes are deteriorating. The routes are fewer, the routes are deteriorating.

What we need in this country is a balanced transportation system in which people who want to go from one city to another do not have a choice only between a car or an airplane. We need trains, we need airplanes, we need Amtrak, we need cars, we need all of it. We need rail freight efficiency, we need cars, we need all of it.

I hope that we can, working together, develop an adequate capital funding stream for Amtrak, because otherwise it will deteriorate. It has already been deteriorating. The routes are fewer than they have been. Many cities are being cut off, and we ought to have an adequate passenger rail transportation system, which is a dedicated capital funding stream. It ought to have a dedicated operating funding stream.

I support the efforts of the chairman and of the gentlewoman from Connecticut, and I hope we will in the months to come put more close attention to this than we have in the past, because a healthy rail transportation system both for freight and for people, a healthy AMTRAK, is essential to the efficient and efficient operation of the economy of this country and the economic growth of this country, not to mention the well-being of its citizens.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want unanimous consent that the bill, through page 26, line 24, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], would that still give me the chance to offer an amendment at page 27?

Mr. WOLF. If the gentleman would yield, that is correct.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request to open up that portion of the bill?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 13, line 10, through page 26, line 24 is as follows:

Facilities and equipment: (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase, of airports, airport facilities, and the Air Traffic Control System, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated-

(Federal airports) $1,500,000,000, of which $1,200,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which $300,000,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999, and $300,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2000:

Provided, That there shall be available-

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund) $1,200,000,000, of which $1,000,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which $200,000,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999:

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund) $300,000,000, of which $150,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which $150,000,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999,

(Liquidity of contract authorization) (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) For the purpose of ensuring an adequate level of liquidity for the Federal Aviation Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated-

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund) $50,000,000, of which $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and $25,000,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999:

(i) For the purpose of ensuring an adequate level of liquidity for the Federal Aviation Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated-

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund) $50,000,000, of which $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and $25,000,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999,

(ii) For investments in necessary sites by the Federal Aviation Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated-

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund) $75,000,000, of which $37,500,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and $37,500,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999:

(iii) For hire of air navigation and experimental facilities, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated-

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund) $25,000,000, of which $12,500,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and $12,500,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999:

(iv) For contracts for hire of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated-

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund) $50,000,000, of which $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and $25,000,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999:

(v) For necessary expenditures for research, engineering, and development, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated-

(Airport and Airway Trust Fund) $100,000,000, of which $50,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and $50,000,000 shall be derived from the General Revenue Fund, and which shall remain available until September 30, 1999:

(vi) For grants-in-aid for airports (Liability of contract authorization) (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) For grants-in-aid for airport planners and developers, and for noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 145 of title 49, United States Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations, $1,500,000,000, to be derived from the...
For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of Title 23, United States Code, section 408, and 410, chapter 303 of Title 49, United States Code, that are attributable to those funds:

Provided further, None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 1997, are in excess of $157,100,000, for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402 and 403, not more than the amounts described in section 1003(a)(7) of Public Law 102-240, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund, $50,377,000, of which $27,066,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999.

Highway Traffic Safety Grants (Liquidation of Contract Authorized) (Highway Trust Fund)

For Federal-Aid Highways (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Highway Trust Fund)

For carrying out the provisions of Title 23, United States Code, that are attributable to Federal-aid highways, including the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, $80,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1999, for high-speed rail trainset and maintenance facility financing arrangements...

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations pursuant to section 13012 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to pay any amounts required pursuant to the guarantee of the principal amount of obligations under sections 511 through 513 of such Act, such authority to exist as long as any such guaranteed obligation is outstanding...

Next Generation High-Speed Rail

For necessary expenses for Next Generation High-Speed Rail studies, corridor planning, development, demonstration, and implementation, $19,757,000, to remain available until expended...

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION Office of the Administrator

For necessary expenses of the Federal Rail...
RHODE ISLAND RAIL DEVELOPMENT

For the costs associated with construction of a third track on the Northeast Corridor between Providence and Fall River, Providence, and in the Fall River Middlesex, Rhode Island, with sufficient clearance to accommodate double stack freight cars, $4,000,000 to be matched by the State of Rhode Island or its authorized agent, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL RAIL ROAD SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

For passenger rail service payments, and for grants and payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of the High-Speed Ground Transportation program as defined in subsections 1036(c) and 1036(d) of the Intercity and High-Speed Ground Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, including planning and environmental analyses, $2,855,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

HIGH-SPEED RAIL

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Act, $4,800,000,000, to remain available until expended, $460,000,000: Provided, That no more than $2,052,925,000 of budget authority shall be available for these purposes: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading for grants, no more than $400,000,000 may be used for operating assistance under 49 U.S.C. 5336(d): Provided further, That the limitation on operating assistance provided under this heading shall, for urbanized areas of less than 200,000 population and seventy-five percent of the amount of operating assistance such areas are eligible to receive under Public Law 103-331: Provided further, That in the distribution of funds provided under this heading to urbanized areas that had a population under the 1990 census of 1,000 or more, the Secretary shall direct such areas under consideration to the impact or reductions in operating assistance on smaller transit authorities operating within the area and to the needs and resources of transit authorities when the limitation is distributed among all transit authorities operating in the area.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF: On page 27, line 4, strike "$460,000,000" and insert "$490,000,000".

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment to ensure that the mass transit account of the Highway Trust Fund is used solely for capital and capital-related expenses in the transit formula program.

It simply increases the general fund by $30 million. The amendment does not change the amount available for transit operating nor does it change the outlays scored against the bill. The intent of the amendment simply corrects an inadvertent estimating error by the Federal Transit Administration, and it has the support of the chairman of the authorizing committee, and I ask that the amendment be adopted.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Coleman.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have had a chance to inspect the amendment. It is a technical amendment, and we have no objection. We believe it should be adopted, and we urge adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. Filner] may offer his amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Filner: On page 23, line 16, insert the following after the word "made": "in excess of $490,000".

Mr. Filner. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to introduce an amendment that is absolutely critical to the economic development of the city of San Diego and its surrounding communities. In effect, what my amendment does is add $490,000 to the section 511 railroad loan guarantee program in order to leverage approximately $10 million in private sector loan guarantees that are necessary to reestablish the San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railroad. I repeat this is a loan guarantee which leverages 20 times that amount of private sector funding.

Now, the lack of a direct rail link to the East is hampering the real growth potential of the San Diego economy. Currently, San Diego's few commercial rail shipments must first make a several hundred mile detour.

Ships which would otherwise use the port of San Diego are therefore forced to go elsewhere in search of faster rail routes to inland markets. As a result, our communities lost out on business opportunities, and our port suffers from serious underuse. Reestablishing a rail link to the East is critical to San Diego's growth potential. The San Diego & Arizona Eastern Railroad is on the top of everyone's priority list in San Diego and enjoys widespread bipartisan support. The city of San Diego, the county board of supervisors, the San Diego Association of Governments, the Port of San Diego, the Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce, and the San Diego Economic Development Corporation, all of whom's leadership comes from the other side of the aisle, I might point out, all of these organizations agree that reestablishing this rail link is the area's highest priority for economic development.

Many of our Nation's regional and shortline railroads, like the San Diego & Arizona Eastern, find it difficult to originate financial or rail improvements because of short-term and high interest rates. Government assistance in the form of loan guarantees often becomes the only viable means to rehabilitate these vital links to our transportation infrastructure.

Last year the chairman of the transportation appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. W...
Mr. WOLF. I joined me and several of my colleagues in a colloquy in support of this very program.

If the gentleman will remember, in that colloquy that we had 1 year ago he stated that, and I quote:

I concur that these loan guarantees have proven to be reliable and can be a cost-effective and wise use of Federal transportation dollars.

I am going to quote the gentleman:

I assure you that I am sensitive to the needs of our regional shortline railroads, and I will certainly consider funding the 511 guarantee program, if it is brought before a House committee.

Unfortunately, this important program did not receive any funding in 1996. And although a bipartisan group of Members joined me in writing to the Subcommittee on Transportation urging that funds be appropriated for this program, it is not proposed for funding in 1997.

Mr. Chairman, the economy of San Diego cannot wait for another year. Because the appropriation subcommittee has recommended funding for this section 511 program, I offer this amendment to directly fund it. I do so with the knowledge that San Diego interests will apply for a loan, private interests will apply for a loan to reestablish this railroad. I have the support of the Regional Railroads of America in this effort. Further, it is our understanding that this request is within the necessary budget authority and outlays.

What I am addressing here, Mr. Chairman, is the absolute critical importance of the rehabilitation of this railroad to our community. It is critically important that we fund this line. We can get this train up and running with a modest $400,000 investment, a $400,000 loan guarantee which, as I said before, leverages 20 times that amount in private sector loans.

I hope the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will remain consistent and understand fundamental principles. If these loan guarantees are a reliable, cost-effective and wise use of our Federal transportation dollars.

I hope that my colleagues can support this investment in economic growth in Southern California.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I tell the gentleman, we did look at it. We later found out that 90 percent of this is in Congressman Hunter’s district.

Second, we looked into the whole issue. And one of the reasons for opposing it is that it provides funding for loan guarantees. However, there is not appropriation made to administer the program. It is a technical law which may be rewritten by the railroad administration.

Third, there is the hope that the funds would be used for a local project in San Diego, when the project does not have local consensus, because I understand Mr. Hunter opposes it and I believe the gentleman from California, Mr. Packard, opposes it.

Under the section 511 loan guarantee program, if railroads are unable to repay these loans, the Federal Government is responsible. If the railroad cannot pay for them, the Federal Government is responsible for paying for them. I do not favor placing the Federal Government at risk.

Finally, if these loan guarantees are portrayed as inexpensive, Members should be aware that if the railroad defaults on a loan, the costs could be very, very high. So the area is divided. It is mainly in Mr. Hunter’s district. Third, it is a loan guarantee program. A default means that everybody in the country pays. And, therefore, I strongly oppose the amendment.

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

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I know this is a debatable issue. I just want to make sure that my colleagues understand, this program has been used before in the past. It has never, a loan has never been repaid in this program. The authorization is in the generic act—90 percent of the line is not in Mr. Hunter’s district. It is shared between our two districts and between two nations, in fact, Mexico and the United States. So with those corrections, I understand the gentleman’s opposition.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, there has been a default. There has been one. Second, we know absolutely nothing at all about the railroad, absolutely, positively, categorically nothing.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows nothing about what?

Mr. WOLF. About the railroad.

Mr. FILNER. This goes into the generic program. This is a loan guarantee. Second, if it was the Federal Government who would have to pay for the loan guarantee and would not be given unless all due diligence was done by the railroad administration.

Mr. WOLF. But if we do not know the profit, we do not know whether or not it could default. Therefore, if it defaults, as it happened one other time, everybody is obligated.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the project. I have discussed this at length with the people. I think that it is a good project. The rail line, this San Diego & Arizona Eastern rail corridor at some point in the future, I hope, will be open. I simply feel that this is not the future, I hope, will be open. I simply feel that this is not the proper way to proceed with the funding for it.

The opening of this railroad would benefit the San Diego region. It would provide a more direct and less costly route, although the transport from all parts of the United States to the Port of San Diego. But I do believe that there are other ways to do it. Certainly we ought to pursue that.

But the bill does not fund the loan guarantee program. There are no funds in the loan guarantee program. If this amendment passed, there are many projects that would apply for this loan guarantee funds. It would not just be the San Diego project. It would be projects that they compete for those funds. It would be very limited and, thus, I think that there is certainly no assurance that these funds would go to the San Diego rail corridor.

There is another factor I think that ought to be mentioned. That is that the reason that there was no funds put into this loan guarantee program was because there was simply not sufficient funds to fund all of the other programs that this subcommittee and the subcommittee that I served on had to support. There are budget constraints and I think that is good, the reasons why that whole program was not funded this year.

I hope that we will find ways of funding this project, because I do support the innovative way of building through private money. I do not support the way to do it and not the way to do it.

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

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague from San Diego and the northern part of our county support for the project. We have searched, as you know, for 2 years now for other kinds, for the funding to get this started. You said this is not the way. I would ask my friend if there was any other way, let us do it. This is the only way, this is a cost-effective way. This leverages 20 times what the appropriation is. I cannot think of a better way to get private-sector funding into it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, there are things, in fact, Mexico can re-claim my time. First, is we have required offsets for every transfer of funds. This amendment is not accompanied by offsets. Second, I recognize that this is a good way to fund these kinds of projects. But we simply have not got funds in that program, and if we put these funds in that the gentleman is requesting in his amendment, there is no assurance that the San Diego project would be able to re-claim these funds.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that would then meet the objection of the distinguished subcommittee chairman in that there would be competition for these funds. We are assured that because of the amount of work that has been done on this line and the support from the local governments and the studies that have been made, that this would be a top priority.

Reclaiming my time, it simply would mean that there was no assurance that San Diego would get these funds or have them accessible for a loan guarantee. Second, if it was
competitive and thus divided among many projects, it would help no project. There simply would not be enough.

Mr. FILNER. I wish the gentleman would work with me to find the method to get this project going.

Mr. PACKARD. I very reluctantly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for the nice presentation that he has made in support of this railroad, but let me tell my colleagues what this involves. This is a railroad that once existed between Imperial County, which is east of San Diego County, some 100 miles or so, almost to the Arizona border. It is a railroad that runs from San Diego into Mexico, travels a number of miles in Mexico, goes up some canyons, and finally reemerges in the United States in my district in what is known as East San Diego County and travels about 70 miles through my district in San Diego County into Imperial Valley, almost to the Arizona border.

This railroad was knocked out of commission many, many years ago. It has not been in operation for a number of years. There is an issue here that is a very important issue to everybody in the country, and that is border patrol. Let me just tell my colleagues what I am concerned about, Mr. Chairman.

There were articles in the Boston Globe, the Los Angeles Times, the San Diego Union, the last headline of which said, Robbers Ride the Rails. And they were headline stories about the enormous number of robberies of American trains in New Mexico, for example, some 600 robberies of Southern Pacific, in one year with an enormous criminal base, basically endangered by this train robbery operation. Those were trains that are in the United States. They do not even go into Mexico.

We propose at a time when our border in southern California is totally out of control and totally in the hands of criminal aliens, and there is a massive flow of cocaine coming across the border both in the urban areas and now in the suburban areas, and incidentally I have 60 miles of farm families and ranch families who right now are being held in their own homes by the threats of banditry or by letting a few people scare us off from making economic gains, then we would not be the country we are today.

That is what this railroad is all about. Let us make the economic development of this border area really work, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to do that. I did not quite get the amendment he thought about offering. If it is in conjunction with mine, let us do it. If it is in place of mine, I prefer that we try to get the funding in place.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], does, of course, is not even make a direct grant. Mr. FILNER's amendment only provides loan guarantees.

I think that it is a good amendment in that it helped provide a small amount of assistance in the form of those guarantees to regional railroads which need assistance for capital improvements, so I do not think that we should reject out of hand the efforts by our colleagues who want to provide this kind of funding. I think it is one way to look at ways in which we can be innovative in order to provide the funding that is necessary for good operations, for good businesses, and I would rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition. From my calculations, I do have about 90 percent of this railroad in my district. I think we need to have this type of information before we blindly move ahead because we have a lot of governmental entities that like this project.

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

Let me say that I understand and recognize the efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER]. I underst and the concerns of my colleagues also from San Diego, CA, representing a border district.

I would note and would suggest to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], that perhaps his idea concerning the kinds of restrictions and requirements on loan guarantees need to be applied not just in terms of border regions with respect to documentation or ideas about the numbers of robberies, the numbers of undocumented persons but indeed what, after all, we do when we provide for capitalization projects.

I point out to this House that in last year's, in this 1996 year of fiscal operations, we have in the current operations a $10 million grant that was not included in the President's budget to the Alaska Railroad for capital improvements. We did not do that in the House. That was as a result of coming out of conference, but we voted for that passage in legislation which came back from conference. So we, in fact, have already approved a project much like this. This is not a first-impression move.
The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 460, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FILER] will be postponed.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on each amendment to the remainder of the bill, and any amendments thereto, be limited to 10 minutes, equally divided, with the exception of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] for 20 minutes and the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] for 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 55, line 15, be considered as read, and printed in the record and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 55, line 15, is as follows:

**HIGHWAY TRUST FUND**

For necessary expenses for university transportation centers as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 5317(b), to remain available until expended, $6,000,000.

**REGIONAL TRANSIT PROJECTS**

[Continued on page 934]
from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which $15,500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1999. Provided, That in addition to amounts made available for the Pipeline Safety Fund, $1,000,000 shall be available for grants to States for the development and establishment of one-call notification systems and shall be derived from amounts previously selected under section 7005 of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS (EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For expenses to carry out section 5901±5902 of title 5, United States Code, $200,000, to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 1999. Provided, That none of the funds under this heading shall be for the conduct of contract audits.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by section 5116(i) and 5127(d) of title 5, United States Code, to be made available for obligation by the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee, $39,450,000:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $29,450,000: Provided, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee.

T I T L E II

RELATED AGENCIES

ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, as authorized under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, $3,540,000: Provided, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for obligation until such time as the United States Code is amended to reflect provisions of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, that require the Board to maintain a List of Schools with Architectural Barriers.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Transportation Safety Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; services as authorized by title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for a GS±18 uniformed, or allowing for the use of uniformed, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901±5902), $42,007,000, of which not to exceed $2,000 may be used for official representation expenses.

T I T L E III

GENERAL PROVISIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Sec. 301. During the current fiscal year all applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901±5902).

Sec. 302. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1997 pay raises for programs funded in this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act or previously appropriated for the budget period ending September 30, 1997.

Sec. 303. Funds appropriated under this Act for expenditures by the Federal Aviation Administration shall be available (1) except that the amounts made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(1) and 5127(d) shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee;

(2) for necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by section 5116(i) and 5127(d) of title 5, United States Code, to be made available for obligation by the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee, $39,450,000:

(3) none of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be transferred to, or obligated under, any other appropriation, and shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1997.

Sec. 304. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by section 601 of the Federal Lands Transportation Act of 1984, but not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for an Executive Level IV.

Sec. 305. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than one hundred seven political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation: Provided, That none of the personal secretaries or personal assistants assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation shall be charged such salaries and expenses.

Sec. 306. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory, licensing, or adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act.

Sec. 307. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, nor may any be transferred to other appropriations, unless expressly so provided herein.

Sec. 308. The Secretary of Transportation may enter into cooperative agreements, and other transactions with any person, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, any unit of State or local government, any corporation, and any other entity in execution of the Technology Reinvestment Project authorized under the Defense Conversion, Reinvestment and Transition Assistance Act of 1992 and related legislation: Provided, That the authority provided in this section may be exercised without regard to section 3254 of title 31, United States Code.

Sec. 309. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting services through purchase of professional services is limited to the amounts set forth in section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

Sec. 310. (a) For fiscal year 1997 the Secretary of Transportation shall distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways by allocation in the ratio which sums authorized for Federal-aid highways that are apportioned or allocated to each State for such fiscal year bear to the total of the sums authorized to be apportioned or allocated to all the States for such fiscal year.

(b) During the period October 1 through December 31, 1996, no State shall obligate more than 25 per centum of the amount distributed to such State under subsection (a), of the total amount distributed to all States under such period, and the amount distributed under such period shall not exceed 12 per centum of the total amount distributed to all States under such subsection.

Sec. 311. (a) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) provide all States with authority sufficient to prevent lapses of sums authorized to be apportioned or allocated to States for highways that have been apportioned to a State;

(2) after August 1, 1997, revise a distribution of the funds made available under subsection (a) for a State so that the amount distributed during that fiscal year and redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under section 103(e)(4), 104, and 144 of title 23, United States Code, and under sections 1013(c) and 1015 of Public Law 102±240, and

(3) in any fiscal year distribute amounts authorized for administrative expenses and funds from the administrative takedown authorized by section 104(a), title 23 U.S.C., the Federal Lands Transportation Act of 1984, the Federal Highway Safety Construction Program, the surface transportation systems program, and amounts made available under sections 1040, 1047, 1064, 6001, 6005, 6006, 6023, and 6024 of Public Law 102±240, and

(b) Nothing in any provision of this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to make available under the head “Federal-Aid Highways” in this Act.

(c) During the period October 1 through December 31, 1996, the aggregate amount of obligations under section 157 of title 23, United States Code, for projects covered under section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978, section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981, sections 131(b), 131(i), and 404 of Public Law 97±442, sections 1061, 1103 through 1108, 4008, and 6023(b)(8) and 6023(b)(10) of Public Law 102±240, and for projects authorized by Public Law 99±500 and Public Law 100±17, shall not exceed $2,277,431,840.

(d) During the period August 2 through September 30, 1997, the aggregate amount which may be obligated by all States shall not exceed 2.5 percent of the aggregate amount of funds apportioned or allocated to all States—

(1) under sections 104 and 144 of title 23, United States Code, and 1013(c) and 1015 of Public Law 102±240, and

(2) for highway assistance projects under section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, which would not be obligated in fiscal year 1997 if the total amount of the obligation limitation provided for such fiscal year in this Act were utilized.

(e) Paragraph (2) shall not apply to any State which on or after August 1, 1997, has the amount distributed to such State under paragraph (a) for the fiscal year 1997 reduced under paragraph (c)(2).

Sec. 312. The limitation on obligations for the fiscal years 1997 through 2000 for Federal-aid Highways shall not apply to any authority under 49 U.S.C. 5338, previously made available for obligation, or to any other authority previously obligated, under the discretionary grants program.

Sec. 313. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

Sec. 314. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to plan, finalize, or implement...
SEC. 321. Funds provided in this Act for the Transportation Air Traffic Service Center (TASC) shall be reduced by $10,000,000, which limits fiscal year 1997 TASC obligations.

SEC. 322. Funds provided by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Federal Railroad Administration, Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training shall be reduced by $4,023,030 in funds made available for the Highway Trust Fund or other projects under 49 U.S.C. 5309.

SEC. 323. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay the salaries or expenses of Department administrative or related agencies funded in this Act or any subsequent Act, or for transportation personnel who approve or facilitate the construction of, a third track on the Metro-North Railroad Harlem Line in the City of New York, unless the construction of such track has been completed.

SEC. 324. None of the funds in this Act shall be used for planning, engineering, design, or construction of a sixth runway at the new Denver International Airport, Denver, Colorado.

SEC. 325. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics from the sale of data products, for necessary expenses incurred pursuant to the provisions of section 606 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, may be credited to the Treasury to reimburse the Bureau for such expenses.

SEC. 326. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to accept funds appropriated in this Act to "Rental payments" for any expense authorized by that appropriation in excess of the amounts provided in this Act; provided, That prior to any such transfer, notice shall be provided to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 327. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate or enforce regulations that would result in the withdrawal of a slot from an air carrier at O'Hare International Airport under section 33.223 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations.
SEC. 405. Public Law 100±202 is amended in section 1107(b) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2050), relating to Mobile, Alabama, is amended in the second column by inserting after "Alabama" the following: "and for feasibility studies, preliminary engineering, and construction of a new bridge and approaches over the Mobile River".

SEC. 406. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereinafter referred to as a "funded item".
what we said we were going to spend just last year. I think that is a terrible mistake from a policy standpoint, and I think it makes it even more difficult for us to say that we are going to actually reduce spending in the outyears. In the words I said last night was, how in the world can we say in good conscience to our constituents that we cannot cut an additional $4.1 billion worth of spending this year and yet somehow miraculously in 3 years we are going to have the discipline to cut $47 billion in spending?

I think it a mistake, and, as I say, as a result of that we came up with a very simple amendment that we are going to offer to every single appropriation bill from this point forward to simply trim 1.9 percent from each appropriation bill in discretionary domestic spending so that if all of those amendments were passed, it would at least get us back to the promise that we made just last year.

But as I listened at this transportation appropriation bill, I must be honest that we find that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wolf] and his committee have done a very good job, and, as a matter of fact, their appropriation bill is less than the 600(b) allocations. And unfortunately, around this place, altogether too often no good deed goes unpunished, and so as we looked at this, essentially we came to the conclusion that this is one committee that has already met the challenge which we laid out in terms of trying to recover that $4.1 billion.

So as a result, Mr. Chairman, if I could engage in a brief colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wolf], I think we can resolve this matter and move forward to the next order of business. I ask the gentleman:

It is true that under this bill, H.R. 3675, the gentleman proposes to spend $398 million less than the budget authorities, under the transportation subcommittee by the full committee?

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Would it be the gentleman’s intention to continue to try and save $388 million should this bill go forward into the conference committee under the 600(b) allocations?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, it is my intention to see that the conference report reflects the priorities and funding levels of the House, and also I might say that if the Senate tries to put any highway demos in, we will make sure that they do not in, and I hope that the people of our body will help us to make sure they are not in, it, but there are no highway demonstration projects in this bill.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The amendment that was offered would save approximately $232 million and obviously a savings of $338 million is greater than $232. So in light of this fact, I commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wolf] and the full committee for the work that they have done and foregoing the extra mile in terms of trying to preserve the American dream for our kids.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the Amendment offered by Mr. Andrews. Mr. Andrews, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: Page 55, after line 15, insert the following new section:

SEC. 406. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide, or to pay the salaries or expenses of Department of Transportation personnel who provide, to a State more than $50,000 in Federal assistance from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for any surface transportation project except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that:

At least 30 days before entering a contract or agreement with a private business entity for the performance of work usually performed by employees of a State under which the State will obligate more than $50,000; the State has conducted and submitted a cost-benefit analysis of the project; (2) the cost-benefit analysis includes a detailed description of—(A) the costs of labor; (B) the costs of employer-provided fringe benefits; (C) the costs of equipment or materials, whether supplied by the State or private contractor; (D) the costs directly attributable to transferring the work being performed by State employees to a private business entity; (E) the costs of administering and inspecting the contracted service; and (F) the costs of any expected unemployment compensation or other benefits which are likely to be paid to State employees who are displaced as a result of the contracted services; (3) the cost-benefit analysis includes an analysis of whether it is more cost effective to use employees of a private business entity than to use State employees to perform the work; and;

(4) the cost-benefit analysis is accompanied by an analysis of the State’s financial and personnel and an analysis of the ability of the State to reassure the contracted service if contracting of the service ceases to serve the public interest; (5) in the case of a contract or agreement described in paragraph (3) that will result in a decrease in the amount of work assigned to State employees, the cost-benefit analysis demonstrates that—(A) the contract or agreement will result in a substantial cost savings to the State; and (B) the potential cost savings of contracting of services will be outweighed by the public’s interest in having a particular function performed directly by the State; (6) at least 30 days before entering into a contract or agreement described in paragraph (1), the State has submitted a past performance history of the private business entity under the contract or agreement includes—(A) work performed for the State under contracts and agreements described in paragraph (1) in the 5-year period ending on the 45th day before the date of entry into the contract or agreement; (B) if no work was performed for the State under contracts and agreements during such 5-year period, then any work performed for other States under contracts and agreements described in paragraph (1) in such 5-year period; (C) with respect to each contract or agreement to which subparagraph (A) or (B) applies, the amount of funds actually expended by the State under the contract or agreement; and

(D) with respect to each contract or agreement to which subparagraph (A) or (B) applies, the amount of funds actually expended by the State under the contract or agreement; and

(9) not later than 5 days after submission of the cost-benefit analysis and other documents for public inspection, the analysis and other documents have been made available for inspection upon request.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The limitation established by subsection (a) shall not apply to an existing transportation project if it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend the funds that:

(1) the project is a pilot project for a particular type of work that has not previously been performed by the State and is being undertaken to evaluate whether contracting for that particular type of work can result in savings to the State; or

(2) the analysis of the State’s finances and personnel under subsection (a)(4) demonstrates that the State cannot perform the work with existing or additional departmental personnel and that the work would be of such an intermittent nature as to be likely to cause regular periods of unemployment for State employees.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the earlier unanimous consent agreement, the proponent and the opponent each will control 10 minutes for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
The purpose of this amendment is rather simple and straightforward, and it is that the taxpayers that we represent have a right to know how and where their money is being spent. This is a phenomenon that is happening across our country right now. State governments, in an attempt to save money, are laying off public employees by the score. People are losing their jobs, they are losing their careers, they are losing many of the things they depend on for their families. These are long-term, hard-working public employees.

The justification that is offered time after time for this contracting out and for these employees losing their jobs is that it saves money.

This amendment simply says to a local government using Federal taxpayer dollars in transportation projects, it says to that local government:

If you want to lay off public employees, if you want to lose the jobs of people who have been on the payroll for a long time and done their job as they have been asked, then you have to show us, you have to show the public that the savings of money that you assert are there, in fact, there.

Here is the way it works:

When a local government using Federal funds from the transportation trust funds decides to contract that work out, if the work is work that has been traditionally done by public employees, then they decide to contract the work out, this amendment requires the local government to go through a cost-benefit analysis. It requires a local government to weigh the costs and benefits of contracting the work out versus the costs and the benefits of keeping the work in-house and being done by public employees. The record of that analysis is then spread before the public, and that is it.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues what the amendment does not do. The amendment does not require that work that has been done by the private sector for years be changed. If, as in most States, the actual construction of these projects is done in the private sector and not by public employees, this amendment does not apply. It applies only to work traditionally done by public employees. It does not create a massive and new bureaucratic gauntlet for State governments to run.

I would hope that every State and local government that is spending the hard-earned tax dollars of our constituents is already doing this. I hope they are already sitting down and saying what traditional A cost to contract the work out versus what option B cost to keep the work inside. This really simply requires then to disclose what I hope they are already doing.

Finally, this amendment does not do what it requires that there be some new obligation placed upon States or that some new category of work be kept in house that would otherwise be contracted out. This is common sense.

It even says, Mr. Chairman, that after the cost benefit analysis has been done, if the State still decides to contract the work out, there is nothing in this amendment that precludes them from doing so.

It protects the right and discretion of States and local governments. This, Mr. Chairman, is a truth-in-govern- ment amendment. It says that if a local official, using Federal taxpayer dollars, if a State official using Federal taxpayer dollars, decides to lay people off the public payroll because they claim that it saves money, they have to show that it is that simple. It is a truth-in-government amendment. I believe it deserves broad support, and I would ask that it receive that support.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. Also, the American Consulting Engineers Council, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, the Associated General Contractors of America, the American Institute of Architects, the National Society of Professional Engineers, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the Council of Federal Practitioners, the Institute for Urban Design, and the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, the National Utility Contractors, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the National Society of Professional Engineers, the American Institute of Architects, and the American Society of Landscape Architects.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell Members what AASHTO says. AAAHSTO says the amendment is sweeping and would include everything from engineering and design and management, consultant contractors, and at the low threshold of $50,000 it would mean that most activities carried out by the State would not be effective.

They said implementation of the amendment would require a whole array of procedures at the State and Federal level which would impose significant costs and delays in project development. It would make it impossible to utilize private sector resources. It is opposed by the State departments of New York, New Jersey, Texas, Illinois, Indiana, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, and Montana, and others.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, if each of the associations that my friend from Virginia cites are opposed to the bill, does that not surprise me. Taxpayers are in favor of this bill, because all it really says is if you are really saving money, you ought to prove it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].

Mr. FILNER. I thank the gentleman for his amendment, Mr. Chairman, because as I read it, it would simply replicate at the State level the procedure that is followed by the Federal Government to require cost comparisons before a contract could be given to private entities. This gentleman’s amendment will ensure the prudent use of taxpayer dollars by requiring cost comparisons when in-house expertise is available. State governments frequently have trained competent public employees. Having State workers perform design and engineering work on highway projects will often save taxpayers’ money because the job can be done quicker and cheaper.

This amendment is a major step toward protecting the American taxpayer and ensures their tax dollars will be well spent. Too often private contractors are given sweetheart contracts in return for financial and political support. The best interests of the American people are not served. This practice is egregious when the result is the displacement or underutilization of public workers. I think this amendment sets politics aside and brings back into focus the interests of American taxpayers.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], a member of the committee.

MR. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Andrews amendment for several reasons: First, it imposes an unfunded mandate on the States, like our own State of New Jersey. We already have enough unfunded mandates now.

Second, it violates States rights. States should be able to make transportation decisions without any further Federal interference.

Third, it removes the flexibility that States currently enjoy to address their unique transportation needs. In our State our States have particular transportation needs because of our population density.

Fourth, it swells State bureaucracies that many Governors, like our own State of New Jersey Governor, Christine Todd Whitman, were trying to control costs, so why would we need to swell the bureaucracy with more employees paid for by Federal dollars?

Fifth, it invites lawsuits, totally unnecessary lawsuits.

Sixth, it hurts minority and start-up small businesses who already have problems competing in a complex situation in terms of transportation projects.

Seventh, it delays highway projects. In a State with as many problems as we have, we do not need any more delays.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, it hurts the private sector, who is perfectly capable, who has a wonderful track record of designing and working on construction projects.
For these reasons and many others, I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. The amendment is straightforward and requires that before Federal funds are used to contract out highway work, the locality must determine whether the benefits of contracting out, including the costs of the contract, the costs of terminating public employees, the costs of administering and supervising the contract, and the costs of the projected unemployment, outweigh the anticipated benefits.

This should not be controversial. Small businesses and middle-class homeowners do this all the time. They want to get the best deal for their money. The taxpayers have a right to demand that their governments should treat their own dollars with the same care and respect.

I know that privatization is very popular these days. I know some of our colleagues like to point to situations in which privatization saved the government money. I know in some circles, putting people out of work simply because they committed the unpardonable sin of devoting their energies to serving their communities as public servants, is politically popular. That is wrong. It may be write in a given case, but it is not too much to ask that before a State rushes forward and begins contracting out, it take the trouble to find out whether it would be getting a good deal.

Some have complained we have no business telling the State governments to comparison shop. I disagree. This is not a question of unfunded mandates. What is at issue here is a fundamental question of accountability, accountability for the use of Federal tax dollars. Demanding accountability, making sure that contracting out really will save money, is not simply local politicians giving some goodies to the old boys' network. It is not an abuse of our authority. It is a fundamental exercise of our responsibility as legislators and as stewards of the taxpayers' funds.

It does not matter whom we send this money through, it is our responsibility to ensure that the tax money we appropriate today is spent wisely. That is what accountability is all about. That is our first obligation, and that is why I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. ANDREWS]. This amendment is not merely a limitation on funds for fiscal 1997, it requires States to perform six pages of new specific criteria, creates new requirements out of whole cloth that have never been present in the last 40 years of Federal highway programs. This amendment places the highway bidding and contracting process, and it does so without any hearings or any debate as to whether such a revolutionary change should be adopted. This amendment has sparked broad-based opposition, including the States of New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Texas, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Montana, the American Consulting Engineers Council, the American Road and Transportation Builders and the Associated General Contractors.

I am informed by the Federal Highway Administration and the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials that this amendment would freeze in place these different State practices.

This amendment goes exactly in the opposite direction, and I urge all Members on both sides of the aisle who are interested in voting to "no."

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would add unnecessary delays and added costs to almost every highway project across the country. More importantly, it would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business, which adopted as one of its main planks this statement: At the Federal, State, and local levels, laws, regulations, and policies should prohibit direct government-created competition in which government organizations perform commercial services. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation. It would go very much against one of the leading recommendations of the most recent White House Conference on Small Business. That hits right at the heart of this amendment. This amendment goes against that leading recommendation.
Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In urging my colleagues to vote with this amendment, I would like to deal with some of the misconceptions put forward in this amendment and, I say, they want smaller government. What we are doing here would not give us smaller government, if we oppose this amendment, it would give us dumber government, because government would be taking taxpayers' money and not necessarily getting the best deal for it.

We hear it is a violation of States' rights. Not so. This simply says the State needs to go through a justification process, but the decision as to what to do remains with the State. We hear this is unworkable. Any State that is spending tens or hundreds of millions of Federal taxpayer dollars without doing this is running their projects in an unworkable way.

We hear that privatization has been a great success, and since my friends from New Jersey raised New Jersey, let me remind New Jersey, as I understand it, laid off the custodians at the State Capitol, the people who clean the State Capitol building in the name of saving money. We have a problem with the Capitol building not being cleaned out that the firm that hired to do the work has hired illegal aliens to do the work, so I am not sure that that was a success.

When our constituents, Mr. Chairman, go out and shop tonight for an air-conditioner or a TV set, they look for the best deal. We should do the same thing with their money. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Davis].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I was in local government for 15 years. This is not true cost-benefit at all; this is a presumption on one side of the ledger sheet and creates a presumption that somehow the public sector delivers this better. It is an unfunded mandate; it is an economic study for every Federal highway program over $50,000.

This amendment will delay projects, and when you have short construction seasons, as is the case, it is going to kick it over, sometimes over a year's delay getting that project costed and that ends up delaying costs and I doubt that even goes into the cost-benefit analysis. This makes it very difficult to contract out and utilize the private sector resources available.

The cost and the delays in undergoing these studies are deterrent to bidding these programs out and using private sector forces. This does not save a dime; it is anticompetitive. It ends up costing money with the delays, and it diverts dollars from pavement and bridges and it puts them into the bureaucracy and bureaucratic studies.

I think despite its good intentions, this does not cut the mustard, it does not do the job. I urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Andrews].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 460, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Andrews] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hunter: Page 55, after line 15, insert the following new title:

FIFTEENTH ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. (a) LIMITATION ON NEW LOAN GUARANTEES FOR CERTAIN RAILROAD PROJECTS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the cost of any new loan guarantee commitments for any new railroad project, when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that such railroad project is an international railroad project of the United States and another country, or a railroad project in the United States in the vicinity of the United States border with another country.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) a comprehensive study has been conducted after the date of the enactment of this Act regarding criminal activities that have occurred on existing railroads of such type, including—

(A) the use of such railroads to facilitate the smuggling of illegal aliens and illegal drugs, entering the United States, and the impact of such smuggling on the total number of illegal aliens, and the total amount of illegal drugs, entering the United States; and

(B) the commission of robberies against such railroads; and

(2) a detailed report setting forth the results of such study has been issued and made available to the public.

Mr. HUNTER (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 California?

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Coleman] reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of earlier today, the gentleman from California [Mr. Hunter] and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, very simply, this amendment affects the proposal that the gentleman from California [Mr. Filner] made on the border train, which lies mainly in my congressional district, and I brought up to my colleagues the problems that we presently have on the southern border of California with traffic of control illegal immigration. It has become a cocaine highway in San Diego and Imperial Counties, and the problem with this train is that a border train, which does not even go into Mexico, in New Mexico was robbed 600 times last year, according to stories in the Boston Globe, the L.A. Times and the San Diego Union.

So you have an issue of border control and what effect this border train that weaves in and out of Mexico will have on that situation. Will it become an illegal alien express? Will it be robbed? Will it build up a base of banditry along the southern border?

What my amendment does very simply is it asks for a study. It says, we cannot fund any railroad projects under this section until and unless a study is done that addresses the effect of existing border trains on illegal immigration, cocaine smuggling, and the prospects for banditry which have taken place in great numbers in New Mexico.

So we need information on this proposal, and this amendment asks for a report that gives that information, and certainly I cannot see any proponents wanting to deny the House information that would let us make a reasoned judgment on this border train.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, mainly so that I could inquire of the author of the amendment, and we could be able to divide some time perhaps so that I could inquire. The language of the amendment is that none of the funds are made available in this act for any railroad project, and when it is made known to the Federal official having the authority to obligate or expend such funds that such railroad project is an international railroad project of the United States and another country, or a railroad project in the United States in the vicinity of the United States border with another country.

So you have an issue of border control and what effect this border train that weaves in and out of Mexico will have on that situation. Will it become an illegal alien express? Will it be robbed? Will it build up a base of banditry along the southern border?

What my amendment does very simply is it asks for a study. It says, we cannot fund any railroad projects under this section until and unless a study is done that addresses the effect of existing border trains on illegal immigration, cocaine smuggling, and the prospects for banditry which have taken place in great numbers in New Mexico.

So we need information on this proposal, and this amendment asks for a report that gives that information, and certainly I cannot see any proponents wanting to deny the House information that would let us make a reasoned judgment on this border train.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, mainly so that I could inquire of the author of the amendment, and we could be able to divide some time perhaps so that I could inquire. The language of the amendment is that none of the funds are made available in this act for any railroad project, and when it is made known to the Federal official having the authority to obligate or expend such funds that such railroad project is an international railroad project of the United States and another country, or a railroad project in the United States in the vicinity of the United States border with another country, meaning Alaska, the State of Washington?

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, no, that does not mean Alaska, if the gentleman is asking.

This is what I would hope that we would do under this, is to look at the existing situation. It is an international railroad project in San Diego’s, and that is the border train that borders New Mexico that has been robbed 600 times in the last year. The study would under this amendment,
the intent of the author is that we would look at that situation.

Second, with respect to the gentleman's statement that there is no funds under this act, this is attached to this section of the bill on the presumption that if the Filner amendment did pass, there would be funds available in the act?

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, claiming my time, I think that is the issue. I mean if the Filner amendment does not pass, of course this kind of language is not necessary to do that.

I know the gentleman wants to conduct a study, and I do not object to just doing a study, but I am afraid that the way the gentleman has crafted the amendment, we are going to do more than just a study. We may indeed be prohibiting any future use of any loan guarantee funds on behalf of any railroad just because they happen to be near a border, and I do not think that is fair, either. The gentleman represents a border, like I do.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. COLEMAN. No, Mr. Chairman, I think it is only a technical flaw and not subject to a point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say to my colleagues, for the proponents of this border train, the point of my amendment is that there are a lot of ramifications of this train that go far beyond simply linking up a couple of railheads with an existing port and expediting trade between nations. There are enormous problems along the southern California border. There are right now enormous problems among all of the southern border with enormous illegal immigration and all of the ramifications that come about as a result of that situation.

This amendment has asked for a study. It should not be mission impossible to get a study. Now, if the gentleman says, well, no monies can be spent until there is a study, well, that is easily taken care of by simply producing a study, and I think that INS, at least the people that I have talked to, Customs, Border Patrol, have got facts coming out of their ears with results of what has happened to border train, by all means, from months.

So let us have this study, and then the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] can move ahead in an informed manner, and I can move ahead in an informed manner, and all Members of the House will know what the facts are. Let us do the study.

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

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

Again, I think the problem of trying to draft legislation on the floor of the House is evident by the fact that what we have in this particular amendment says that this would include a railroad project in the United States, in the vicinity of the United States border with another country. That is not just Mexico. Where does everybody get the idea that the border is only Mexico in the United States?

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. WOLF], the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It was an issue that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTER] raised with regard to drugs coming out of Mexico. Up to 75 percent of the marijuana is coming across the Mexico border. I think a study is a fair thing to do, so I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my dear colleague from San Diego, Henrys from San Diego, and I am going to get in the middle of this family feud. I would ask every Member here and every Member who is watching on C-Span, do you hear what is going on? We are talking about linking up commerce in the good things that we all talk about everything in this country. But here you have two colleagues that have districts side by side, and because of the uncontrolled situation along our frontiers, because not an American soil seems to be created equally.

It does not appear to be by this Congress or other Congresses, because we are in a situation now to where a railroad is threatened, because we do not have control of U.S. soil and we are not going to see the commerce and the prosperity that we should see in certain parts of this country, because America and the Federal Government has not taken care of it.

I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], does the gentleman know what I would like to see this study say? Not what is going to be the problems, but what can the greatest Nation in the history of the world that travels all around the world to defend and secure the national sovereignty of everybody else, what can we do to make the NAFTA train of the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] safe and prosperous? That is what our study should say.

I just ask every one of my colleagues as they go back to the July 4 recess, go back to your districts and think about the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] are going to go back to their neighborhoods and their neighborhood is not as secure and as safe from foreign intrusion as everyone else in this country should be and presume to be.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER].
The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Hunter]. The amendment was agreed to.

Amendment offered by Mr. Collins of Georgia

Mr. Collins of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Collins of Georgia: Page 55, after line 15, insert the following new title:

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the National Transportation Safety Board to plan, conduct, or enter into any contract for a study to determine the feasibility of allowing individuals who are more than 60 years of age to pilot commercial aircraft.

Mr. Collins of Georgia (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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the earlier unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Collins] and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Collins].

Mr. Collins of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the report accompanying the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act contains language directing the National Transportation Safety Board to review and issue a report on the Federal Aviation Administration’s “age 60 rule” which requires pilots to retire upon reaching the age of 60.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Oberstar] and myself prohibits funding of this study based upon several reasons.

First, the NTSB is not the appropriate agency to undertake such a study. The chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board responded to an inquiry from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Obey] just yesterday. The National Transportation Safety Board letter stated that the basic scientific research required by such a study is currently beyond the mission and capability of the Safety Board. In addition, the letter stated that such a study would require about 1½ years of professional staff effort, and could replace or delay other safety studies already scheduled.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe that taxpayer dollars should be targeted to the mission of the National Transportation Safety Board, which is investigating accidents and helping to prevent their reoccurrences, and not diverted for projects for which the agency is not suited.

Second, the age 60 rule has been studied and restudied for decades by experts in the field. Congress ordered a major study in 1979. The National Institutes of Health, National Institutes of Aging, and National Academy of Sciences undertook an exhaustive study and concluded that while there may be individuals capable of flying after age 60, there was no way to make such a determination without constant examinations, which are completely impractical.

During the 1980s the issue was revisited in various forums without change, and in 1995 the Federal Aviation Administration, which has a medical component, undertook another extensive review receiving thousands of comments. Not only did the agency conclude that a change in the retirement age was not warranted, but it applied the age 60 rule to commuter airlines which had been allowed to have pilots over the age of 60. I reiterate, this was just last year.

I believe that requiring the National Transportation Safety Board to do yet another study is not only unwarranted, it is not a wise use of taxpayers’ dollars, and certainly not a wise use of the National Transportation Safety Board’s already strained resources.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Wolf] rise in opposition?

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia will control 10 minutes in opposition.

Mr. Wolf. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

If this bill said to raise the age to 60 or 61, I would not be for it. All it says is the National Transportation Safety Board should look at the issue. Fifteen years have passed since the last major study. We know what has happened. There has been some political pressure by one group who has come in and said, “Don’t even look at it.” We cannot put our head in the sand when the cargo door blew out, causing the serious of conditions they are flying in and have caused tragic accidents.

Let me give an example. A recent accident is the American Eagle accident near Morrisville, NC that occurred because a young pilot, age 29, misinterpreted an engine-out light and lost his orientation, resulting in a perfectly good aircraft being flown into the ground. Another example is when a Henson Airlines pilot, using an incorrect navigation aid, flew the aircraft like an ocean near Grotto, VA. In this case the copilot was 26 years old, even younger and less experienced than the pilot.

I final example is a 1983 Air Illinois flight where a 32-year-old pilot took off at night, lost electrical power, and instead of turning the aircraft around for an emergency landing, he continued to fly the aircraft and crashed it.

I do not say that the age out to be raised. I am not sure. If I were a Member of Congress over 60 I would not be for it. All it says is the National Transportation Safety Board should look at the issue. Fifteen years have passed since the last major study. We know what has happened. There has been some political pressure by one group who has come in and said, “Don’t even look at it.” We cannot put our head in the sand when the cargo door blew out, causing the serious of conditions they are flying in and have caused tragic accidents.

Let me give an example. A recent accident is the American Eagle accident near Morrisville, NC that occurred because a young pilot, age 29, misinterpreted an engine-out light and lost his orientation, resulting in a perfectly good aircraft being flown into the ground. Another example is when a Henson Airlines pilot, using an incorrect navigation aid, flew the aircraft like an ocean near Grotto, VA. In this case the copilot was 26 years old, even younger and less experienced than the pilot.

I final example is a 1983 Air Illinois flight where a 32-year-old pilot took off at night, lost electrical power, and instead of turning the aircraft around for an emergency landing, he continued to fly the aircraft and crashed it.

I do not say that the age out to be raised. I am not sure. If I were a Member of Congress over 60 I would not be for it. All it says is the National Transportation Safety Board should look at the issue. Fifteen years have passed since the last major study. We know what has happened. There has been some political pressure by one group who has come in and said, “Don’t even look at it.” We cannot put our head in the sand when the cargo door blew out, causing the serious of conditions they are flying in and have caused tragic accidents.

Let me give an example. A recent accident is the American Eagle accident near Morrisville, NC that occurred because a young pilot, age 29, misinterpreted an engine-out light and lost his orientation, resulting in a perfectly good aircraft being flown into the ground. Another example is when a Henson Airlines pilot, using an incorrect navigation aid, flew the aircraft like an ocean near Grotto, VA. In this case the copilot was 26 years old, even younger and less experienced than the pilot.

I final example is a 1983 Air Illinois flight where a 32-year-old pilot took off at night, lost electrical power, and instead of turning the aircraft around for an emergency landing, he continued to fly the aircraft and crashed it.

I do not say that the age out to be raised. I am not sure. If I were a Member of Congress over 60 I would not be for it. All it says is the National Transportation Safety Board should look at the issue. Fifteen years have passed since the last major study. We know what has happened. There has been some political pressure by one group who has come in and said, “Don’t even look at it.” We cannot put our head in the sand when the cargo door blew out, causing the serious of conditions they are flying in and have caused tragic accidents.

Let me give an example. A recent accident is the American Eagle accident near Morrisville, NC that occurred because a young pilot, age 29, misinterpreted an engine-out light and lost his orientation, resulting in a perfectly good aircraft being flown into the ground. Another example is when a Henson Airlines pilot, using an incorrect navigation aid, flew the aircraft like an ocean near Grotto, VA. In this case the copilot was 26 years old, even younger and less experienced than the pilot.

I final example is a 1983 Air Illinois flight where a 32-year-old pilot took off at night, lost electrical power, and instead of turning the aircraft around for an emergency landing, he continued to fly the aircraft and crashed it.

I do not say that the age out to be raised. I am not sure. If I were a Member of Congress over 60 I would not be for it. All it says is the National Transportation Safety Board should look at the issue. Fifteen years have passed since the last major study. We know what has happened. There has been some political pressure by one group who has come in and said, “Don’t even look at it.” We cannot put our head in the sand when the cargo door blew out, causing the serious of conditions they are flying in and have caused tragic accidents.

Let me give an example. A recent accident is the American Eagle accident near Morrisville, NC that occurred because a young pilot, age 29, misinterpreted an engine-out light and lost his orientation, resulting in a perfectly good aircraft being flown into the ground. Another example is when a Henson Airlines pilot, using an incorrect navigation aid, flew the aircraft like an ocean near Grotto, VA. In this case the copilot was 26 years old, even younger and less experienced than the pilot.

I final example is a 1983 Air Illinois flight where a 32-year-old pilot took off at night, lost electrical power, and instead of turning the aircraft around for an emergency landing, he continued to fly the aircraft and crashed it.
amendment and note that if a Member of Congress has a heart attack or if a dentist has a heart attack, the public safety is not at risk. That is not the case in the occupation we are talking about here tonight.

I would say that it is important to understand that the National Transportation Safety Board itself does not believe that it is qualified to conduct the study that it is being asked to conduct. When we asked them what they felt about it, they responded as follows: it is our judgment that the proposed study will conclude that significant new laboratory research on the effect of aging on tasks that are critical to safe performance as an airline pilot will be required. Basic safety research of this nature, of course, is currently beyond the mission and capability of the Safety Board.

After that letter was sent, I understand that they sent another letter to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], because I know how things work. When the subcommittee chairman says something, they respond. In the subsequent letter which the agency sent to the gentleman from Virginia, they indicated that they would conduct the study if asked to do so and if it was requested. But, I will repeat, they indicated that in their judgment such a study, while they would do it if told to by the Congress, is beyond the mission and the capability of the Safety Board.

So it seems to me that maybe this study ought to be conducted, but it certainly should not be conducted by an agency that itself believes it does not have the capacity to do it. I would urge that the gentleman’s amendment be adopted.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. There was no pressure. I said to Mr. Hall, “You do the right thing, whatever this thing is.”

Second, I do not have the confidence in the FAA to do this study and I wanted the National Transportation Safety Board, which is above and beyond the pressure of politics and Cabinet secretaries of whatever administration, to evaluate all the data—as I said, 15 other countries do it—and make a report back. I tell the gentleman it is the Safety Board that would make the report back to the FAA and the FAA would do whatever.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS] and the ranking member of the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

I seriously doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government needs another study. But if one is needed, then we should let the groups and the companies which are for and against this fund these studies. In addition, we can hold hearings on this without requiring the taxpayers to fund any new studies.

I know there are good and well-intentioned people on both sides of this issue, but this question has already been, with considerable simplification, first imposed during the Eisenhower administration. As has been pointed out, National Transportation Safety Board Chairman Hall recently wrote that this study, “may replace or delay other safety studies scheduled for completion during fiscal year 1997.”

The Federal Aviation Administration, as a result of its studies and its one-level-of-safety initiative, concluded just this past December that the age 60 rule should not be changed and, moreover, the FAA has recently applied the age 60 rule to commuter pilots.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good amendment and I urge its support.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for encouraging this amendment, for initiating it, in fact.

Mr. Chairman, I was very interested and pleased to hear that the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee mentioned the Sioux City, IA crash. People walked away from that crash for a couple of reasons: The seat strengthening that was required on all aircraft, to 18 G forces, that kept those seats in place and saved 110 lives; and for the skill of that pilot in managing this aircraft when he lost all control surfaces. Capt. Al Haynes, who flew that aircraft, is very strongly in support of the age 60 rule. I do not think it was the intention of the chairman to imply that he was opposed to the age 60 rule, but it is very clear that Capt. Al Haynes supports the age 60 rule and wants it to remain in place.

This issue has been studied to death. We do not need to waste more dollars and the precious resources of the National Transportation Safety Board on another study. In 1979 Congress directed NIH to study the age 60 rule. The National Transportation Safety Board Chairman Hall recently wrote that inexperience, not age, is the leading cause of aviation accidents.

The FAA’s latest study released in 1993 showed that accidents declined to their safest level at age 55 and remained at that level until the age of 63. Now that study also showed that the highest risk age category was from 24 years old to 39 years old, and it stated and I quote: ‘‘In all of our analyses, we saw no hint of an increase in the accident rate for pilots of scheduled air carriers as they neared their 60th birthday.”

Further, accident data collected by the National Transportation Safety Board confirms that inexpensiveness, not age, is the leading cause of aviation accidents.

When we really need to know what caused an accident, we do not call the FAA. We call the NTSB. They have worldwide respect in their knowledge of what causes accidents. So it is only natural to ask the NTSB to make this kind of study and report to the FAA and look at it. Why does the FAA insist so stubbornly on retaining this rule?

I think it is time to really fully examine the relationship between age and performance and explore alternatives to the age 60 rule. Our friends on the other side of the Atlantic are already moving in this direction. Additionally, foreign carriers are allowed to fly under less restrictive age rules through and into U.S. airspace in America. This is absurd. Vote ‘‘no’’ on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, has 3 minutes remaining and the right to close, and the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. COLLINS], has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I only wanted to say to my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has done what he should have done with NTSB. He has agreed to their request for hearings. Let me tell all of my colleagues why this amendment is important. The safety studies are already in progress by NT SB. They are
not going to get any more money by doing this study. In progress, they
have emergency evacuation of commercial aviation under aviation; under
highways they have a child-passenger protection study; a study of passive grade-
crossing study; Venetian blinds; safety bus and safety vehicle; belt study; a fishing vessel
safety study; evacuation damage prevention for pipeline safety; safety at
passage grade crossings and rail safety.

In addition to that, at the moment they have 24 ongoing major accident
investigations of transportation; 8 of them are in aviation. We are not going to give them more re-
sources, but we are going to ask them more or less let us do another study.
That is the reason I think the gentle-
man from Georgia's amendment is
appropriate at this point in time. If we
want to have people do more studies,
we are going to have to pay for it. Is
that not what we all said when we talk
about a balanced budget? I think the
gentleman from Georgia's amendment is
a good one and I recommend it to my
colleagues.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1
minute to the gentleman from Califor-
nia [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreci-
ate the gentleman yielding me the
time.

Mr. Chairman, let me make several
points. There is nothing magic about the
date. As strictly an arbitrary age we
can pick 59, we can pick 50 or
70. It is arbitrary. People are living
longer and more productive lives. All
common carrier planes have to have at
least two pilots. A heart attack will
not cause the plane to go down and
they also, most of them, have a flight
physical. No other profession requires
the termination of their careers at age
60, not the railroad engineer, not a bus
driver, not a truck driver, not a physi-
cian, a nurse. Age 60 is not consistent
with the Age Discrimination in Em-
ployment Act which states that ability,
not age, should determine an indi-
vidual's qualifications for getting and
keeping a job.

These pilots are willing to subject
themselves to rigorous medical or
physical tests in order to keep flying.
That should be what determines wheth-
er they are qualified to fly or not is if
they are physically capable of doing so.
I urge my colleagues to oppose this
amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1
minute to the gentleman from Califor-
nia [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I
reluctantly oppose the gentleman from
Georgia's amendment. Let me tell
Members why. I am not asking to let
STORM THURMOND fly, but in my experi-
ence, I can name a dozen people that
are flying in air shows right now at
that age that are pulling minus 5 G's
and doing every day. After going through a rigorous examination, an
annual physical. They even check for
drug and alcohol, for eye, for heart, for
sonograms, and that picks out what it
is. If my colleagues ask me, with my
experience, what flying requires, if I
am going to fly with a young pilot or an
experienced pilot, I am going to take the experienced pilot because in
the long run that is going to be safe.
Mr. Chairman, I do not think we know Members have good intentions on
this amendment, that age 60 should
limit someone. When we talk about it
is a wasted study, when we are talking
about taking someone's livelihood,
that is not proportionate to the safety
erected. That is wrong and I oppose the
amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to
a Member who will be so convincing,
the next Senator, the gentleman from
Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I
thank the gentleman for yielding me
the time, and I hope I can meet up to
your chairman's expectations.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to
the amendment, based on a couple of
reasons. First of all, my good friend
from Minnesota said that we have stud-
ied this forever and we agree about 99
percent of what we need to do with the
FAA. But the problem is, there is no
data to study. We do not have any pi-
lots in this country flying commercial airlines over the age of 60 because the
law has prohibited it for 37 years. So it
is very difficult to study the perform-
ance of people over the age of 60 if you
do not let them fly in the first place.

So in order to reach some kind of
a logical agreement, I agree with the
gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOLF],
the vote was tonight to raise the age
limit. I think I would be opposed to it
simply because we do not have the data
available to do it. All that the chair-
man is asking us to do is to try to look
at other countries that are allowing
commercial airline pilots over the age
of 60 to perform, to see how they meet
the safety standards, to see how they
stack up, to see what their accident rate
is, and then perhaps the NTSB, working with FAA can make the proper
decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on
the amendment offered by the gen-
tleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].
The question was taken; and the
vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—aye 193, noes 212,
not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]  
AYES—193

Akerbohm
Andrews
Andresen
Arnold
Baker
Baladeci
Ballenger
Barrett
Barcelon
Bencen
Benson
Bensken
Berman
Boswell
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brock
Cardin
Chapman
Clark
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Corner
Costello
Coyne
Cranney
Cumming
Dannenhofe
de la Garza
Deals
Dea, auro
Delums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dowd
Dubin
Edwards
Edwards
Engel
Ensign

ESHO
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Flohr
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frank (MI)
Freeman
Freeman
Gerson
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hal (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Higginbothan
Hinchen
Hoyt
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (TX)

MCHALE
McIntosh
McNamara
Meehan
Menendez
Millet
Morr
Milestone
Murray
Mink
Mink
Moor
Mote
Mollahan
Montgomery
Morgan
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Oberstar
Ole
Oliver
Onore
Orton
Owens
Palone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (NY)
Pet
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Poe
Polk
Portman
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivera
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sablan
Sanders
Sawyer
Schurter
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shuster
Siski
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stemholm
Stokes
and GREENWOOD changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”
Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. BALDACCI changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.
The Clerk will designate the amendment.
The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.
A recorded vote was ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 162, noes 238, not voting 33, as follows:

| AYES—162 |

| Abercrombie | Ballenger |
| Andrews | Barrett (NE) |
| Baer | Barrett (WI) |
| Bacam | Barton |
| Bacon | Bateson |
| Baker | Bateman |
| Baker (NE) | Baxter |
| Ball | Bayes-

...
So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Andrews], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayeys 123, noes 280, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—123

Abercrombie (HI) Frank (MA) Frank (RI) Moakley
Baldacci (MA) Napolitano
Barcia (MA) Neal
Bartlett (RI) Gonzalez
Beccera (CA) Gonzalez
Bellon (NY) Ortiz
Berman (NY) Foster
Bonior (NY) Payne (NJ)
Brown (GA) Hoyer
Brown (OH) Jackson (OH) Polk
Chapman (CA) Jackson (GA) Rangel
Clay (OH) Richardson
Clayton (DE) Johnson (NJ)
Clayburn (WA) Johnson (E.B.)
Cochran (MS) Kennedy (MA)
Conyers (GA) Kennedy
Coyne (IA) Kildee
Cummings (MD) Kileczka
DeFazio (NY) LaFalce
DeLauro (CT) Lantos
Delums (SC) Levine
Deutsch (PA) Lewis (GA)
Dicks (WA) Lowey
Dingell (MI) Markey
Dixon (CA) Markham
Dooley (GA) McDermott
Doyle (PA) McHale
Drews (IL) McKinley
Engel (NY) McNulty
English (VA) Meehan
Evans (GA) Meeks
Farr (CA) Menendez
Fattah (PA) Millender
Field (LA) Milliken
Filner (CA) Mink

Crapo (WY) Johnson (SD)
Crummen (WI) Johnson, Sam
Cubin (WY) Jones
Cunningham (CO) Kauderer
Danner (OR) Kasich
Davis (GA) Kennedy (RI)
Davila de la Garza (TX) Kennedy
Deal (GA) Kim
Del. lay (FL) King
Del. az-Balat (CA) Kingston
Dickey (MA) Klink
Dole (IL) Kluczynski
Dornan (CA) Knollenberg
Dreier (NY) Kolbe
Duncan (TN) Latham
Dunham (MS) Lathrop
Dunn (WI) Laythco
Durbin (IL) LaTorette
Ehlers (MI) Laughlin
Ensign (NV) Lazio
Eshoo (MD) Leahy
Everett (MA) Lewis (CA)
Ewing (MD) Lewis (KY)
Fawell (GA) Lightfoot
Fields (TX) Lipski
Flanagan (IL) Livingston
Foley (NY) Longo
Forbes (NY) LoBiondo
Franks (CT) Longely
Franks (N.J.) Maloney
Frelighhuysen (NJ) Manzullo
Frisa (NJ) Martini
Furth (NJ) McCarthy
Gallagher (NY) Ganske
Gates (MD) Gegler
Gehr (AL) Geren
Gilchrest (MD) Gillman
Gillmor (OH) Gilmore
Goodlatte (VA) Goodling
Gossett (GA) Goss
Graham (NC) Gramm
Greene (UT) Greenberg
Guinke (NC) Guin
Hale (TX) Hall
Hamilton (MD) Hancock
Hansen (WA) Hansen
Hastert (IL) Haskell
Hastings (WA) Neumann
Hayworth (NY) Ney
Hefner (OK) Nussle
Heineman (ID) Oberstar
Herger (CA) Heron
Hillrey (IN) Hill\nHokestra (NE) Hoekstra
Hopper (AR) Horn
Hosch (MN) Hoyer
Hostetler (OH) Hostetler
Hunter (CA) Hunter
Hutchinson (KS) Hutchinson
Hyde (NJ) Hyde
Inglish (GA) Ingold
Issa (CA) Inskeep
Johnson (CT) Johnson (GA)

NOT VOTING—30

Ackerman (NY) Hayes
Brewster (NY) Houghton
Bryant (TX) Jacobs
Flake (GA) Lincoln
Fogliosi (NY) Linder
Fondren (GA) Martinez
Gebhardt (AZ) Vargas
Gutierrez (TX) Velasquez
Hall (OH) Vellon
Hatcher (AL) Vickers
Hayes (OK) Werner
Hagedorn (MD) Wexler
Hoffman (TX) White
Johnson (TX) Young

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Collins], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayeys 247, noes 159, not voting 27, as follows:

AYES—247

Abercrombie (NC) Ehrlich
Andrew (NY) Engel
Bachus (GA) Lucas
Bachus (WY) Ensign
Baladacci (RI) Eshoo
Barcia (MA) Evans
Bar (GA) Everett
Barr (CA) Farr
Bartlett (RI) Martinek
Becerra (CA) Garcia
Becerra (CA) Garcia
Bell (WI) Green
Bengson (WA) Grimm
Beyar (NJ) Goodlatte
Brown (NC) Goodling
Brownback (KS) Gottlieb
Brown (FL) Graf
Browder (MD) Grimm
Brown (OH) Grothman
Brown (CA) Furse
Brownsberger (PA) Gejdenson
Bulilson (CA) Gekas
Burke (NY) Gekas
Burke (NY) Gekas
Buster (WA) Gekas
Byrne (NJ) Gekas
Cai (CA) Gekas
Califano (NY) Gekas
Camden (NJ) Gekas
Campbell (TX) Gekas
Campbell (TX) Gekas
Camp (WY) Gekas
Carter (GA) Gekas
Chabot (CA) Gekas
Chambliss (TN) Gekas
Chambers (FL) Gekas
Chapman (MA) Gekas
Chenoweth (OK) Gekas
Park (TX) Gekas
Pennsylvania (PA) Gekas
Penn (WI) Gekas
Porter (CA) Gekas
Porter (CA) Gekas
Powell (IN) Gekas
Price (GA) Gekas
Pyre (GA) Gekas
Quillen (TX) Gekas
Quinn (GA) Gekas
Reid (RI) Gekas
Riggs (TX) Gekas
Roberts (CA) Gekas
Rogers (IN) Gekas
Rohrabacher (CA) Gekas
Roth (CA) Gekas
Royce (CA) Gekas
Ryburn (OH) Gekas
Sanford (FL) Gekas
Sawyer (NY) Gekas
Saxton (OH) Gekas
Schaffer (PA) Gekas
Schiff (CA) Gekas
Seastad (NV) Gekas
Sensenbrenner (WI) Gekas
Shadegg (AZ) Gekas
Shaw (OH) Gekas
Shays (CT) Gekas
Shuster (CA) Gekas
Skaggs (ND) Gekas
Skakel (CT) Gekas
Slaughter (CA) Gekas
Smith (MI) Gekas
Smith (WV) Gekas
Smith (WY) Gekas
Smith (WY) Gekas
Souders (PA) Gekas
Spence (FL) Gekas
Spratt (SC) Gekas
Steinholm (CO) Gekas
Stump (MS) Gekas
Talent (ID) Gekas
Tanner (WV) Gekas
Tate (AL) Gekas
Taulb (CA) Gekas
Tejada (CA) Gekas
Tejada (CA) Gekas
Tejada (CA) Gekas
Tejada (CA) Gekas
Tejada (CA) Gekas
Tejada (CA) Gekas
Thomas (GA) Gekas
Thornberry (TX) Gekas
Thurmond (SC) Gekas
Thurmond (SC) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Tilden (CA) Gekas
Wamp (VA) Gekas
Warner (NY) Gekas
Wattenbarger (CA) Gekas
Weinberger (CA) Gekas
Welch (WY) Gekas
White (CO) Gekas
White (VI) Gekas
Wilkerson (CT) Gekas
Wilson (MS) Gekas
Woolley (WY) Gekas

VOICES—159

Ackerman (NJ) Hayes
Brewster (NY) Houghton
Bryant (TX) Jacobs
Flake (GA) Lincoln
Fogliosi (NY) Linder
Fosdell (CA) Martinez
Gebhardt (AZ) Vargas
Gutierrez (TX) Velasquez
Hall (OH) Vellon

NOT VOTING—30

Ackerman (NY) Hayes
Brewster (NY) Houghton
Bryant (TX) Jacobs
Flake (GA) Lincoln
Fogliosi (NY) Linder
Fosdell (CA) Martinez
Gebhardt (AZ) Vargas
Gutierrez (TX) Velasquez
Hall (OH) Vellon

MESSRS. DINGELL, DOOLEY of California, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed their vote from "no" to "aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3675, the fiscal year 97 Transportation Appropriations bill and would urge my colleagues to support its passage today.

I do, however, want to register my concerns about the omission from this bill of funding for the Alameda Corridor under sections 503 and 505 of the Railroad Revitalization Act of 1976. This $2 billion project construct service on 90 miles of rail with 200 grade crossings into a single 20-mile grade separated system. The corridor will link the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach with the National Railroad System and widen and improve the truck route parallel to the railroad facility. This is vital to the local economy.

The Alameda Corridor will mitigate traffic congestion and pollution, enhance the competitiveness of the San Pedro ports, bring jobs to a hard-pressed region, and enhance redevelopment along the corridor. These are important local benefits. But it is essential that Members from California understand the national significance of the Alameda Corridor Project.

The current value of trade traveling through the San Pedro Bay ports is estimated today at $116 billion annually. This trade generates 2.5 million jobs, $14 billion Federal taxes, and over $5 billion in State and local revenues. One need only look at some of the regional figures included in those estimates to understand the significance of the corridor project to the Nation.

The estimated value of Atlantic seaboard region trade traveling through the San Pedro Bay ports totals $14.9 billion; in the Great Lakes region $16.6 billion; in the South East region $5 billion. Jobs related to these trade figures number in the hundreds of thousands, and State and local revenues in the hundreds of millions.

Forecasts of the projected growth of U.S.-Pacific rim trade consistently project a doubling of trade volumes over the next 15-20 years. We cannot take full advantage of this expanded growth by depending on freight traveling at speeds of 5 miles an hour—as it now is apt to do along the Alameda Corridor. This situation will be exacerbated as train traffic along the corridor grows from its current 29 trains per day to an expected 97 trains by the year 2020.

It is seldom that we encounter a project that makes greater sense from a local, State, and national standpoint.

The Transportation Appropriations bill also includes $90 million for further design and construction of segment 3 of the metro rail red line. While this is significantly less than the Federal Transit Administration’s recommendation and the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s (MTA) request, we recognize the number of worthy projects competing for tight Federal dollars. I am also well aware of the committee’s concern about a number of matters associated with the corridor construction. I am gratified by the committee’s continued support of the Los Angeles subway and its expectation that, under new leadership, any outstanding problems facing the project will be overcome.

A broad-based bipartisan coalition of elected officials, and business and community leaders support the L.A. MATS’s efforts to implement our comprehensive transportation plan. That plan includes combining heavy-rail subway, at grade light-rail, commuter and bus service. The People of Los Angeles have levied a one-cent sales tax on themselves to

Mr. PACKARD and Mr. PAXON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk reads as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997.”
Amtrak last year, which passed the House by brought a bill before the House to reauthorize path off of operating support. Additionally, for the last 2 years have put Amtrak on a glide stage with regard to our national rail pas-

Are we being penny wise and pound foolish? Trains are an important travel option for senior citizens, the disabled, and for persons with medical conditions that prevent them from flying. Amtrak’s goal is to operate an efficient rail passenger system that does not have to de-
opend on Federal dollars, and it has a business plan to accomplish this goal by the year 2002. Until that time, Amtrak needs Government support in order to successfully achieve its goal. By putting Amtrak in jeopardy of losing its national passenger rail-

lack significant transportation options. Access to metro rail will not merely enhance the daily lives of these residents, it will also enable many to easily travel to other job rich areas of Los Angeles County.

With the Los Angeles area continuing to re-

cover from a stubborn recession, L.A.’s metro rail also provides thousands of needed jobs to residents of the area, with Federal dollars leveraging local and private funding vital to ex-

pansion of the local economy. Last year, 15,000 jobs were created through metro rail construc-

tion, and the MTA estimates that over 100,000 jobs will be created by the time the metro rail is complete.

The Alameda Corridor and the metro rail sys-

The Alameda Corridor is the economy, not politics. Members from both sides of the aisle have fought hard for the program in the Democratic-led 103d Congress as well as the Republican-led 104th. The adminis-

Mr. CHAIRMAN, let us not forget that if Am-

Mr. Chairman, let us not forget that if Am-

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to draw my colleagues at-

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to draw my colleagues at-

We are all aware that the budget resolutions for the last 2 years have put Amtrak on a glide path off of operating support. Additionally, after months of hearings and deliberations, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee brought a bill before the House to reauthorize Amtrak last year, which passed the House by a vote of 406 to 4. The House-passed bill also constructs a gradual phase out of Amtrak’s operating support by 2002. Moreover, Am-

Drastic cuts in Federal funding of Amtrak will result in the decline and the eventual elimination of this railroad sys-

Amtrak will not be able to continue its present level of service under the funding lev-

els in this appropriations bill. The railroad would be forced to discontinue a number of routes and many workers would lose their jobs. Amtrak employs more than 25,000 peo-

ple. The rails in our port cities, and the trains that serve our ports, local municipalities and railroad users.
As we debate this measure it is particularly important for Members to focus on assuring that Federal policy continues to help address the mounting infrastructure needs and transportation priorities of major cities such as Chicago.

It is the opinion of this Member that the miniscule increases offered by the Gingrich-Army budget simply do not keep pace with the Nation’s transportation needs. And that, Mr. Chairman, is very disheartening.

Furthermore, it is outrageous that this Republican proposal which is nearly $170 million below the administration’s request is flawed. It is asking States and municipalities to do a whole lot more with a whole lot less. And while they do, their transportation systems are falling apart. Our cities cannot continue bearing the heavy economic burden of attracting residents back to our urban areas without the continued assistance of the Federal Government.

In the Chicago metropolitan area the funding for transportation initiatives such as improvements to the Chicago Transit Authority’s bus and rail fleet and other street and road repair projects would go far in increasing the economic base of the area. This requires a lot more assistance than that this Members propose. And that Mr. Chairman, is why I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 3675.

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Chairman, funding America’s transportation needs is absolutely essential to the viability of our nation’s business and industry. And for the most part, the House 1997 transportation spending bill recognizes this national priority for economic expansion and job creation. While the bill is $50 million below President Clinton’s request for 1997, and more than $1 billion below 1995 levels which represent an increase of about $150 million from current year levels.

Yet despite this significant increase, this bill eliminates funding for one of the most important and successful transportation projects in this country. Amtrak’s Northeast Corridor Improvement Project will speed travel between Washington and Boston; alleviate airport and highway congestion and the associated environmental problems; and create jobs.

The Transportation Committee recommended the elimination of Amtrak corridor improvement funds for 1997 because of the belief that Amtrak had a backlog of unspent funds due to unavoidable project slowdowns. Yet these funds will be expended by the end of the year. If this happens, Amtrak will not have money to complete Northeast corridor projects needed to bring high-speed rail to America.

We’ll have the opportunity to fix these cuts when the House and the other body meet to work out differences between our respective transportation spending bills. But the cuts in the House bill are harmful to America’s workers, harmful to consumers, and harmful to our business. Nearly every Member of the House of Representatives, myself included, supported Amtrak’s efforts to end Federal operating sub-
sidies for Amtrak by the year 2002. Yet these cuts are $1.2 billion below what Amtrak needs for operating self-sufficiency until the phase-out of subsidies. We cannot expect them to continue to operate a national system given these deep cuts.

Amtrak needs to invest in order to strengthen future business prospects. Creating the high-speed corridor in the Northeast is just one example of how Amtrak can run more like a private business and create jobs and economic growth in this country. Let’s hope they don’t get the job done so that they can operate more like other businesses. Let’s not be shortsighted in our obligation to ensure that Americans have the best transportation system in the world.

Ms. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, Metropolitan Atlanta is the fastest growing major metropolitan area in the nation. DeKalb County, a major part of metropolitan Atlanta, is the second most populated county in the State of Georgia, with 577,877 residents in 1994 and a projected growth to 719,761 residents by the year 2010. This growth is bound to exacerbate current transportation needs and create a very inefficient public transportation system.

Regarding the modes of transportation used in DeKalb County, 75 percent of commuters drive alone and only 8 percent use public transportation to reach their work on a daily basis. Most of DeKalb’s residents work within the county. Clearly these present factors contribute to the daily traffic jams that occur throughout the populated communities of DeKalb County.

While the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority’s [MARTA] rail system serves the city of Atlanta, only two lines are dedicated to serve DeKalb County, and the vast number of rail stations exists outside DeKalb County. For these reasons, I requested $1 million to be included in H.R. 3675 to conduct a study exploring the feasibility of a light-rail line in DeKalb County. This study will examine the impact of the line and its effect on the surrounding communities. Among the institutions and communities that will benefit from the MARTA extension are the Emory community that comes to the university, the Center for Disease Control, several other prominent health institutions, and the residential area of South DeKalb. One excellent possibility would be a rail line connecting the Lindbergh Station on the current North-Northeast-South Line nexus with the East Line at East Lake Station and extending into Southern DeKalb County to DeKalb College South Station. Such a line would be a vital connection between these important areas.

Thus, to ensure the future vitality of Metro Atlanta, we must continue to explore new ways of transporting its residents. I commend the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this bill, and for their efforts to meet the transportation needs of America’s fastest growing metropolitan area.

Mr. MARKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3675, the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. I am particularly concerned about the drastic cuts that are proposed for Amtrak. Under H.R. 3675, the Northeast corridor improvement program would receive no funding for fiscal year 1997.

Last year, Congress provided Amtrak with critical assistance and operating assistance budgets would be cut by a total of $173 million compared to last year. This will have a devastating impact on railroad service in the Northeast corridor and, therefore, on travelers in New England.

It should be clear by now that Congress intends Amtrak to be self-sufficient by fiscal year 2002. Last year, the House of Representatives approved a reauthorization bill for Amtrak which gradually phases support by the year 2002. In addition, the fiscal year 1997 budget resolution places Amtrak on a glidepath toward self-sufficiency. However, with the proposed level of funding for fiscal year 1997, Congress has moved away from the blueprint envisioned in the budget resolution and in last year’s reauthorization bill. Amtrak’s funding levels from 1995 to 1997 are $1.2 billion less than what they indicated was necessary for operating self-sufficiency.

Railroads are capital intensive operations, and yet Congress has kept Amtrak on a slim fast capital diet for the better part of its 25-year existence. Without adequate capital funds during this critical transition period, Amtrak cannot make the essential investments necessary to survive once Congress has provided its last dollar of operating support. Amtrak will continue to operate a national system given the capital intensive operations. Nearly every Member of the House of Representatives, myself included, supported Amtrak’s efforts to end Federal operating subsidies for Amtrak by the year 2002. Yet these cuts are $1.2 billion below what Amtrak needs for operating self-sufficiency until the phase-out of subsidies. We cannot expect them to continue to operate a national system given these deep cuts.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 3675, the Fiscal Year 1997 Transportation Appropriations Act. For the second consecutive year, Chairman Wolf and the House Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee have produced an excellent bill that builds America’s infrastructure while helping to balance the Federal budget.

While there are many fine provisions contained in this bill, there is one provision of particular concern to my constituents: The provision to which I am referring is a $1 million appropriation for the West Trenton Line in New Jersey. This appropriation is a major step forward in restoring commuter service on this line.

The West Trenton Line would provide transit service to southern and central Somerset County as well as the northern and western portions of Mercer County. It is expected to provide service to 1,750 commuters a day by 2015. The service would be offered from West Trenton to Bound Brook. The train would then continue to the Raritan Valley Line and terminate at Newark. Passengers traveling south could board SEPTA trains to Philadelphia or other points in Pennsylvania. In fact, there are plans
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to have future coordination with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation to eventually extend the line into Bucks County.

I believe restoring the line makes sense for a number of reasons. First, it would provide cost-effective relief from traffic congestion along I-276, I-476, and 22, which serves Chester County's highway system is already overburdened and building new roads or expanding existing ones is a costly and potentially difficult proposition. Additionally, the line would help the state meet its Clean Air Act mandates, and improve the current 1.08 average vehicle occupancy for this area—which is the lowest in the State.

While a large number of residents in this area go to work everyday to Philadelphia, Trenton, Norristown, or New York, there is no scheduled public transportation. This was not always the case. The West Trenton Line was established in the 19th century and continued under various owners until 1982. Unfortunately, service was terminated in 1982 because of declining ridership due to the state-owned bus service, poor on-time performance, and infrequent service. The line is now used by Conrail as a freight line.

Much has changed since the line stopped carrying passengers 14 years ago. The population of the township of Hillsborough alone has experienced a 51-percent increase in population from 1980 to 1990. According to NJ transit, the government entity which would operate this line, a total of 104,000 people now reside in the West Trenton corridor. This project enjoys the support of many groups, including: the Union County Transportation Advisory Board, the Lower Bucks County Transportation Coalition, the Mercer County Planning Board, the Greater Princeton Transportation Management Association, the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce, the Somerset County Environmental Stewardship Council of the Pohatcong Valley, Inc., the West Trenton Coalition, and the Middlesex County Planning Board. Moreover, I thank Mayor Ken Scherer of Hillsborough, NJ, and Barbara Roos, president of the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce, for coming to Washington, DC, and by so doing in support of this project, I believe their testimony was crucial in finally getting this project off the ground.

Mr. Chairman, I support this project because of its positive benefits regarding economic cost effectiveness, energy efficiency, congestion mitigation, and safety. I urge my colleagues to vote “aye” on this important bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to the bill, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PETRI] having assumed the chair, Mr. BERERUTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having considered the bill, (H.R. 3675), making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 462, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule IV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 2, not voting 29, as follows:

```
[Roll No. 292]
YEAS—403

Abercrumbie, Conyers, Cooley, Andrews, Conyers, Costello, Archer, Cox, Armaye, Bachus, Cramer, Baez, Crane, Baker (CA), Crapo, Baker (LA), Cremeans, Baldacci, Cubin, Baldieri, Cummings, Barcia, Cunningham Bass, Danner, Barrett (NE), Barrett (WI), Bartlett, Deal, Bates, Deer, Bass, DeLorio, Baxter, DeLeuw, Bentsen, Deutsch, Berman, Dick, Billings, Bilirakis, Billy, Dickerson, Bono, Bircher, Bilirakis, Boulter, Blaylock, Boren, Billy, Bronson, Borski, Borden, Brown, Boudreau, Brown (CA), Brown (FL), Brown (OH), Brownback, Bryant (TN), Bryant, Burr, Burton, Burr, Buyer, Bypass, Fattah, Calahan, Fawel, Calvert, Fazio, Campbell, Fields (LA), Campbell, Fields (TX), Canady, Filner, Cardin, Flanagan, Chad, Forbes, Chabot, Ford, Chapland, Fowler, Chenoweth, Frank (MA), Chrysler, Frank (WI), Clay, Frank (NJ), Clayton, Frelinghuysen, Cleland, Frost, Clyburn, Funderburk, Coburn, Fusse, Coleman, Gaek, Collins (GA), Collins (IL), Collins (MI), Combest, Gilchrist, Condit, Gillmor, Laughlin, Lazio, Leah, Levin, Lewis (CA), Lewis (GA), Lightfoot, Lindsey, Livingston, Lofgren, Longley, Lucas, Luther, Maloney, Manton, Mansuelle, Martin, Marx, Mascara, Matsui, McCarthy, McCullum, Mc Dermott, McHale, McHugh, McNinch, Mcelhinny, McNulty, Mcnulty, McGovern, Meek, Meeks, Menendez, Metcalfe, Meyers, Meng, Moore, Molina, Montgomery, Moorhead, Morse, Morella, Murtha, Myers, Myrick, Nadler, Nebch, Nethercutt, Neumann, Ney, Ney

NAYS—2

Belenson, Schroeder

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman, Blute, Brewster, Bryant (TX), Flake, Fogleild, Gossard, Gibbons, Gullitter, Hall (OH)

Agreed to as ordered above.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE
A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1880. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 102
we sense Republicans are running away from the issue faster than Madalyn Murray O'Hair from a revival meeting. There is a good chance the GOP will largely ignore a campaign strategy of the pro-homosexual, including his recent endorsement of intrusive legislation that would inject "sexual orientation" into employment and landlord-tenant relations. Even the Christian Coalition, we fear, may not use its influence to make Clinton's pro-homosexual record a major campaign issue in the upcoming election.

Compounding the problem is a skillful homosexual propaganda strategy that labels anyone who opposes "gay" activism an "extremist" or a "bigot." It is no accident that the pro-gay group PFLAG has targeted Christian Coalition leader Pat Robertson with its $625,000 broad campaign linking Christian leaders with heinous violence and suicidal youth (see page 8). And now the Human Rights Campaign, a homosexual lobby, has proclaimed that three GOP presidential contenders—Buchanan, DORNAN, and Gramm—are "HRC-designated extremists". (page 12) Let's see: Phil Gramm, anti-gay extremist. Can there be any hyperbole more to intimate critics and stifle debate? We are hardly shocked that the homosexual lobby would attempt to marginalize its foes, but it is telling that even some "pro-family" leaders would stigmatize those of a different sexual orientation, or are at least shying away from this critical issue. Two years ago, Bill Bennett sent an ominous signal when speaking at a Christian Coalition convention he chastised conservatives who "obsess" on homosexuality. The much respected Bennett was dead wrong in this case. What he did was the political equivalent of what proper arterial repair is on the fetus. Yet his putdown spoke volumes about the way Washington insiders, versus everyday Americans, perceive this troubling issue.

We understand why Bennett, like many Washington politicos, would rather downplay homosexual-related matters. Unfortunately, gay activists aren't so accommodating. In fact, they are spending millions to, in effect, normalize the homosexual lifestyle. A decade ago, their call was for tolerance. Now, as Ben Bradlee's credo "the truth is that he served so well, the eulogy in content but uniform in affection, appreciation, and sense of personal loss. A veteran member of this House observed the tribute to Bill was the most far reaching in terms of both time and members that has been witnessed in recent times. Mr. Speaker, just 2 days ago, Member of this body rose in an outpouring of personal tribute to our late colleague; the comments diverse in content but uniform in affection, appreciation, and sense of personal loss. A veteran member of this House observed the tribute to Bill was the most far reaching in terms of both time and members that has been witnessed in recent times. Mr. Speaker, the American Heritage Dictionary defines "eulogy" as a public tribute or speech extolling the virtues or achievements of a person and honoring one recently deceased. The eulogy for Bill was given by his longtime friend and trusted assistant, Lloyd Smith, and in his remarks, Lloyd provided us with a fitting tribute to Bill so fitting to our celebration of his life. In behalf of the Speaker and all of those present, we thank Lloyd for his most fitting, appropriate and comforting tribute.

I commend to my colleagues and to the citizens of his beloved Eighth Congressional District and this country that he served so well, the eulogy in behalf of our friend, the Honorable Bill
Emerson, Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri.

The eulogy referred to is as follows:

Marie, Jo Ann, Liz, Abby, Tori, Kathryn, Mr Speaker, Colleagues and the many friends of Bill Emerson, both here in this beautiful Capitol building and throughout our country—indeed, around the world—we express our deep pain and our gratitude today.

In his address, the late Congressman Bill Emerson expressed his deep sorrow at the loss of a wonderful son, Bill, and his loving companion, Liz.

Emerson was a true giant in the world of politics, having served in Congress for many years. His dedication to public service and his commitment to his constituents were unmatched.

Emerson was also known for his strong political views, which he advocated for throughout his career. He was a Democrat who worked hard to represent the interests of his constituents.

Emerson's legacy will live on, and his contributions to our country will be remembered for generations to come.

Thank you for your service, Congressman Bill Emerson. You will be greatly missed.
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REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1462

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1462.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to second the comments made by my dear friend, the gentleman from Kansas, about the services for Bill Emerson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE CONSTANCE A. MORELLA TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH MONDAY, JULY 8, 1996

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

WASHINGTON, DC
June 27, 1996

I hereby designate the Honorable Constance A. Morella to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolution through Monday, July 8, 1996.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JULY 9, 1996

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, July 8, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 9, 1996, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will recess until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 9, 1996.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1996

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, July 9, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, July 10, 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will recess until 9 a.m. on Wednesday, July 10, 1996.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1996, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY, BINYAMIN NETANYAHU, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, July 10, 1996, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting his Excellency, Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 1996

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 10, 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

GRANTING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE PRIVILEGE TO EXTEND AND REVISE REMARKS IN CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for today all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the Record entitled "Extension of Remarks."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ANY ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, July 8, 1996, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3158, PILOT SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business be permitted to file its report on H.R. 3158, the Pilot Small Business Technology Transfer Program Extension Act of 1996, before 4 p.m. on Wednesday, July 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Makah Tribe's proposal to hunt five gray whales a year in the Pacific Northwest has been put on hold for at least 1 year. It is my hope that it will eventually be put on hold permanently.

Today, the Clinton administration's delegation to the International Whaling Commission meeting in Aberdeen, Scotland withdrew its request for Makah whaling rights, but has indicated it will renew the request at the IWC meeting next year.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that Congress needs to hold public hearings, so we can give the Clinton administration direction on this issue. Opposition to this proposal cuts across ideological and political lines. Environmentalists, Republicans, Democrats, and even seven Makah elders question the tribe's need to renew whaling.

Yesterday, my distinguished colleague from the other side of the aisle, Mr. MILLER of California, joined with me in introducing a resolution in the Resources Committee opposing the Clinton administration's support for the gray whale hunt. The resolution passed unanimously.

Let me give some background on this issue. For centuries, the Makah Indians, who live on the Olympic Peninsula, hunted the gray whales that migrated past their villages. Seventy years ago, the hunts were abandoned when the whale population plummeted.

Only 2 years ago, gray whales were removed from the endangered species list, and since that time, a number of native groups in both the United States and Canada have eyed the hunting of the gray whale as a lucrative commercial venture.

Makah tribal leaders say they want to start hunting the gray whale again as a way of reviving their culture. They insist that the whales would be used for ceremonial and subsistence purposes—but they have also reserved the right to commercial whaling in the future.

In fact, seven elders of the Makah Tribe strongly oppose the proposal. They question the need for resuming the hunting of gray whales, and some of them have questioned the motives of the tribal officials making the request, fearing the hunt will become a commercial enterprise.

According to the June 19 edition of the Seattle Post Intelligencer, one gray whale could fetch as much as $1 million in Japan. Norwegian whaling interests have offered the tribe harpoons and a boat.

Another factor is that 13 native groups in Canada have already indicated their intention to resume whaling if the Makah Tribe is given a green light by the IWC. The Makah Tribal leaders say they want to kill only five whales a year, but if they start, how many more would be taken by other native groups? Where would it stop, once it started?

In addition to supporting the Makah request, the U.S. delegation to the IWC also supported a request by Russia to allow whaling of the
endangered bowhead whale by a native group. Meanwhile, that same delegation opposed Japan’s request for a small-scale whale hunt for scientific research. Mr. Speaker, it is plainly clear the Clinton administration has no real whaling policy.

This requirement of a coherent policy is why we definitely need to hold congressional hearings on the Clinton administration’s support of re-newing commercial whaling under the guise of Native American hunting rights.

As a member of the Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs, I intend to do everything in my power to stop this tragedy before it gets started.

I would like to close by quoting from an editorial which appeared in the June 23 Seattle Times:

By supporting the Makah bid to the IWC, the U.S. sets up an untenable double standard—Native American whaling is legitimate but Japanese whaling is not. It will get worse; tribes from Washington to the Bering Sea are sharpening their harpoons, waiting for the Makahs to get the go-ahead.

The Seattle Times editorial continues:

As creatures that routinely migrate the globe, whales demand a coherent and consistent international policy. If the world community approves the Makahs’ whale hunt, then Japan deserves the same. But the long, grim history of commercial whaling points to a tougher response: No more harpoons. Whales are for watching.

Mr. Speaker, I have the good fortune occasionally to observe gray whales from my home on Whidbey Island. The Gray Whale should be protected, not hunted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HALL of Ohio (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, after 8 p.m., on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POSHRARD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. ROSE-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LARGENT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BARR, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2487. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands in Gilpin County, Colorado.
H.R. 3525. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the Federal jurisdiction over offenses relating to damage to religious property.

□ 0119

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 8, 1996

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI), Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 192 of the 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, July 8, 1996.

Thereupon (at 1 o’clock and 16 minutes a.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 192, the House adjourned until Monday, July 8, 1996, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

198. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Order Amending the Order (F.V.93-1) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

199. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule—Spearpoint Oil Produced in the Far West; Order Amending the Order (F.V.95-985-4) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.


201. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Operating-Differential Subsidy for Bulk Cargo Vessels; Maintenance and Repair Subsidy (Maritime Administration) (RIN: 2113-A.B.27) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

202. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 96-35: Determination Under Section 2(b)(2)(D) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as Amended: People’s Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

203. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Education, transmitting notice of final priority and limitation on use of funds; Elementary School Mathematics and Science Equipment Program for the fund for the improvement of education, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(a); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

204. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priority—Postsecondary Education Program for Individuals with Disabilities, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1234b; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

205. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the agency’s report on postsecondary education programs for individuals with disabilities, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

206. A letter from the Deputy Executive Director and Chief Operating Officer, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule—Reorganization, Renumbering, and Reinvestment
of Regulations (RIN: 1212-AA.75) received June 26, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.


3878. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s “Major” final rule—Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Certification Standards for Deposit Control Gasoline Additives (FRL-5528-6) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3877. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—General Procedures for Application of the Clean Water Act’s Line-Sourcing Requirements; Removal of Jefferson County, Albany and Buffalo, New York; Twenty-eight Counties in Pennsylvania; and Hancock Counties in Michigan from the Formulated Gasoline Program (FRL-5528-6) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3876. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Withdrawal of Final Test Rule for Mesityl Oxide (FRL-5363-2) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3875. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Formation and Use of Pesticide Tolerance (FRL-5369-7) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3874. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule—Pentaerythritol Stearates; Tolerance Exemption (FRL-5381-5) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.


3871. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for the year 1995, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78ggg(c)(2); to the Committee on Commerce.

3870. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force’s proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance and defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96-45), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

3869. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force’s proposed lease of defense articles to Jordan (Transmittal No. 34-99), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3868. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity for J-sure (Transmittal No. E-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

3867. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force’s proposed lease of defense articles to Jordan (Transmittal No. 13-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3866. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy’s proposed lease of defense articles to Oman (Transmittal No. 21-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3865. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy’s proposed lease of defense articles to Israel (Transmittal No. 23-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3864. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army’s proposed lease of defense articles to United Nations (Transmittal No. 30-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3863. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army’s proposed lease of defense articles to United Nations (Transmittal No. 29-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3862. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army’s proposed lease of defense articles to United Nations (Transmittal No. 28-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3861. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army’s proposed lease of defense articles to United Nations (Transmittal No. 27-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3860. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army’s proposed lease of defense articles to United Nations (Transmittal No. 26-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3859. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army’s proposed lease of defense articles to United Nations (Transmittal No. 25-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2276(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3858. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting text of agreements in Washington, D.C. between the United States and Panama in which the United States attributes to Panama all locating service performed in or emanating from Panama in the period January through December 1994, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3857. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jetstream Model 4101 Airplanes (Docket No. 96-M-129-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA.64) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3856. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Jumbojet Model 4101 Airplanes (Docket No. 96-M-199-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA.64) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3855. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 96-M-230-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA.64) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3854. A letter from the Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F28 mark 0100 and Fokker Model F28 mark 1000 Airplanes (Docket No. 96-M-328-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA.64) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3853. A letter from the Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F28 mark 0100 and Fokker Model F28 mark 1000 Airplanes (Docket No. 96-M-328-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA.64) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3852. A letter from the Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Series Airplanes (Docket No. 96-M-230-AD) (RIN: 2120-AA.64) received June 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3851. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to redesignate the title of the National Cemetery System Director to Director of the National Cemetery System; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.
3916. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 801(1)(A), to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3917. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Part III Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous (Rev. Proc. 96-49) received June 26, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.


3919. A letter from the Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Taxpayer Distilled Spirits Used in Manufacturing (RIN: 1512-AA07) received June 26, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3920. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Taxpayer Distilled Spirits Used in Manufacturing (RIN: 1512-AA07) received June 26, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPRATT (for himself and Mr. MCCOLLUM):
H.R. 3730. A bill to take measures to protect the security of the United States from proliferation and use of weapons of mass destruction; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CALVERT (for himself, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. Bono, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HORN, and Mr. RIGGS):
H.R. 3731. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the transfer to State and local governments of certain surplus property for use for law enforcement or public safety purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. MCELHINNEY, and Mr. CHRISTY):
H.R. 3732. A bill to authorize the State of Michigan to implement the demonstration project known as To Strengthen Michigan Families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PLATT, Mr. BORELLI, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. BEREUER, Mr. HINCHIEY, Mrs. KENNELY, Mr. FARR, Mr. SABO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LAFAULCE, Mr. F RANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WOODSEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MARKY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELLO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. HORN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. STARK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. ESCH, Mr. YATES, Mr. HORN, and Mr. RANGEL):
H.R. 3733. A bill to amend the Legal Services Corporation Act to prescribe an income safety purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASICH:
H.R. 3734. A bill to provide a provision for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a)(3) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Ms. RA-LEHTIEN, Mr. J JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):
H.R. 3735. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act to authorize the development of agricultural training programs administered by the Federal Housing Administration, to reform the single family and multifamily housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 3736. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1994 to terminate the availability of community development block grant funds for States and localities within such States that allow recovery of damages suffered in the commission of a felony; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. CLEMENT):
H.R. 3737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of educational grants by private foundations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 3738. A bill to authorize the Federal unemployment benefit system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:
H.R. 3739. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide, without subsidy, for enhanced essential air service to remote insular areas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LAZIO of New York (by request):
H.R. 3740. A bill to consolidate the community and economic revitalization and affordable housing programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development into two community development funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 3741. A bill to enhance the effectiveness of enforcement provisions relating to single family and multifamily housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 3742. A bill to increase the flexibility of and to streamline certain single family programs administered by the Federal Housing Administration, to reform the single family and multifamily housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 3743. A bill to establish a single authority to administer the National Housing Act for rental and cooperative housing with five or more units and for health care facilities through consolidation of multifamily programs, authorization of risk sharing programs with private and public entities, and increased flexibility for FHA to establish program operations; to make changes to the multifamily housing programs designed for the elderly and persons with disabilities; to extend certain provisions of existing law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 3744. A bill to reauthorize the Attorney General to promulgate regulations relating to gender-related persecution, including female genital mutilation, for use in determining an alien's eligibility for withholding of deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BARCA of Michigan, Mr. HEFLY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. EHLING, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BALLenger, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KNOBBENBERG, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARR, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BAKER of Idaho, Mr. FLANAGAN, and Mr. QUILLEN):
H.R. 3745. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to minimize unfair competition for Federal contract opportunities between Federal Prison Industries and private firms, especially small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REED of Maine, Mr. BAKER of Massachusetts, Mr. PLATT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. STAHL):
H.R. 3746. A bill to amend title IX the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to make the development of brownfield sites eligible for assistance; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, 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. SCHROEDER (for herself and Mr. MARKEY):
H.R. 3747. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage economic development through the creation of community empowerment zones and enterprise communities and to encourage the cleanup of contaminated brownfield sites; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. HERGER):
H.R. 3748. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of crops destroyed by casualty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORN:
H.R. 3750. A bill to permit the interstate distribution of State-inspected meat under appropriate circumstances; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, and others):
H.R. 3751. A bill to amend the Food Safety and Quality Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study of the USDA Meat Inspection Program and the USDA Poultry Inspection Program; to the Committee on Agriculture.
Mr. Hilliard, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Johnston of Florida:
H. R. 3751. A bill to establish certain requirements for managed care plans; to the Committee on Commerce.
By Mr. Young of Alaska:
H. R. 3752. A bill to preserve the sovereign United States on public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands and acquired lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on Resources.
By Mr. Gunderson (for himself, Mr. Poshard, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Bereuter, Mr. Bonilla, Mr. Bunn of Oregon, Mr. Hilliard, Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut, Mrs. Lay of Wisconsin, Mr. Payne of Virginia, Mr. Williams, Mr. Baker of Louisiana, Mr. Barrett of Nebraska, Mr. Boehner, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clinger, Mr. Combest, Mr. Condit, Mr. Cooley, Ms. Danner, Mr. Ehlers, Mr. Evans, Mr. Fazio of California, Mr. Hall of Texas, Mr. Jackson of South Dakota, Mr. Klug, Mr. McHugh, Mr. Ney, Mr. Nussle, Mr. Peterson of Minnesota, Mr. Rahall, Mr. Ramstad, Mr. Sanders, Mr. Stupak of Michigan, Mr. Thornberry, Mr. Walsh, and Mr. Whitfield):
H. R. 3753. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Public Health Service with respect to the health of residents of rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.
By Mr. Diaz-Balart:
H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of both Houses; which was laid on the table.
By Mr. Baker of California (for himself, Mr. Calvert, and Mr. Lipinski):
H. R. 3754. Resolution relating to a question of the privileges of the House; which was agreed to.
By Mr. Goodling (for himself and Mr. McKeon):
H. R. 3755. Resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Department of Education should play a more active role in monitoring and enforcing compliance with the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 related to campus crime; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

MEMORIALS
Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:
231. By the Speaker: Memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 432 (LS) relative to congratulating and commending Ms. Bella Cruz-Aviles for being the first Chamorro woman appointed as Associate Director of Policy, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, U.S. Federal Government; to the Committee on National Security.

232. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Resolution No. 139 memorializing Congress to approve legislative authorization states to restrict the amount of solid waste they import from other States; to the Committee on Commerce.

233. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 58 (Leg), undocumented alien prisoners, to the Committee on International Relations.

234. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 99 requesting the President and Secretary of State of the United States to express disapproval of Norway for its commercial whaling policies and for the raising of its quotas on minke whales; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS
Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:
H. R. 145. Mrs. Chenoweth and Mr. Stockman.
H. R. 163. Mr. Vento.
H. R. 263. Mr. Wilson.
H. R. 324. Mr. McHale.
H. R. 387. Mr. Campbell.
H. R. 491. Mr. Gillmor, Mr. Diaz-Balart, Mr. Spence, and Mr. weldon of Pennsylvania.
H. R. 777. Mr. LoBiondo.
H. R. 778. Mr. LoBiondo.
H. R. 779. Mr. Ganske.
H. R. 881. Mr. Ganske.
H. R. 451. Mr. Solis, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Jefferson, and Mr. McNulty.
H. R. 858. Mr. Riggs and Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts.
H. R. 995. Mr. Stump, Mr. Clinger, Mr. Fazio of California, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Hostetler, Mr. Weller, Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania, Mr. Giegel, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Sanders, Mrs. Thurman, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. Hoek, Mrs. Fowler, and Mr. Frisa.
H. R. 958. Mr. LoBiondo.
H. R. 1030. Mr. Fazio of California.
H. R. 1073. Mr. Condit and Mr. Sisisky.
H. R. 1074. Mr. Condit and Mr. Sisisky.
H. R. 1078. Mr. McCollum.
H. R. 1127. Mr. Shays.
H. R. 1226. Mr. Bereuter.
H. R. 1496. Mr. McCollum.
H. R. 1532. Mr. Zimmer.
H. R. 1656. Mrs. Schroeder.
H. R. 1950. Mr. Boehlert.
H. R. 2111. Mr. Bishop, Mr. Bonior, and Mr. Condit.
H. R. 2089. Mr. Horn and Mr. Manzullo.
H. R. 2185. Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Faleomavaega, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Greenwood.
H. R. 2209. Mr. Lafalice, Mr. Pete Geren of Texas, Ms. Danner, Mr. Callahan, Mr. Ford, Mr. Berman, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. McNulty, and Mr. Hastings of Florida.
H. R. 2244. Mr. Herger.
H. R. 2247. Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut, Mr. Kleczka, and Mr. Sawyer.
H. R. 2272. Mrs. Kelly and Mr. Metcalf.
H. R. 2470. Mr. Lewis of Kentucky.
H. R. 2591. Mr. Bishop.
H. R. 2616. Mr. Dixon.
H. R. 2683. Mr. Sweeney.
H. R. 2697. Mr. Cummings, Mr. Martinez, Mr. Manton, Ms. DeLauro, and Mrs. Velazquez.
H. R. 2740. Mr. Calvert.
H. R. 2748. Ms. McKinney, Mrs. Schroeder, Ms. Norton, Mrs. Kennelly, Mrs. Thurman, Ms. Harman, Mr. Linder, and Mr. Clifton of Texas, Mr. Pallone, Ms. Velazquez, and Mr. Jefferson.
H. R. 2757. Mr. Spence, Mr. Wise, and Mr. Norwood.
H. R. 2899. Mr. Boehlert, Ms. Slaughter, and Mr. Serrano.
H. R. 2957. Mr. LoBiondo.
H. R. 2993. Mr. Nethercutt and Mr. Ehlers.
H. R. 2991. Mr. Wellon of Pennsylvania.
H. R. 3025. Mrs. Lincoln.
H. R. 3091. Mr. Gutierrez and Mr. Yates.
H. R. 2976. Ms. Brown of Florida, Mr. Hedley, and Mr. Richardson.
H. R. 2984. Mr. Bartlett of Maryland.
H. R. 2985. Mr. Ewing, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Ney, Mr. English of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Welller.
H. R. 3012. Mr. Campbell, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Baker of California, Mr. Biley, Mr. Baldacci, Mr. Metcalf, Mrs. Seastrand, Mr. Quillen, Mr. Foglietta, Mr. Stark, and Mr. Gillmor.
H. R. 3077. Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hobson, and Mr. Moran.
H. R. 3083. Mr. Downey, Mr. Cox, Mr. Radnum, Mr. Royle, and Mr. Pombo.
H. R. 3114. Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Sawyer.
H. R. 3142. Mr. Barr.
DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3, of rule XXVII the following discharge petitions were filed:


Petition 14, June 27, 1996, by Mr. Tanner on House Resolution 425, was signed by the following Members: John S. Tanner, Bill Orton, and L. F. Payne.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:


AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1462: Mr. Poshard.

H.R. 1472: Mr. Luther.

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. 3173: Ms. Norton, Mr. Fawell, Mr. Torkildsen, and Mr. Meehan.
H.R. 3187: Mr. Costello, Mr. Dilemmas, Mr. LaFalce, and Mr. McClaugh.
H.R. 3255: Mr. Chambless, Mr. Klug, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Dickey, and Mr. Campbell.
H.R. 3199: Mr. Thompson, Mr. Frank of Massachusetts, Mr. Baker, Ms. Norton, Mr. Chambless, Mr. Montgomery, and Mr. LaHood.
H.R. 3211: Mr. Delay, Mr. Buerger, and Mr. Hoke.
H.R. 3260: Mr. Barton of Texas, Mr. Dickey, and Mr. Hayes.
H.R. 3263: Mr. Foley.
H.R. 3292: Ms. Pelosi.
H.R. 3307: Mr. Heineman, Mr. Buyer, and Mr. Gallegly.
H.R. 3337: Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut and Mr. Barrett of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3358: Mr. Stenholm and Mr. Gillmor.
H.R. 3374: Mr. Stark.
H.R. 3395: Mr. Green of Texas.
H.R. 3396: Mr. Paxton.
H.R. 3449: Mr. Bryant of Tennessee.
H.R. 3452: Mr. Peterson of Minnesota.
H.R. 3486: Mr. Hansen.
H.R. 3493: Mr. Jefferson, Ms. Morella, Mr. Hastings of Florida, Ms. Furse, Mr. Baker of Louisiana, and Ms. Woolsey.
H.R. 3505: Mrs. Maloney.
H.R. 3520: Mr. Gordon and Ms. Roybal-Alldard.
H.R. 3566: Mr. Stupak.
H.R. 3569: Mr. English of Pennsylvania, Mr. Borski, Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania, Mr. Goodling, Mr. Klink, Mr. Kanjorski, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Mascara, Mr. McHale, Mr. Murtha, and Mr. Greenwood.
H.R. 3580: Mr. Spence, Mr. Hayworth, and Mr. Hastings of Washington.
H.R. 3622: Mr. Rohrabacher, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. Paxton.
H.R. 3645: Ms. Norton, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. English of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Clayton, Mr. Ehrlers, and Mr. Kildee.
H.R. 3654: Mr. Young of Alaska, Mr. Gephardt, Mr. Everett, and Ms. DeLauro.
H.R. 3665: Mr. Farr.
H.R. 3688: Mr. Lipinski.
H.R. 3715: Mrs. Meyers of Kansas, Mrs. Mink of Hawaii, Mrs. Maloney, Ms. Norton, and Mr. Gutierez.
H.R. 3725: Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Dilemmas, and Ms. McKinney.
H.R. 3727: Mr. Fields of Louisiana, Mr. Royce, Mr. Blute, and Mr. Vento.
H.R. 3729: Mr. Kildee.
H.R. 3736: Mr. Saxton, Mr. Yates, Mr. Horn, and Mr. Moran.
H.R. 3737: Mr. Faleomavaega, Mr. Funderburk, Mr. Dornan, and Ms. Longren.
H.R. 3738: Mr. Faleomavaega, Ms. Norton, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Engel.
H.R. 3740: Mr. Frost, Mr. Doyle, Mr. ZImmer, and Mr. Rohrabacher.
H.R. 3745: Mr. Packard.
H.R. 3746: Mr. Boehner, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Royce, and Mr. Speence.

OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL OF CALIFORNIA

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, APPROPRIATIONS, 1997

AMENDMENT No. Before the short title at the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . (a) In addition to any other estimates it may prepare of any proposed change in Federal revenue law, a fiscal estimate shall be prepared by the joint committee on Taxation of each such proposed change on the basis of assumptions that estimate the probable behavioral responses of personal and business taxpayers and other relevant entities to that proposed change and the dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects of that proposed change, and it shall include a statement identifying those assumptions.

The preceding sentence shall apply only to a proposed change that the joint committee on Taxation determines, pursuant to a static fiscal estimate, has a fiscal impact in excess of $100,000,000 in any fiscal year.

(b) In addition to any other estimates it may prepare of any proposed change in Federal revenue or spending law, a fiscal estimate shall be prepared by the Congressional Budget Office of each such proposed change on the basis of assumptions that estimate the probable behavioral responses of personal and business taxpayers and other relevant entities to that proposed change and the dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects of that proposed change, and it shall include a statement identifying those assumptions.

The preceding sentence shall apply only to a proposed change that the Congressional Budget Office determines, pursuant to a static fiscal estimate, has a fiscal impact in excess of $100,000,000 in any fiscal year.

(c) Any report to Congress or the public made by the joint committee on Taxation or the Congressional Budget Office that contains an estimate made under this concurrent resolution of the effect that any legislation will have on revenues or spending shall rely upon Congressional Budget Office data and shall be accompanied by a written statement fully disclosing the economic, technical, and behavioral assumptions that were made in producing that estimate.

(d) In performing the tasks specified in subsections (a) and (b), the joint committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office may, subject to the availability of appropriations, enter into contracts with universities or other private or public organizations to perform such estimations or to develop protocols and model for making such estimates.
In recognition of this significant 50-year milestone, I would also like to commend CDC for its outstanding efforts to protect women's health through preventive health services, research, and surveillance and for its important research and surveillance activities for preventing HIV/AIDS.

I congratulate the agency and its dedicated workforce, and I look forward to another 50 years of outstanding work to enhance the health of the American people.

A TRIBUTE TO ED POSHARD

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to my brother Ed Poshard who is retiring on July 31 after 36 years of service with State Farm Insurance Co.

Throughout my entire life, my brother has been a great inspiration to me, having given me the benefit of his love and wisdom since I was a small boy. I could not begin to count the benefits that have accrued to me over my lifetime as a result of my brother's influence on my life.

Some of my earliest memories as a child was Ed getting up at 4 a.m., still in his teens, packing a lunch bucket and heading out over ice slickened roads to work in the oil fields. Whatever money he made, he shared with the family, especially with my sister Jolene and me, who were still young and in school. Going into Norris City with him every Saturday morning, getting a burr haircut at Will Harlow's barber shop, and washing his car, always washing his car, for his Saturday night date were some of the highlights of my youth. He was my big brother who I always looked up to and was always proud of.

He finished high school, went to college while he was still in the Army, sent pictures to our home of far away places, told me in every letter to get a good education, and fueled my own dreams of learning and contributing to my fellow man.

But more than the dreams he inspired and the encouragement he gave and the wisdom he shared there was something else he gave me that only had to be observed. It's called work ethic and it's a little out of vogue today. But not with my brother. Ed has worked hard at everything he's done. He's worked hard at being a good husband, a good father, a good son, and a good brother. And for the folks in this room, he's worked really hard at being a good insurance agent. In fact, my brother isn't just a good insurance agent, he's a great one. He has lived and breathed and loved his work in a way few people ever do. After his family,

- This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
- Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
his first love has always been selling insurance. Late at night, early in the morning, anywhere or anytime a customer had a need, my brother would find a way to get there first and make the sale. He never sold them more than they required and he never misrepresented what they were getting. He worked hard to get their business and whenever possible people came back. He built trust in his family and he built trust in his customers and his life has been successful because of it.

In a very real sense my brother represents the best of what we stand for in this country. The old values endure. Family, honesty, hard work. I’m proud of him. I’ll always be proud of him. I hope his retirement is long and enjoyable and he and Phyllis travel to new and exciting places, watch a lot of fall sunsets over the Shawnee, and have lots of playtime with their grandchildren. He will always have my love and respect.

WATER COMING OUT OF TAPS MUST BE SAFE FOR CHILDREN TO DRINK

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the summer of 1993 taught those of us in southeastern Michigan just how quickly our lakes and rivers can be contaminated and become unsafe. It also taught that change is permanent and that we will continue to face new challenges. Right now the St. Clair River is being threatened by a proposed discharge into the St. Clair River from a plant in Canada. The proposed discharge would lead to 750 million gallons of contaminated water with nearly 160 chemical combinations being released into the very river from which many of us get our drinking water. I am working to stop this discharge from happening. While I hope it can be prevented, our communities must be able to access up-to-date drinking water standards, know the best available treatment technology and have the tools they need to construct proper drinking water treatment facilities. An improved Safe Drinking Water Act will go a long way toward providing that information and those tools. Further, it will allow every parent to know exactly what is in the water coming out of their taps before they pour a glass for their children.

It has been said that water is the key to life. Human beings should drink eight glasses of water a day according to the American Dietetic Association, but for Americans to stay healthy their water must be healthy. We cannot afford to have our drinking water contaminated with parasites like cryptosporidium which caused the death of 104 people in Milwaukee 3 years ago.

That is why it is important for Congress to renew the commitment we made some 20 years ago to ensure that the water coming out of our taps is safe to drink. By passing legislation to update the Safe Drinking Water Act, I believe we took a positive step toward renewing that commitment.

The water we are served is not perfect—and there are some parts of it I disagree with—but it will ensure the public’s right to know within 24 hours that contaminants have been discovered in their drinking water. It will for the first time give us drinking water standards for arsenic, radon and sulfate. It will give our local communities the tools they need to build proper drinking water treatment facilities. Perhaps most importantly, it will continue the landmark commitment made in 1974 when Congress first enacted the Safe Drinking Water Act. An improved Safe Drinking Water Act will go a long way toward bringing a partnership with the public health. We can all be proud.

ADD CARRIER COMPETITION TO PASSENGER AIR ROUTES BETWEEN PACIFIC ISLANDS, AMERICAN SAMOA AND HAWAII

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA
OF AMERICAN SAMOA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation which will add carrier competition to the passenger air routes between Pago Pago, American Samoa and Honolulu, HI. Mr. Speaker, the experience of the people in the territory I represent is a good example of the difficulties we Pacific Islanders face in establishing regular and reliable air transportation at a reasonable rate for passengers, vital cargo, and mail.

American Samoa is comprised of a remote group of islands located in the South Pacific Ocean. The territory is approximately 2,200 miles from the closest State in the United States, which is the State of Hawaii. With millions of square miles of open ocean surrounding our islands, air transport is not simply a faster way for travelers to get from point to point, it is often the sole and only feasible means to bridge our isolation.

Because American Samoa is a remote destination, the U.S. Department of Transportation, in an effort to assure at least minimal air service, designated Pago Pago, American Samoa as an EAS—essential air service—community on October 26, 1979. This designation recognizes that American Samoa is a remote location in need of air service on a regular basis to ensure that certain necessities are available.

The U.S. Postal Service averages between 27,000 and 30,000 pounds of mail per week for local residents. Among other vital cargo carried on this route are medical supplies such as Hepatitis B serum, hemodialysis supplies, insulin, samples requiring laboratory testing, and blood packs for rare blood types. Because ocean shipping can take up to 2 months, perishable food items such as bread, vegetables, dairy products, and meat must come in by air.

For those of us in Macomb and St. Clair Counties, these are critical, commonsense protections which will help us know when excessive sewage discharges are made into the Clinton River and Lake St. Clair. We will know if we drink radon and sulfate. It will give our down-river communities will know within 24 hours if they should shut off their water intake pipes.

The passage of this bill reminds us that our environment, the health and safety of our children, the water we drink and the air we breathe ought not to be partisan, divisive issues. There can be no cost-benefit analysis, regulatory reform, state flexibility or risk assessment which can determine the price of a healthy child or the value of a safe workplace to our community. We can never forget: we don’t just inherit this land and water from our parents—we borrow it from our children. If we continue to do the right thing and adopt common-sense environmental protections like the Safe Drinking Water Act, we will give them a future of which we can all be proud.
But when we do hear about CDC, we know we are facing an urgent crisis—but that the crisis is being handled expertly—whether it is occurrence of a mysterious infectious disease, later called Legionnaires’ disease in Philadelphia, or the first case of AIDS in San Francisco; or illness spread from food contaminated with E. coli in the States of Washington, California, Idaho, and Nevada; measles epidemics in major metropolitan areas across the United States; cryptosporidium in Milwaukee drinking water; serious illness from oysters in Florida; an outbreak of hanta virus in New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, and Colorado; the reemergence of tuberculosis as a serious health risk, especially in New York, Miami, and Los Angeles; or lead poisoning in children in Chicago and Rhode Island.

While CDC has been catapulted only recently onto suburban movie screens because it inspired “The Hot Zone,” the agency has, over its 50-year history, cooled off many hot zones with its unique expertise and capability. CDC assists governments and health officials all over the world in preventing and controlling disease and responding to crises that literally threaten the health and safety of entire populations of people—Ebola virus in Zaire; deadly chemical release in a Tokyo subway; disease-causing radioactive fallout in the Marshall Islands; outbreaks in Spain of illness from contaminated worldwide immunization efforts to prevent deadly childhood and adult illnesses such as smallpox—now completely eradicated because of these efforts; typhoid fever, and polio.

Though its origins—in Atlanta, GA—and its early mission were modest—the control of malaria in war areas—CDC quickly gained strength and prominence as the world’s emergency response team, as it formed critical and productive relationships with health officials throughout the United States and around the world. Its physicians and epidemiologists have been involved in public health activities ranging from the virtual eradication of polio from the Western hemisphere to quarantining the astronauts who first walked on the moon and examining the now-museum-housed moon rocks. Uniformed services have worked closely with American companies to help identify and solve workplace hazards and prevent worker injuries. The agency’s specialized laboratories provide unique, state-of-the-art analyses of dangerous viruses, and unidentified toxins. The National Childhood Immunization Initiative, designed to achieve full, age-appropriate vaccination of all American children, to prevent completely preventable childhood illnesses such as whooping cough, measles, mumps, rubella, and polio; a nationwide program for early detection and control of breast and cervical cancer; and a dynamic education program targeted at smoking, the Nation’s No. 1 preventable cause of illness, are all initiatives launched and still maintained by CDC.

Today, as it moves into the 21st century, and the second half of its first century, CDC is focused on the future of public health, and refocusing efforts to direct attention at problems that are just beginning, or are growing—new infectious diseases; reemergence of diseases once thought to be controlled, such as drug-resistant TB; prevention and control of birth defects and genetic diseases, such as fetal alcohol syndrome, mental retardation, and spina bifida; identification and control of environmental factors that lead to serious adverse health effects, such as radiation and environmental lead; preventing disability and early death from injury and chronic disease; collecting and analyzing data that help to understand better how to protect and promote health; and refocusing a variety of activities on special health problems of teenagers and women.

I am proud to have supported the work of CDC over many of its 50 years. Congress and the American people have entrusted one of our most precious possessions to this remarkable agency—the public health. Today, CDC employs over 13,000 dedicated people with a big and critically important task. CDC has never betrayed our trust, and has lived up to our expectations. I expect no less in the future. I congratulate CDC on this 50th birthday, and wish the agency at least 50 more, equally productive years.

IN HONOR OF REV. DR. ERMINE STEWART

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the outstanding career and 25 years of service to the Reverend Dr. Ermine Stewart. Called into the ministry in May 1956 to pastor a church in Coleyville, Jamaica, West Indies—Reverend Stewart has provided a global vision of missionary work and ministerial commitment that continues to extend itself to the New York area and beyond.

Upon his return to the United States in 1965, Reverend Stewart established a branch of the “Church of the First Born Miracle Temple, Inc.” in the United States. Over the past 31 years Reverend Stewart has witnessed the unfolding prosperity of several churches throughout New York.

Presently, the Church of the First Born has nine churches, three of which are in the United States—New York, New Jersey, and Maryland; one in the Province of Canada, and one on the Island of Jamaica. In addition to the established church branches, Reverend Stewart’s devoted efforts and ministry have spawned the Television Ministry, which can be seen on J.B.C. Television in Jamaica. Such service exemplifies Reverend Stewart’s instrumental work and institutional accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Reverend Ermine Stewart on receiving this impressive honor, and extend to him my best wishes for continued success in the ministry.

KALKASKA COUNTY’S 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. BART STUPAK
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to bring to the attention of this body, and the Nation, the 125th anniversary of the official founding of Kalkaska County, MI. In celebrating this occasion, I would like to take the opportunity to look back upon those years.

In 1855, William Copeland purchased a large tract of land, presently found between Round Lake and M–72 within which is now the Kalkaska County borders. After Mr. Copeland’s purchase, a wave of settlers were brought in to clear trees for farms and orchards. This area was first known as Wabassee. Before Kalkaska County, Kalkaska was part of Grand Traverse, Antrim and Crawford Counties. It was not until 1843 that the Wabassee area became known as Kalkaska County. In 1871, Kalkaska County residents officially organized themselves. The Village of Kalkaska became the county seat and was incorporated in 1887.

During the late 19th century, Kalkaska County became a magnet for lumberjacks, offering both success and failure to those who sought jobs. While some parts of Kalkaska County enjoyed economic booms, 13 other settlements closed down. A strong timber trade would remain until 1920, when the county’s population leveled off at 5,570 people. The timber industry spurred the development of railroads to transport the timber. From farming to timber to railroads, an economic base for Kalkaska’s development was established.

Kalkaska County also benefited economically from the spirit of mechanical innovation. Residents, such as Elmer Johnson, tinkered with the internal combustion engine, creating a few automobile prototypes in his day. One of these “Elmers” is currently displayed at the Kalkaska County Historical Museum.

Aviation was also suited to invention Kalkaska-style. Around the turn of the century, W.C. Freeman announced that he had built a flying machine and was attempting a trial flight. Unfortunately, no record exists of the success or failure of Mr. Freeman’s attempt.

During this period of timber and innovation, Kalkaska encountered several citywide fires which leveled parts of the city. Some of the more destructive and memorable fires occurred in 1908 and 1910. But the most destructive fire in Kalkaska County occurred in 1921, when the central portion of the village of South Boardman burned to the ground. This part of South Boardman has never been rebuilt.

Mr. Speaker, Kalkaska County, MI, has had wonderful and varied experiences throughout its 125-year existence. Its development has mirrored much of northern Michigan’s and on behalf of the State of Michigan and its people, I commend both past and present county and community leaders and wish Kalkaska a successful celebration and best wishes for a successful future.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TREES OF MYSTERY

HON. FRANK RIGGS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House of Representatives I am proud to represent the owners of one of the premier attractions in the entire country, the trees of mystery. Nestled among the giant redwoods of California’s north coast just north of the town of Klamath, this marvelous environment stands as a testament of how man and nature can coexist as partners.
Last week the trees of mystery celebrated its 50th anniversary. Throughout those 50 years, millions of people have had the pleasure of strolling through nature's shrine. I want to congratulate Marylee Smith and her son, John Thompson, for the foresight to preserve and protect one of the most beautiful spots on Earth.

I hope that all of my colleagues will make an opportunity, as I did last week, to view the cathedral tree, where many marriages take place, or the family tree, with each branch supporting another member of its clan, or the wonderful Native American Museum at the trees of mystery.

Thank you Maylee and John for preserving our history for future generations.

CELEBRATING IOWA'S BIRTHDAY

HON. JAMES A. LEACH
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to invite my colleagues and their families to become honorary Iowans for the next few weeks as Iowa and its sons and daughters celebrate our State’s birthday. Come to the Smithsonian’s annual Folklife Festival on the Mall to see what Iowans with midwestern understatement, are so proud of.

You will discover Iowa is a State of immigrants who have come together to make a singularly diverse community.

Our first citizens immigrated to Iowa across a land bridge joining North America with Asia and eventually became members of the approximately 17 different Indian tribes that reside in the State at various times in its early history. The Indian word meaning “the beautiful land” both describes the State and gave it its name.

Iowa’s Sauk and Mesquaki tribes were among the most powerful tribes in the upper Mississippi and legend has it that the famous Sauk chief Black Hawk’s courageous and intelligent leadership of his people contributed to Iowa becoming known as the “Hawkeye State.”

Although it is thought Spanish explorers may have reached Iowa first from the south, and earliest Europeans known to have visited what would become the State were the French explorers Father Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet. They were followed by immigrants from Germany, Sweden, Norway, Holland, and Great Britain.

In their turn came people from Ireland, Austria, Italy, and Czechoslovakia. Iowa entered the Union officially on December 28, 1846, as a free State, and prior to the Civil War African-Americans found the State a haven as part of the Underground Railway carrying them from slavery to freedom. Many African-Americans would settle in southeastern Iowa, most notably in Buxton, a community of almost 5,000 that was over 50 percent African-American. Buxton’s social and economic institutions were fully integrated decades before the country would begin to make the effort to become so and many of the town’s professionals were African-American.

Although far from the great battles of the Civil War, Iowa contributed disproportionately to the Union cause in the conflict. More than 76,000 Iowans, more per capita than any other State, served in the war. One out of five of the Iowans who enlisted lost their life in the course of the war.

Iowa perennially leads the Nation in literacy, school achievement tests and quality of life polls. Its vigorous economy has a sound basis in agri-business, small to medium manufactur- ing and a growing financial services sector. But it is the State’s people that are Iowa’s most important product.

Herbert Hoover was a renowned engineer mining wealth for his Presidency preceded the onset of the great depression. His humanitarian relief efforts, both as Chair of the American Relief Commission and U.S. Food Administrator on the War Trade Council during World War I, as co-founder of CARE and UNICEF, and as a leader of U.S. food relief efforts after World War II, are credited with saving hundreds of millions of lives.

Henry Wallace, an agronomist who helped develop hybrid corn, served as Secretary of Agriculture and then Vice President to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. An exemplar of this country’s gregarious political tradition, Wallace ran for President in 1948 as one of the most significant third party candidates in American history.

Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt’s chief-of-staff and personal emissary to Great Britain at the beginning of war, The printmaker Mauricio Lasansky found a home at the University of Iowa. His haunting depictions of the Holocaust have helped keep alive the memory of the millions lost in Nazi death camps.

Iowans have always loved the written and spoken word. The University of Iowa has long been home to the world famous Creative Writers Workshop, founded by the poet Paul Engle. The novelists Flannery O’Connor and John Irving among others too numerous to mention chose to live for a time in Iowa City and finished further workshop participation.

Iowa also claims the novelists Mackinlay Kantor and Wallace Stegner, as well as the playwright David Rabe. And two recent Pulitzer Prize winners, Jane Smiley and Jorie Graham, teach at our State universities, the former at Iowa State, the latter at the University of Iowa.

As for the press, journalists like Hugh Sidey, Harry Reasoner, Tom Brokaw, George Mills and Don Kaul have ennobled their profession with common sense, historical perspective, and thoughtful wit.

The actors Cloris Leachman and Marion Morrison—better known as that icon of American manhood John Wayne—are from Iowa, as is Donna Reed and the original superman, George Reeves. Ringling and his brothers ran away from Iowa to found a circus, and Johnny Carson is an Iowan familiar to a generation of insomniacs.

Jack Trice, Nile Kinnick, Bob Feller, Roger Craig, Dan Gable, and Gayle Hopkins are just a few of the world class athletes Iowa has produced.

Where to put Buffalo Bill Cody on a list of eminent Iowans is unclear, but he certainly belongs there. So do the Friedman twins from Sioux City, who, writing as Abigail Van Buren and Ann Landers, have touched the lives of millions of Americans.

In the final analysis, making lists like this is fun, if dangerous. Inevitably many who belong on it are overlooked.

In the law, Iowa was the first State in the Union to admit a woman to the practice of law, Arabella Mansfield, in 1869. Iowa University’s Law School was the first public law school to graduate a woman, Mary Beth Hickey, in 1873.

As for the environment, Iowans such as J. “Ding” Darling and Frederick Leopold brought early awareness of the planet’s fragility.

The arts have always been at the center of Iowa’s life. The Czechoslovakian composer Anton Dvorak spent summers in Spillville and wrote his symphony “From the New World” there. Since then, Iowa has given such classic voices as those of Simon Estes, Emmy Award winner Mary Beth Peil, and Dame Margaret Roberti, to the world’s stages. Roberti, a.k.a. Margaret Jean Nobis, opened the season at La Scala more times than Maria Callas and sang the lead in more Verdi operas than anyone in operatic history. She is the only American opera singer ever knighted by the Italian Government.

Jazz immortal Bix Beiderbecke also was from Iowa, as was bandleader Glenn Miller, Andy Williams, the original music man—Meredith Willson—and, for a time, the Violist, Sir William Primrose.

Grant Wood was born in Iowa and made the people and landscapes of his home State famous as he pioneered American regionalist art. The printmaker Mauricio Lasansky found a home at the University of Iowa. His haunting depictions of the Holocaust have helped keep alive the memory of the millions lost in Nazi death camps.

Iowans have always loved the written and spoken word. The University of Iowa has long been home to the world famous Creative Writers Workshop, founded by the poet Paul Engle. The novelists Flannery O’Connor and John Irving among others too numerous to mention chose to live for a time in Iowa City and finished further workshop participation.

Iowa also claims the novelists Mackinlay Kantor and Wallace Stegner, as well as the playwright David Rabe. And two recent Pulitzer Prize winners, Jane Smiley and Jorie Graham, teach at our State universities, the former at Iowa State, the latter at the University of Iowa.

As for the press, journalists like Hugh Sidey, Harry Reasoner, Tom Brokaw, George Mills and Don Kaul have ennobled their profession with common sense, historical perspective, and thoughtful wit.

The actors Cloris Leachman and Marion Morrison—better known as that icon of American manhood John Wayne—are from Iowa, as is Donna Reed and the original superman, George Reeves. Ringling and his brothers ran away from Iowa to found a circus, and Johnny Carson is an Iowan familiar to a generation of insomniacs.

Jack Trice, Nile Kinnick, Bob Feller, Roger Craig, Dan Gable, and Gayle Hopkins are just a few of the world class athletes Iowa has produced.

Where to put Buffalo Bill Cody on a list of eminent Iowans is unclear, but he certainly belongs there. So do the Friedman twins from Sioux City, who, writing as Abigail Van Buren and Ann Landers, have touched the lives of millions of Americans.

In the final analysis, making lists like this is fun, if dangerous. Inevitably many who belong on it are overlooked.
Moreover, lowans know that such lists are ultimately beside the point. They understand that the important people in all of our lives are the family members, friends, and neighbors who make our communities home. What Iowa is for its citizens who have gathered here in Washington and who will gather throughout the State this year for similar events is a celebration of Mid-American values of home and country.

Our country’s greatness resides in no small part in the particular virtues of each of the 50 States that are the pluribus that make our unum. This summer, on the Capitol Mall and in our cities and towns, Iowa is celebrating its unique contribution to our United States. All are welcome to join in.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CARL F. EIFLER
HON. SAM FARR
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FARR, of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has not only served his country as a U.S. Army colonel but his community, in Monterey County, CA, for the past 75 years. Dr. Carl F. Eifler is a living legend who is today celebrating his 90th birthday. Dr. Eifler has led a distinguished life. He joined the Army in 1922 at 15, but was honorably discharged 2 years later when his age was discovered. After World War II, he reenlisted in the service and served from 1944 to 1949. He was the commander of the first special agents to operate behind enemy lines, and participated in a number of heroic acts. The developer of training techniques still in use to this day, Eifler helped save more than 200 downed airmen, transported the first captured Japanese pilot from enemy territory and led a special team whose mission was to kidnap a prominent German scientist working on development of the atomic bomb for his country—though the plan was abandoned when it was discovered that United States invented its own atomic bomb. In 1943, Eifler was successful in rescuing nine survivors from a crashed B-24 bomber, after taking over an unarmed patrol boat no less.

Eifler’s daring WWII rescues have earned him numerous honors. He was awarded a Purple Heart, inducted into the Military Intelligence Hall of Fame, and presented with the William Donovan Award by the Veterans of the Office of Strategic Services, whose previous recipients include Ronald Reagan and George Bush. Most recently, Eifler was recommended for the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Due to an injury sustained in the line of duty, Eifler retired in 1947. However, his postwar achievements are worthy of praise as well. He went on to later bachelor of divinity degree and a doctorate in psychology. Following, Eifler served as chief psychologist for the Monterey Department of Public Health in the mental health division from 1964–73. The above lists of accomplishments which Dr. Eifler has attained are only part of the reason for this recognition. In addition, he has an exceptional moral character, outstanding leadership, and lifetime dedication are truly admirable and are the main reasons we recognize him today, on his 90th birthday. I know I am speaking for all of his constituents when I say that we are lucky to have benefited from Dr. Eifler’s service to his country.

CONGRATULATIONS TO OLD STURBRIDGE VILLAGE ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY
HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today it is with great pleasure that I pay tribute to the largest history museum in the northeast on its 50th anniversary, Old Sturbridge Village. Nestled in the small New England community of Sturbridge, MA, Old Sturbridge Village is an outdoor history museum and recreated village that tells the story of everyday life in a rural New England town during 1830’s.

Old Sturbridge Village is a composite New England town displaying the various aspects of several communities of the 1830’s. The museum was founded by Albert, Cheney, and George B. Wells as an outgrowth of the family’s extensive collection of antiques. Old Sturbridge Village first opened to the public on June 8, 1946, with 81 visitors touring the village. Today the nonprofit educational institution boasts more than 435,000 visitors yearly and 100,000 pieces in its collection of antiques documenting New England’s past.

Mr. Speaker, this year Old Sturbridge Village is celebrating its first half-century as the region’s premier living history museum recreating in lively fashion the important period in American history between 1790 to 1850. For nearly 50 years a historically costumed staff has reenacted the daily work activities and community celebrations of a rural 19th-century town for thousands of children and adults alike.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the achievements of Old Sturbridge Village in its attempt to provide modern Americans with a deep understanding of their own times through a personal experience with New England’s past. By visualizing what moved the men and women of prior generations, Old Sturbridge Village has for 50 years shed light on Americans as they attempted to act, believe, and build the future of America. Congratulations to Old Sturbridge Village on its 50th anniversary.

LEXINGTON AND CANADA: INDEPENDENCE WITH TOGETHERNESS
HON. JAMES A. BARCIA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to celebrate July 4th, our Independence Day, it is important to reflect upon the fact that our struggle for independence was not the only one, in fact, our achievement of independence was the result of joint efforts with Canada. That proud heritage continues through the present day with many of Lexington’s residents, including the parade’s Grand Marshall Philemon W. Still, having a chance this year to specifically celebrate their Canadian heritage.

Next week Canada herself will be ably represented at the festivities by The Honorable Mike Bradley, major of Sarnia, Ontario. Mr. Joe Mills of the Royal Canadian Legion, and our friend of the Royal Canadian Legion. I want to join all the people of Lexington in extending a very warm welcome to our Canadian friends.

Mr. Speaker, independence is special. The freedom that we have from independence can never be taken for granted. But the experience provides us with special opportunities for togetherness—togetherness with those who joined in our struggles to gain or maintain our freedom, or who on their own fought for a freedom very similar to our own. I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in wishing the people of Lexington the very best as they celebrate Independence Day.

SUPPORT FOR DURHAM CENTER ALTERNATIVE BASED LEARNING EXPERIENCE
HON. ELIZABETH FURSE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support alternative schools across our nation, and to highlight the Durham Center alternative based learning experience [ABLE] program offered by the Tigard-Tualatin School District’s 21st Century Academy and provides education, support, and job seeking assistance to students like Denise Saavedra who struggled through high school and is the mother of a 2-year-old child, Denise, at age 20 is the first one in her family to graduate from high school and has learned firsthand about the value of an education and the ABLE program. The education and tools she has received through ABLE will better prepare her and open more doors for her as she seeks employment. She will be better qualified to compete in the job market and financially support herself and her child.

There are many stories like that of Denise Saavedra. Many young people drop out of high school for reasons ranging from teen pregnancy to problems with fitting in. That is why, as we support our young people in alternative schools, such as the ABLE program, which provide an option for young people to go back and get their high school diploma in
a welcoming environment. Without alternative schools, many young people such as Denise would not have the opportunity to obtain her high school diploma. I urge my colleagues to continue supporting funding for alternative schools.

**CAMPUS SECURITY ACT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED**

**HON. HOWARD P. “BUCK” McKEON**

**OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, June 27, 1996**

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. GOODLING and I have introduced a House Resolution dealing with the Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act.

On June 6, 1996, the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training and Life-Long Learning held a hearing with respect to the Issue of campus crime. We were particularly interested in hearing about the Department of Education’s implementation of Section 485(f) of the Higher Education Act, known as the Campus Security Act of 1990.

The Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act signed into law by President Bush required colleges and universities throughout the United States to provide their students information on campus crime statistics and school policies related to campus security. This was a first step in providing students necessary information if they were to protect themselves from becoming victims of campus crime.

During the course of the hearing, some concerns were raised that colleges and universities were not accurately reporting their crime statistics. In addition, several witnesses did not believe that the Department of Education considered the enforcement of the Campus Security Act a priority.

The resolution we have introduced today directs the Department of Education to give priority to the monitoring of compliance and enforcement of the provisions of the Campus Security Act. Congress enacted this law to protect students, but for that to happen, the law needs to be complied with honestly and completely. The Department of Education has the responsibility for ensuring this compliance, and if we hope to protect our students as envisioned when the law was adopted, the Department needs to give priority status to this responsibility.

**TRIBUTE TO KERRY P. HEIN**

**AMERICAN LEGION POST NO. 1991**

**HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES**

**OF NEW YORK**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Thursday, June 27, 1996**

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Kerry P. Hein American Legion Post in Rocky Point, Long Island, NY, founded 5 years ago to honor the memory of CWO Kerry P. Hein, who gave his life in service to America on February 27, 1991, while serving in Operation Desert Storm. Hein was a resident of Sound Beach, on Suffolk County’s North Shore, and was the only Long Island resident to die in the Persian Gulf war.

Founded in 1991 as America’s first Desert Storm post, the Kerry P. Hein American Legion Post No. 1991 honors the Army medevac helicopter pilot who was shot down over Kuwait just 1 day before the cease-fire was declared in the Persian Gulf war. It was shortly after Hein’s death that World War II veteran Fred Denninger of Middle Island was inspired to establish the new American Legion post to honor Hein while serving the many veterans living in the communities surrounding Rocky Point.

With the help of other veterans, including but not limited to Ron Libonati, Mike Cutrone, Harold Cases, Frank Devine, and Tom Peppard, the Kerry P. Hein American Legion Post received its permanent charter from the National American Legion Command on July 27, 1992. It received its New York State charter on August 6 of that same year.

Beginning with 54 charter founders, the Kerry P. Hein Post now boasts 137 members from the North Shore communities of Brookhaven and Riverhead towns. One of those inaugural members is Hein’s grandfather, James Connelly, who visits area schools to talk to young students about patriotism and the role of the American Legion.

Because of its distinction as the only Desert Storm post, it has also attracted membership from throughout Long Island and America, and from as far away as Puerto Rico and Australia.

The Kerry P. Hein Post was assigned number 1991 to signify three historical acts; it was the year Hein died and when the post was founded, but also to pay tribute to the 50th anniversary of the bombing of Pearl Harbor that drew America into World War II.

Kerry Hein was born in Queens, NY, and grew up in Sound Beach. In 1987, he joined the U.S. Army Reserve, completed basic training at Fort Jackson, SC, then received a bachelor of science in aeronautical studies from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Florida. He was assigned to the 348th Medical Company in Dayton, Ohio, and served until July 1989, and ultimately rose to the rank of sergeant. After completing the Rotor Wing Aviator Course at Fort Rucker, AL, Hein was commissioned a warrant officer and accepted an opportunity to serve on active duty.

Hein served in Operation Desert Storm with the 507th Medical Company, flying air ambulance helicopters that removed wounded soldiers from the battlefield under enemy fire. He was killed in action during the waning moments of Operation Desert Storm while flying a helicopter rescue into the Kuwaiti battlefield. The medevac helicopter pilot was posthumously promoted to Chief Warrant Officer 2 and received numerous battlefield honors, including the Purple Heart, Conspicuous Service Cross, Kuwait Liberation Medal and Army Commendation Medal.

Hein is survived by his wife, Laura, daughter Melissa, and son Christopher, who was born 2 months after his father’s death. Hein was buried in Calverton National Cemetery on Long Island, near his hometown, with full military honors.

Along with the American Legion post in Rocky Point, the 77th U.S. Army Reserve Command [ARCOM] located on route 25A in Rocky Point was named in Hein’s memory. During Operation Desert Storm, 3,400 soldiers from the 77th ARCOM served in the Persian Gulf. Also renamed in Hein’s memory was New York Avenue, the main thoroughfare in Sound Beach. Other memorials include a walkway at Armed Forces Plaza in Hauppauge, Suffolk County’s seat, and a help pod at Fort Hood in Mexia, TX.

These eponymous tribes are just a modest recognition of the sacrifice and service that Kerry P. Hein offered America, a small measure of the gratitude we owe these men and women who gave their lives for this country.

For generations to come, these tributes will serve to remind all Americans that freedom does not come without cost, that the liberty we all enjoy was paid for with blood of men and women like Kerry P. Hein.
Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute one of Long Island's most dedicated and accomplished educators, Sister Janet A. Fitzgerald, O.P., Ph.D. After serving as president of Molloy College in Rockville Centre, NY since 1972, Sister Janet has announced her resignation. Sister Janet's tenure of almost 24 years was longer than that of any other Molloy president. Nearly 85 percent of Molloy's 8,500 graduates earned their degrees during Sister Janet's term in office.

Coming to Molloy 27 years ago, Sister Janet taught in the philosophy department. She became president in 1972 and served in that capacity until this year. Following the completion of a well-deserved sabbatical, Sister Janet will return to Molloy to once again teach philosophy.

Under Sister Janet's leadership, Molloy College grew dramatically. Enrollment has more than doubled and the number of faculty has increased from 73 full-time and 27 part-time in 1972 to 136 full-time and 142 part-time for the 1995-96 academic year. As president, Sister Janet oversaw the construction of three new campus buildings: The Wilbur Arts Center, the Chapel of the Sacred Heart, and the William J. Casey Center. During her presidency, extensive renovation and modernization were done to both Kellenberg and Quealy Halls.

Molloy College also expanded its academic offerings during Sister Janet's administration. Twenty-one majors were created and in 1989, Molloy offered its first graduate program, the M.S. in Nursing. Molloy has also added three additional M.S. programs in nursing.

On a personal level Sister Janet and I both grew up in the Sunnyside/Woodside neighborhood in Queens, NY. Sister Janet certainly epitomizes the qualities which were prized in our neighborhood—courage and strength of purpose.

Sister Janet Fitzgerald is truly one of Long Island’s greatest assets and one of our Nation’s greatest educators. She compiled an outstanding record as president of Molloy College and deserves a debt of gratitude from all of us. I wish Sister Janet all the best and hope that she enjoys her sabbatical, but I know that she will be eager to get back to the classroom.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge Elizabeth S. O’Keefe of Whitfield School, one of the winners of the 1996 Toyota Tapestry program.

The Toyota Tapestry program, which is administered by the National Science Teachers Association, began 5 years ago and has awarded more than $1.6 million in grants to teachers in the United States. Each year, 40 outstanding K–12 grade teachers are given grants of up to $10,000 to implement innovative 1-year programs to enhance science education in their schools. The winning teachers have developed projects that demonstrate creativity, involve risk-taking, possess vision and quality, and model a unique way of presenting science.

Ms. O’Keefe’s winning project was to develop a unique study on ground water in caves. Because caves are void of photosynthetic organisms and litter, the water contains dissolved nutrients as well as herbicides and pesticides that percolate through rock and soil layers into cave streams. Rivers and springs are tested for pollutants; however, there is no systematic evaluation of pollution in cave water. O’Keefe’s seventh grade classes will collect and evaluate water samples from 10 cave sites that were tested over 20 years ago, and determine what environmental and geological changes have occurred over this period.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege for me to pay tribute to Elizabeth O’Keefe, and commend her upon her efforts in ensuring the next generation a quality foundation from where they can pursue their ambitions. I join the National Science Teachers’ Association in honoring the excellent work that she has been able to accomplish.
vulnerable to acts of terrorism, both domestic and international as was tragically illustrated by the bombings that occurred in Oklahoma City last year, and Saudi Arabia earlier this week.

On June 28, 1995, immediately following the Oklahoma City bombing, President Clinton issued a directive to the General Services Administration [GSA] to upgrade all Federal facilities with minimum security standards outlined in a Department of Justice study entitled "Vulnerability Assessment of Federal Facilities." One of the minimum security standards highlighted in the study is the retrofitting of security window film in all Federal facilities. I remember all too well, as I am sure we all do, the horrible pictures and film clips on the evening news of the victims in the bombing bloodied by the shards of glass that were propelled like bullets toward them when the windows of the building were blown out by the blast. Even more devastating were the images of the babies and small children in the Federal day care facility who were severely injured and killed by the impact of the explosion.

This event will help us to avoid additional injuries or deaths in the future. Almost all of our Embassies, both here and abroad, utilize security window film. The White House has it, the Pentagon has it, FEMA has it, and many of the museums in the Smithsonian have it. I concurred with the President that before another tragedy occurs, all Government buildings should have it.

It is my hope that we may move forward with improving the safety of our Federal workers who are disproportionately at risk of being victim to a terrorist act. I am aware that the GSA commissioned a study regarding the effectiveness of security window film and that the Department of Justice, Department of State and the Department of the Army have already conducted research that supported the use of window film for the purposes outlined in the President’s memorandum. I urge GSA to promptly develop and implement a plan and budget for the upgrade of Federal facilities. The safety of our Government workers and their children hang in the balance.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF EMMANUEL BAPTIST CHURCH
HON. JOHN P. MURTHA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity before my fellow Members of the House of Representatives to congratulate the pastor and congregation of the Emmanuel Baptist Church as it celebrates its 100th anniversary on July 5 through July 7, 1996. This small but high-impact community institution deserves national recognition for its century of dedication to the simple but essential American values of faith, family and community.

Throughout the years as Johnstown has endured hardship and tragedy of various types, from floods to the Great Depression, the Nation’s wars, as well as more recent economic hardship and crippling unemployment, the Emmanuel Baptist Church has been a source of support and sustenance, spiritually and otherwise, to generations.

Emmanuel Baptist was organized on July 15, 1896 in the Grand Army of the Republic Hall in downtown Johnstown, PA. For 10 years, the congregation met in the Hall until a new church was built on Poplar Street. In 1959, the church relocated to its present home, 425 Luther Road in Richland Township. The congregation has been served by one pastor, the Reverend Ray Streets, Sr., for the past 42 years. His son, the Reverend Ray Streets, Jr., currently serves with him as associate pastor.

The church reaches 19 Sunday School classes, of which 5 are for adults. It also provides other educational programs for children. One is for kids ages 3 through 12, and another, Impact Ministry, is geared toward junior and senior-high students and encompasses such activities as drama, music and gymnastics. I congratulate church members Chris Taylor, Pam and Jeff Weaver, and Bill Kagey for their dedication to these programs and to the children of their community.

Several members of the Emmanuel Baptist church also serve as full-time missionaries. Yet another service provided by the church is its Elijah’s Pantry. Run by members Rita and John Marsden, it ministers to needy families.

I am honored to know many of the members of this congregation, and to be able to congratulate Emmanuel Baptist Church on this day. May the church grow and prosper for another 100 years.

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY DESERVES FEDERAL SUPPORT
HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about yesterday’s decision during consideration of the VA–HUD independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997 to not move funding for the National Center for Science Literacy, Education, and Technology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

With more than 200 professional scientists and unbeatable resources and capabilities, the museum is positioned to provide the highest level of return on our country’s investment in NASA’s mission to planet Earth, in translating and extending scientific findings to the general public. This project is not local but national in scope. The museum and its Hayden Planetarium interact with more than 3 million visitors annually from every State in the country. It already welcomes more than 500,000 children each year and its laudable goal is to reach schools and families throughout the Nation using the most advanced 21st century technology.

There is little doubt that we must do a better job to ensure that our children have the highest available level of scientific understanding as it relates to our own planet. This project will do precisely that.

Mr. Speaker, we will still have an opportunity to restore the funds in the House-Senate conference on this bill. And, I would urge the House conferees to support a $13 million investment by the Federal Government in this $135 million center, which has already raised more than $70 million from a number of host State, host city, and private sources.

CROATIA CELEBRATES ANTI-FASCIST STRUGGLE COMMEMORATION DAY
HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVIC
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. RADANOVIC. Mr. Speaker, just last Saturday on June 22, Croatia celebrated its participation in the World War II anti-fascist movement. The Anti-Fascist Struggle Commemoration Day, a national holiday in Croatia, has been a tremendous success and courageous recognition of that ever-important victory over international tyranny some 50 years ago. I would like to formally recognize this event here in the United States House of Representatives, and commend Croatia for her gracious and dedicated efforts to securing and preserving world peace.

THE ANTI-FASCIST MOVEMENT IN CROATIA
Every June 22nd since independence Croatia has celebrated its participation in the World War II anti-fascist movement. The national holiday, Anti-Fascist Struggle Commemoration Day, marks a day on which in 1941 Vlado Janic led forty Croatian anti-fascists from the town of Sisak to fight against fascism, marking the beginning of the anti-fascist struggle in Croatia.

The President of Croatia, Dr. Franjo Tudjman, one of the few European statesmen who is a veteran of the World War II anti-fascist movement, has submitted his recommendations that the anti-fascist struggle greatly contributed to establishing the foundations of a modern, democratic Croatia.

The following factors should be considered when examining Croatia’s role in the anti-fascist struggle:

The anti-fascist anti-fascist movement was among the strongest, not only in former Yugoslavia, but also Europe:
Croatian resistance forces, as part of the democratic coalition of anti-fascist powers, participated in the victory over fascism;
Croatians led the Croatian and South Slavic anti-fascist movement;
Croatian resistance led to the creation of the Federal State of Croatia by ZAVNOH (Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation of Croatia), constitutional foundations of federalism, and the constitutional and legal basis for Croats today; and
The guiding principles of the anti-fascist movement form an integral part of the pre-World War II Croatian Constitution.

Croatia takes pride in the fact that one of the first organized resistance units occupied was Croatian; Croatian resistance unit engaged in several diversions on the Zagreb-Belgrade railway, and by mid-September of 1941 had grown to 77 fighters. By the end of 1941, 7,000 Croats, anti-fascists had joined the armed partisan movement, rising to 25,000 a year later, and to 100,000 following the capitulation of Italy. By the end of the Second World War the number reached 150,000. The overall number of Croatian citizens that participated in the anti-fascist struggle is estimated at 471,836, of which two-thirds were Croats.

Last year, to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the victory of the anti-fascist coalition in Europe, the Croatian Parliament published a report that records the history of the anti-fascist movement in Croatia from the 1920s onwards.
The recognition of Croatia's participation in the anti-fascist movement is one of the pillars of a strategy aimed at national reconciliation. Towards this end, President Tito paid homage at the memorial site in Jasenovac on June 15, 1966, to pay homage to the victims at the Jasenovac camp, a camp which has come to symbolize the evils of fascism and communism. Tito said: “I have laid the wreath as Croatia's President in memory of all victims of fascism.”

CIVIL RIGHTS PROCEDURES PROTECTION ACT

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today and my colleague, Representative MARKEY, are introducing the Civil Rights Procedures Protection Act, which reasserts the rights of employees to take their employers to court for unlawful discrimination.

This legislation would prevent employers from requiring employees to check their rights as American citizens at the front door and agree to submit, sometimes unknowingly, to binding mandatory arbitration as a term or condition of hiring, continued employment, or promotion.

What started as a practice mainly in the securities industry has now spread to a significant number of Fortune 500 companies. The General Accounting Office estimates that in 5 years, over half of all employees in the United States may be bound by mandatory arbitration contracts.

Mandatory arbitration forces employees to choose between their employment and their civil and constitutional rights, such as trial by jury and due process. Employees are forced to submit to arbitration boards that are often set up in a discriminatory fashion. For example, in a company, industry, boards are handpicked by the executives from the industry, who choose from a pool dominated by their peers. They are hardly neutral. Employees also face difficulties in obtaining injunctions, bringing class action suits, and conducting meaningful pretrial factfinding because employers hold most files and information.

My bill would amend seven Federal civil rights and workplace fairness statutes to make it clear that the powers and procedures available under those laws are the exclusive ones that apply to a claim that arises. It does not condemn alternative dispute resolution; it makes it clear that an employee can voluntarily choose to submit a case to arbitration after the claim arises.

Since my first introduction of this bill, a number of women have brought stories to my attention about their own dealings with mandatory arbitration, which highlight the need for change. One such case involved a woman who attempted to bring a charge of age discrimination. She had worked at a clerical position with a company for 13 years and was 58 years of age when her job was terminated. She applied for another job within the company for which she was well-qualified. The job went to a younger woman who had been with the company for only 3 years and had had no training or experience. She initiated a complaint under the company's internal appeals process. After enduring three rounds of appeals, the woman was dissatisfied with what she felt were the appeal boards inaccurate and inconsistent conclusions. But she cannot file a lawsuit outside of the company because she signed a waiver, revoking her right to trial by jury.

Mr. Speaker, when voluntary, arbitration and mediation can be an efficient and effective method of resolving differences and reducing the courtloads of civil and criminal courts. But the key word is voluntary. No one should be forced to choose between their job and their civil rights. This bill restores integrity to employee-employer relationships.

LEGISLATIVE PAY EQUITY STUDY

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as cochair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I am introducing legislation to institute a Legislative Pay Equity Study. As part of the Economic Equity Act, this bill will be one of a package of bills to promote economic equity for women to be introduced by the Caucus in July.

Fifty years have passed since women were found to earn 65 percent of men's wages in 1946. Neither time nor legislation has dramatically improved this inequity: In 1991, women were still found to earn 70 cents for every dollar men earned. During the nearly five decades that passed between these two studies, many women have moved into traditionally male-dominated professions in the work force. Yet their salaries remain significantly lower than those of men—even though women often do the same work as men's counterparts.

The Equal Pay Act was passed in 1963 in order to prevent just such discrimination towards women. Yet in industry, jobs are often treated as equal pay for equal work, this law made illegal for women to earn less than men for the same labor. Unfortunately, pay inequity persists. One reason is that women often do different work than men, making it possible for employers to pay unequal salaries for the work that they do. Even the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which promised to end discrimination based on gender, race, or ethnicity, failed to bring an end to wage discrimination. It is evident that our laws have not achieved equality in the work force. I am introducing this bill today in order to end wage discrimination within the legislative branch and to better understand why women remain consistently underpaid in comparison to men. With this information, recommendations could be made as to how workers within the legislative branch could be more equitably paid. This bill is identical to the legislation introduced in earlier Congresses by Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE.

My proposed legislation would create a bipartisan commission to determine if the salaries of the employees of the legislative branch are equitably paid. Having studied the compensation within and between job classifications as well as personnel policies, an independent consultant could determine whether they comply with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII states that equal work as well as work of equal value should be equally compensated. With this information, recommendations could be made by the commission to apply title VII to the entire legislative branch. It is my hope that the changes made in the legislative branch would inspire and instigate changes to be made in the entire nation's work force.

At a time when there is a continuing concern over the small number of women employed in the fields of math, science, and athletics, it is imperative that it not be forgotten that women's wages still remain below those of men. When women are confident that their salaries will correspond to their work, they will no longer be hesitant to enter professions traditionally dominated men. I invite you to join me in supporting this legislation so that women will have the freedom to choose their career knowing that they will bring home the wage that they deserve.

WESTSIDE LIGHT RAIL AND H.R. 3675

HON. ELIZABETH FURSE
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman WOLF and members of the subcommittee for excellent work in crafting a bipartisan fiscal year 1997 transportation bill. On behalf of the board coalition in Oregon which enthusiastically endorses Westside Light Rail, my thanks to the entire subcommittee for including $90 million for this important project in H.R. 3675.

Earlier this year, as I have for 4 years in a row, I organized a diverse group to testify in Congress in support of the Westside/Hillsboro project. Representatives of private sector groups, local officials, and public organizations continue to strongly support Westside Light Rail in Oregon. As I have noted for a number of years, Westside Light Rail's record of support from Oregonians themselves speaks for itself. In the 1990's, Oregon taxpayers have voted to put their own money into light rail by margins of 65 percent and 74 percent. It is clear that Westside Light Rail's impressive local support was key to the subcommittee's decision to keep this project on track.

Work is progressing on Westside Light Rail through the innovative H.R. 3675. Earlier this year, I attended the holing-through of one of the two 3 mile tunnels through Portland's West Hills—a major milestone in the construction of the
Westside project. In fact, all the benefits of Westside Light Rail which I have touted in Congress for 4 years—the reduced congestion, the economic development, the tie-in with local and State land use laws—are closer to reality with each passing day.

Mr. Chairman, let me add that light rail in Oregon enjoys bipartisan support. Regardless of who has controlled the House of Representatives, I have secured record funding for Westside Light Rail for 4 straight years. My colleagues from Oregon, Mr. BUNN, has worked very diligently on including language in H.R. 3675 for the light rail in Los Angeles. I look forward to working with all members of the Oregon delegation during the reauthorization of ISTEA to help secure authorizing language for the South/North light rail project in 1997.

Again, Chairman WOLF, members of the subcommittee, thank you for your past support of the Westside/Hillside project. I urge all Members of the House to support H.R. 3675.

TRIBUTE TO MARY B. HENRY

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON
OF CALIFORNIA

HON. MAXINE WATERS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to Mary B. Henry, a distinguished Californian and friend, who has served the Los Angeles community with distinction for over 30 years. Currently executive director of the Avalon-Carver Community Center, where she began her career in 1963, Mary B. Henry has worked diligently to enhance the quality of life in the community and enrich the educational lives of our young people. Ms. Henry’s commitment to and accomplishments in the field of education, and her tireless work with various community and civic organizations remind us of just how much of a difference one person can make in the lives of others.

Ms. Henry has spent over three decades expanding her knowledge and imparting her wisdom in a variety of venues. She was elected to the Compton Unified School District Board, serving an unprecedented three terms as president of the Board. As an educational training consultant she has been affiliated with a number of universities. She has trained and conducted community relations at the University of California at Los Angeles, San Diego, and Santa Barbara; the University of Southern California; and Pacific Oaks College, among others. She has also lent her expertise to organizations such as Operation Head Start.

Over the years, Ms. Henry has been affiliated with numerous educational, service, and professional organizations, including the California Center for Community Development; Legislative Committee to the State Department of Social Welfare; Wilson’s Job Corps Advisory Board; Citizen’s Committee for Community Action; EYOA Head Start Task Force; and the California Committee on Regional Medical Programs. She has served as a commissioner of the Southeast General Hospital Authority and as a board member of the Los Angeles Urban Coalition. She is currently affiliated with the California Department of Health and Welfare Committee on Minority Incarceration and the Lutheran World Federation Community Development Committee among others.

Mary Henry’s dedication has not been unnoticed. She is the recipient of numerous awards and honors. Among them: the Los Angeles Times Woman of the Year Award, 1967; Parent-Teacher Association Outstanding Achievement in Community Service Award; Doctorate of Humanities from Windsor University, Los Angeles; and Doctor of Laws, Honoris Causa, from the University of Santa Clara, California. At the State level, she has been honored by the California State Assembly, Governor Jerry Brown, and the California State Senate. At the national level her contributions have been recognized over the years by Presidents John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Jimmy Carter, Vice President Hubert Humphrey, and Members of Congress.

On Saturday, July 13, 1996, friends and colleagues of Ms. Mary B. Henry will gather at the Biltmore Hotel in Los Angeles to pay tribute to this outstanding public servant for her unflinching commitment to our community. Her life serves as an inspiration to us all. We are honored to share this brief glimpse of a very remarkable individual, and to ask our colleagues to join us and our fellow Los Angelinos in saluting Mary Henry.

SISTER KATHERINE MURPHY—50 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. BART STUPAK
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed, an honor for me to bring to the attention of the U.S. House of Representatives and this Nation the celebration of a 50 year devotion to the Sisters of Mercy of Sister Katherine Murphy. The parishioners of St. Francis Catholic Church in Traverse City, MI, the community, her religious order, and the Church, as a whole, have been blessed by her long and dedicated service. This Sunday, June 30, 1996, Sister Katherine will be the guest of honor at a parish dinner.

Born in Detroit, MI, on March 8, 1930, Sister Katherine was the only child of Mae Florence (Henry) and Daniel Murphy. As Sister Katherine entered Our Lady of Mercy Academy, on September 8, 1946, she was exposed to the idea of serving and living her life in faith and order, the Sisters of Mercy for half a century. Katherine’s assignments included the Immaculate Conception School in Traverse City in 1955, 1968, and again in 1971.

As changes occurred in the religious orders, in 1969, Sister Mary Brendan took her own name and has since been known as Sister Katherine. On August 1, 1976, she began her ministry at St. Francis Parish in Traverse City with Father Thomas Neis. As Sister Katherine’s ministry continues at St. Francis, she has served with Father Ron Gronowski and with Father Jim Gardiner. Father Gardiner recently bestowed upon Sister Katherine the title of Pastoral Associate at St. Francis Parish.

As an active and integral member of the St. Francis Parish staff, Sister Katherine’s current duties include directing the OCIA formation program, overseeing the altar servers, lectors, and Eucharistic ministers for the parish and for numerous parishes. She is also chairman of the liturgy commission, a member of the evangelical team and serves on the Diocesan Pastoral Council.

In addition to her official duties, Sister Katherine has also found time to travel, visiting Ireland, the Holy Land, Manila, and traveling throughout Europe and several cities across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Sister Katherine has devoted her life to the Catholic Church through her order, the Sisters of Mercy for half a century. She has provided education, counsel, comfort, and spiritual guidance to so many who have had the privilege of knowing her.

There is a special bond between Sister Katherine, the Traverse City community and St. Francis Parish. When Jesus told Sister Katherine to “Come, follow Me,” 50 years ago, scripture promised:

“And everyone who has left house, ... father or mother ... for my name’s sake shall receive a hundredfold, and shall possess life everlasting.” Matt 19:20

All of us in the Traverse City community and especially here at St. Francis Parish, wish to be among the hundredfold who count as part of Sister Katherine’s family and ministry. Sister Katherine’s devotion, faith, and life serves as an everlasting example to us all.

On behalf of the Traverse City community, Michigan’s First Congressional District, and the State of Michigan, I congratulate and extend best wishes to Sister Katherine Murphy on her lifetime of accomplishments, devotion and faith.

BART STUPAK
Member of Congress
Thursday, June 27, 1996

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the outstanding philanthropic efforts of the 17 semifinalists for the 1996 JC Penny Golden Rule Award. I am proud to represent these people and organizations in Congress. Their commitment and devotion to the central Ohio community is truly exemplary.

The Golden Rule Award ceremony publicly honors local volunteer efforts, and is presented in more than 200 markets in 45 States. The 1996 semifinalists have proven themselves to be clearly deserving of this recognition, having demonstrated continued, selfless sacrifice to the Columbus, OH, area. They serve as a model to us all.

America's generosity both at home and abroad is unsurpassed on this planet. Regrettably, however, the day-to-day volunteer efforts of so many Americans go regularly unnoticed. We take for granted their generous work with the poor, the elderly, the sick, and the neglected. But their unheralded and noble deeds are duly noted by those they help, often providing a bit of hope during times of great distress.

At a time when our Nation demands that government become smaller and spend less, the importance of voluntarism and community service grows profoundly. These semifinalists prove once again that the most important work done in our country is not done within the beltway, but within the shelters, pantries, and soup kitchens of our local communities. We must never lose sight of the fact that Americans' innate sense of sacrifice continues regardless of what may transpire in Washington. I proudly salute the following people and organizations for their inspiring work, and join with my colleagues in congratulating them for this most deserving recognition.

Ms. Jule Rose Cook, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), Franklin County Volunteer Juvenile Program, Hyatt Force on Capitol Square, Bob Meredith/Skip Seaford—Christmas in April.

Parents of Murdered Children and Other Survivors of Homicide, Capital University Circle Kiwanis, Residential Care Team, Teen Parent Connection Volunteers.

Kaleidoscope Youth Coalition, L.E.A.D.E.R. Institute, J.ean "Rambo Gran
ny" Smith, Rick Baumann, Dorothy Burchfield, Dianne Glaser, Dora Browne.

FLORIDA CRUSHED STONE OF BROOKSVILLE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Margaret Angela Baker of South Amboy, NJ, a valued and cherished member of our community, on her 100th birthday.

Margaret Baker was born in South Amboy on July 11, 1896. She grew up when she was 3 years old and her mother, Catherine Ketzner, remarried when she was 9, to the owner and operator of a saloon, named Jacob Baker. Margaret Baker left school after the ninth grade and began working in a factory piecing together clothing. She then worked in a playing card factory and then went on to work in a factory that manufactured military uniforms, where she worked her way up to full-time inspector, while doing part-time clerical work.

Margaret met Mr. John Joseph Dooling on a bus when she was in her 20's. John and Margaret were married March 23, 1924, in Saint Mary's Roman Catholic Church in South Amboy. The couple had a daughter, Rita Catherine Dooling who was born on September 8, 1929, in South Amboy Hospital. John passed away in 1959 at the age of 70. Margaret has three grandchildren: Jamie C. Smith, Karen H. Brent and Amy S. Moore. In addition, she has five great grandchildren: Emily, Christopher, Meghan, Tyler, and Kaitlin, ranging from age 5 years to 2 months.

Mr. Speaker, as she reaches the century mark, Mrs. Baker can look back on a 20th century that has seen America and the world transformed in ways that could scarcely have been imagined in her childhood. For example, during her lifetime, Mrs. Baker witnessed many inventions and technological breakthroughs, including automobiles, electricity, and telephones.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honored to join in congratulating Margaret Angela Baker on this remarkable milestone.

HON. FRANK PALLONE, Jr.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Margaret Angela Baker of South Amboy, NJ, a valued and cherished member of our community, on her 100th birthday.

Margaret Baker was born in South Amboy on July 11, 1896. She grew up when she was 3 years old and her mother, Catherine Ketzner, remarried when she was 9, to the owner and operator of a saloon, named Jacob Baker. Margaret Baker left school after the ninth grade and began working in a factory piecing together clothing. She then worked in a playing card factory and then went on to work in a factory that manufactured military uniforms, where she worked her way up to full-time inspector, while doing part-time clerical work.

Margaret met Mr. John Joseph Dooling on a bus when she was in her 20's. John and Margaret were married March 23, 1924, in Saint Mary's Roman Catholic Church in South Amboy. The couple had a daughter, Rita Catherine Dooling who was born on September 8, 1929, in South Amboy Hospital. John passed away in 1959 at the age of 70. Margaret has three grandchildren: Jamie C. Smith, Karen H. Brent and Amy S. Moore. In addition, she has five great grandchildren: Emily, Christopher, Meghan, Tyler, and Kaitlin, ranging from age 5 years to 2 months.

Mr. Speaker, as she reaches the century mark, Mrs. Baker can look back on a 20th century that has seen America and the world transformed in ways that could scarcely have been imagined in her childhood. For example, during her lifetime, Mrs. Baker witnessed many inventions and technological breakthroughs, including automobiles, electricity, and telephones.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honored to join in congratulating Margaret Angela Baker on this remarkable milestone.

HON. DON BURTON
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, every year, the National Ethnic Coalition of Organizations honors Americans from all ethnic backgrounds with its Ellis Island Medal of Honor. This year, I was deeply honored to be one of the recipients of this prestigious award.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all of this year's honorees. It is a distinguished group of Americans, including my colleagues, Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM, Congressmen BEN GILMAN, RAY LAHOOD, TOM MANTON and CHARLIE Rangel.

The Ethnic Coalition of Organizations is dedicated to pursuing harmony between all ethnic groups. This is a goal which I applaud. I would like to enter into the RECORD a press release announcing these awards, and a list of these distinguished award recipients.

ELLIS ISLAND MEDALS OF HONOR AWARDS

The 10th annual Ellis Island medals of honor awards ceremony—NECO CHAIRMAN WILLIAM DENIS FUGAZI LEADS DRAMATIC CeremonY dedicated to late medal recipiENT, CONGRESSWOMAN BARBARA JORDAN

Ellis Island, NY, May 19—Standing on the hallowed grounds of Ellis Island—the portal through which 17 million immigrants entered the United States—a cast of ethnic Americans who have made significant contributions to the life of this nation, among them George P. Mitchell, Pataki, U.S. Rep. Charles B. Rangel, NYC Police Commissioner Howard Safir, and “street singer” Arthur Tracy, today were presented with the coveted Ellis Island Medal of Honor at an emotionally uplifting ceremony.

NECO’s annual medal ceremony and reception on Ellis Island in New York Harbor is the nation’s largest celebration of ethnic pride. This year’s 10th annual event was dedicated to the memory of U.S. Rep. Barbara Jordan, a 1990 Ellis Island Medal recipient, who recently passed away.

Representing a rainbow of ethnic origins, Pataki, Rangel, Safir, Tracy, and other Ellis Island Medal of Honor recipients, including Baltimore Orioles baseball team owner Peter Angelos, entertainer Jerry Vale and NAACP President Hazel Dukes, among others, received their awards in the shadow of the historic Great Hall, where the first footsteps were taken by the millions of immigrants who entered the U.S. in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

“Today we honor great ethnic Americans who, through their achievements and contributions, and in the spirit of their ethnic origins, have enriched this country and have become role models for future generations,” said NECO Chairman William Denis Fugazi. “In addition, we honor the immigrant experience—those who passed through this Great Hall decades ago, and immigrants who arrive on American soil seeking opportunity. Everyone came here with little more...
than the clothes on their backs. But all they needed was hope and opportunity."

Mr. Fugazy added, “It doesn’t matter how you got here or if you already were here. Ellis Island is a symbol of the freedom, diversity and opportunity—ingredients inherent in the fabric of this nation. Although many recipients have no familial ties to Ellis Islanders, their ancestors share similar histories of struggle and hope for a better life here.

One of the emotional high points of the day came when the words spoken at the 1990 event by the late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, one of the first African-Americans to accept the Ellis Island medal, were replayed over loudspeakers at the 1996 ceremony. Secretary Shriver’s speech this year’s ceremony was dedicated to her memory. Mr. Fugazy recalled how the ailing Jordan flew to New York, dramatically arriving in a wheelchair with a team of medical personnel.

Established in 1986 by NCEO, the Ellis Island Medals of Honor pay tribute to the ancestral groups that comprise America’s unique cultural mosaic. To date, some 500 ethnic American citizens and native Americans have been honored.

NCEO is the largest organization of its kind in the U.S., serving as an umbrella group for 75 ethnic organizations and whose mandate is to promote ethnic and religious equality, tolerance and harmony, and combat injustice, hatred and bigotry.

Ellis Island Medal of Honor recipients are selected each year through a national nomination process. Screening committees from NCEO’s member organizations select the final nominees, who are then considered by the Board of Directors.

Among this year’s recipients were Michigan Senator Spencer Abraham; members of the U.S. Congress Thomas Manton, Benjamin C. Harovah, M.D., Hellenic, Physician; Maj. Gen. Marcelite J. Harris, African, Government Leader; Air Force Major General ASPCA President Roger Caras; WCBS News Executive Jerry Nachman; Christopher Komisarjevsky (Buson-Marsteller USA President); Air Force Major General Marcelite J. Harris, and Air Force Lieutenant Colonel William Gregory (astronaut); and former New York Mets Manager Joe Torre.

In conclusion, Secretary Shriver reflected on the Ellis Island experience and the ideals of freedom and opportunity that Ellis Island represented.

Mr. Fugazy added, “It doesn’t matter how you got here or if you already were here. Ellis Island is a symbol of the freedom, diversity and opportunity—ingredients inherent in the fabric of this nation. Although many recipients have no familial ties to Ellis Islanders, their ancestors share similar histories of struggle and hope for a better life here."

The event was held in the presence of Secretary of State Warren Christopher, who delivered a major policy address at Stanford University regarding efforts to couple environmental objectives with our Nation’s diplomatic efforts and set forth our priorities for the future.
billion of people around the world. We are af- fected by the actions of other countries that create ozone depleting substances, overfish and dump low-level radioactive waste in the world’s oceans, deplete our world’s rainforests, and stress our earth’s ecosystem through overpopulation.

Secretary Christopher pointed out that the needs of the American people are not well served if our foreign policy does not address these global concerns—we may be “Americans,” but we live on a planet that does not recognize geopolitical boundaries.

In his testimony, Secretary Christopher pointed out that environmental forces not only “transcend borders and oceans to threaten directly the health, prosperity and jobs of American citizens,” but that “addressing natural re- source issues is frequently critical to achieving political and economic stability and to pursuing our strategic goals around the world.” He then outlined a series of initiatives the State De- partment will undertake to advance America’s global environmental goals.

Through the State Department and Secre- tary Christopher’s leadership, the United States is working to reform and strengthen the U.N.’s key environmental and sustainable de- velopment programs. We have joined forces with the World Bank to incorporate sound en- vironmental policies in lending programs, and to fund projects through the global environ- mental facility that directly benefit our health and prosperity. In addition, we are striving through the new World Trade Organization to reconcile the complex tensions between pro- moting trade and protecting the environment.

We are looking hard to a cleaner and healthier global environment in 1997. The State Department has begun negotiating glob- al agreements to make further cuts in green- house gases, to address problems caused by migrating toxic chemicals, to promote sustain- able management of our world’s forests, to preserve biodiversity, and to safeguard ocean resources. The State Department is also tak- ing steps to address scarce resource and overpopulation issues that are putting further stress on our environment and the environ- ment our children will inherit.

Through the State Department the United States is recognizing the importance of work- ing bilaterally with key private, government, and nongovernment partners around the world to jointly address environmental concerns. In India, we are investing in environmental tech- nologies and controlling pesticides. In Brazil, we are working to improve the management of forest resources. In Russia, we are promoting the safe operation of nuclear reactors and safe storage of nuclear waste. In fact, we are even using satellite imagery once used to spot missiles and tanks to help clean up military bases and track ocean pollution.

As Secretary Christopher so eloquently stat- ed:

Our strength as a nation has always been to harness our democracy to meet new threats to our security and prosperity. Our creed as a people has always been to make tomorrow better for ourselves and for our children.

For the sake of future generations, we must meet the challenge of making global environ- mental problems our foreign policy. By advancing these environmental goals, we have the opportunity to protect our Nation and make it truly free. The policies set forth by Secretary Christopher are far reaching. They are the necessary mission for the United States to carry forward. I rise in recognition and with deep respect for what Secretary Christopher has set forth. It is environmental statecraft.

THE BARTON CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. ROSA L. DELAURO
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1996

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, on May 23, H.R. 3519 was introduced to amend the Clean Air Act. Its sponsor characterized his bill as “minor,” saying it in no way changes compli- ance timetables or standards, but “simply pro- vides more flexibility in doing so.”

I disagree. In short, the bill repeals the most fundamental aspect of Federal clean air stand- ards—protection of public health. This bill is a polluter’s dream.

The congressional majority’s vision state- ment for the 104th Congress states that Re- publicans support air and water that is clean and safe. But if you read the fine print, the majority’s agenda says that they support clean water and clean air as long as achieving it can be accomplished cheaply.

Everyone supports the bill’s emphasis on the use of innovative technologies to achieve clean air standards. The problem with H.R. 3519 is that it eliminates pollution monitoring and turns off pollution controls except when the air is at its dirtiest.

Under H.R. 3519, if a major source of pollution would no longer be subject to regulation. The Federal Government would no longer enforce healthy air requirements for States and local- ities. In addition, the bill would give polluters 10 years to clean up pollution that is causing health hazards, including cancer, today.

The fact is that this bill substantially repeals key provisions of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments signed by President Bush, and the fundamental principles of the original Clean Air Act signed by President Nixon.

The American public believes that the air should be clean enough to breathe safely. The American public also believes that the Govern- ment has a responsibility to set clean air standards that guarantee health protection.

And the American public does not believe that the science of health should be compromised by cost alone.

For 25 years, clean air health standards have been based solely on the best scientific evidence available as to the impact of air pol- lution on the health of people. Congress has provided that cost considerations are appro- priate when determining how quickly those standards should be achieved.

But now H.R. 3519 says that the health of people should no longer be the driving force behind our clean air programs. If the air is unhealthy but there is a cost of clean up, the health standards—not the pollution levels—should be modified.

For 25 years, no serious legislation pro- posed compromised health science on the basis of economics. For 25 years, no legisla- tion has ever considered the data on health effects be ignored. Yet this Congress is likely to vote on a bill that changes the rules so polluters won’t have to protect health.

Americans need to send Congress the mes- sage that their health is not for sale to special interest groups. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Texas Observer article “It’s the Environment, Stupid,” be printed in the RECORD so Ameri- cans know how important their response to the bill is to protect their environment and health. Thank you.

[From the Texas Observer, June 14, 1996]

IT’S THE ENVIRONMENT, STUPID

(By Louis DuBose)

Phil Gramm got the message in January when his pollster advised him that republican voters don’t trust their own party on environmental issues. Pollsters now trying to determine what will drive November’s elections are discovering that environmental issues are a real public concern. Even Newt Gingrich is beginning to get it. The Speaker crossed the Potomac to salute environ- mental corps kid volunteers working on Reo- sevelt Island, and traveled to New York to embrace a panic-stricken wild pig on the “Tonight Show.” All of this to convince the public that Republicans are not enemies of the environment. And in Congress, the party is backing away from its assault on environ- mental protections—at least until after No- vember’s elections.

But Congressman Joe Barton—two years ago a supporter of environmental protec- tion—is backing away from its assault on environ- mental protections. Barton’s bad air bill and began faxing it to media outlets around the country. “It is the most important legislation introduced in the 104th Congress,” he said, “to complete the ‘Texas Toxic Trilogy.’”

The Barton bill repeals the heart of the 1970 Clean Air Act. Its sponsor characterized his bill as “minor,” saying it in no way changes compli- ance timetables or standards, but “simply pro- vides more flexibility in doing so.”

I disagree. In short, the bill repeals the most fundamental aspect of Federal clean air stand- ards—protection of public health. This bill is a polluter’s dream.

The congressional majority’s vision state- ment for the 104th Congress states that Re- publicans support air and water that is clean and safe. But if you read the fine print, the majority’s agenda says that they support clean water and clean air as long as achieving it can be accomplished cheaply.

Everyone supports the bill’s emphasis on the use of innovative technologies to achieve clean air standards. The problem with H.R. 3519 is that it eliminates pollution monitoring and turns off pollution controls except when the air is at its dirtiest.

Under H.R. 3519, if a major source of pollution would no longer be subject to regulation. The Federal Government would no longer enforce healthy air requirements for States and local- ities. In addition, the bill would give polluters 10 years to clean up pollution that is causing health hazards, including cancer, today.

The fact is that this bill substantially repeals key provisions of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments signed by President Bush, and the fundamental principles of the original Clean Air Act signed by President Nixon.

The American public believes that the air should be clean enough to breathe safely. The American public also believes that the Govern- ment has a responsibility to set clean air standard which guarantee health protection.

And the American public does not believe that the science of health should be compromised by cost alone.

For 25 years, clean air health standards have been based solely on the best scientific evidence available as to the impact of air pol- lution on the health of people. Congress has provided that cost considerations are appro- priate when determining how quickly those standards should be achieved.

But now H.R. 3519 says that the health of people should no longer be the driving force behind our clean air programs. If the air is unhealthy but there is a cost of clean up, the health standards—not the pollution levels—should be modified.

For 25 years, no serious legislation pro- provided compromised health science on the basis of economics. For 25 years, no legisla- tion has ever considered the data on health effects be ignored. Yet this Congress is likely to vote on a bill that changes the rules so polluters won’t have to protect health.

Americans need to send Congress the mes- message that their health is not for sale to special interest groups. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Texas Observer article “It’s the Environment, Stupid,” be printed in the RECORD so Ameri- cans know how important their response to the bill is to protect their environment and health. Thank you.

[From the Texas Observer, June 14, 1996]
of nitrogen from sources within such does not make a significant contribution to ozone concentrations in such area (or in any other nonattainment area), the Administrator may redesignate as in attainment or having a lower classification.

Which, if properly punctuated, would mean to establish whether or not most of the pollution in a region comes from elsewhere—for example, chemical plants and refineries on the other side of Galveston Bay—the air in the region would not be deemed polluted.

Predictably enough, such a declaration would make the air dirtier, because declaring an area “in attainment” means lifting environmental restrictions and allowing more local contamination of air already badly polluted by upstream sources. Barton’s Bad Air Bill is filled with provisions like this one—a “contention” of its standards is achieved by cleaning up the language of the law, rather than cleaning up the environment.

When (to cite another example of Barton’s peculiar logic) the EPA establishes air quality goals for a region, “infrequent episodic variations in air pollution levels that cause by weather” must be excluded from any claim of attainment. So in Fort Worth, Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, and El Paso that pollution can operate without being subject to sanctions or regulation.


More illogic? “The [EPA] Administrator may establish maximum emissions of oxides of nitrogen from baseline vehicles using the re-formulated gasoline be less than emissions from such vehicles when using baseline gasoline.” Leave it to an EPA reg-writer to parse this sentence, which establishes that the quality of emissions are the same—when they aren’t. It’s just one small part of the bill’s broad assault on reformulated gasoline requirements—a two stage program designed to lower tailpipe emissions. The first phase was put in place last year and regulations for implementation of phase two are not yet complete, and might not be if Barton, who once worked as a consultant for Atlantic Richfield, has his way. “This will roll back a program that has cost taxpayers billions of dollars, and that has made a significant contribution to cleaner air,” he said.

Perhaps the loopiest provision—it’s tough to pick one—is Barton’s requirement that control devices voluntarily installed “prior to the designation of the area as a non-arrangement area to be credited as additional reductions.” But it’s tough to think of a more burdensome rule, since it’s hard to imagine a plant that can operate without being subject to permit revisions; some revisions simply change must to may—for sanctions or requirements. And no bill like this one should be complete without the standard “cost-benefit-analysis” provision. Barton would “require” regulators to prove that “the incremental cost of installing [a standard] does not exceed the incremental benefits of attaining the standard.” These provisions always provide an advantage to industry, which can prove that the costs of retrofitting pollution control devices must be justified by savings in the cost of cleaning an area with pollution control devices, then challenge whoever represents the public interest these days to predict and calculate long-term savings in public health, and quality of life—which has no dollar-equivalent market value.

What’s driving Joe Barton’s attempt to dismantle the Clean Air Act? The odd configuration of his Central Texas district provides him with a completely safe seat, which he has protected by seven “re-elections.” In the last election; he’s a true believer in the conservative agenda, and he’s an engineer who understands this stuff better than, say, the average consumer. Yet it seems impolitic for someone who ran as the Washington candidate for the state Republican Party chair in 1994 to burden his party with another bad environmental bill. Barton's bill kicks in yet,” O’Donnell said.

Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to honor an outstanding individual from Rio Grande City, TX, who in words and deed exemplifies strong leadership and an uncompromising dedication to positive values. Basilio Villarreal, who recently retired as mayor of Rio Grande City, is a hard-working businessman who dedicated his life to his business, family, and community. I take this opportunity to acknowledge his many accomplishments and thank him for his efforts.

Mayor Villarreal was the first mayor in Rio Grande City in more than 60 years. He fought hard for the re-incorporation of Rio Grande City, after decades without a city charter. As the first mayor of this newly re-incorporated city, Mayor Villarreal combined his vision for the city with the courage necessary to make real progress for the community. As mayor, Mayor Villarreal took on the difficult task of organizing the structure of city government in Rio Grande City, and he proposed establishing effective police and fire departments. He knew the value and importance of public safety and made it a priority within his public agenda. He established and then required strict adherence to new ethics standards for city employees. He expected no less of himself, always proud to uphold a strong personal code of honor.
Mayor Villarreal did what a good politician should do: He listened to the wants and needs of the citizens who reside within his jurisdiction. When the citizens of Rio Grande City told him that they did not want property taxes to finance city expenses, he worked hard to make this a reality. He fought to establish a government that was born efficient. He is a visionary who pursued the benefits of the empowerment zone and brought direction to its mission.

Basilio Villarreal’s popularity and support have made him a symbol of success and a role model in the community of Rio Grande City. His modest beginnings only make this proud man’s life more compelling. His successful business is a tribute to the same admirable qualities that he instilled in the city government.

When called to service by the community, Basilio Villarreal served honorably. His example inspires others to become involved in politics, pursue educational opportunities, and participate in church activities, teaching all of us to recognize and value the involvement and activism. He is a proud man who has served his community well, and Rio Grande City is a better place for having had Basilio Villarreal as its mayor.

HONORING THE CAREER OF MR. LESTER M. BORNSTEIN OF NEW JERSEY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge and honor the retirement of Mr. Lester Bornstein who ends 38 years of service to the Newark Beth Israel Medical Center. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Bornstein on his incredible accomplishments as president of the Newark Beth Israel Medical Center.

Mr. Bornstein began dedicating his time and energy to the Newark Beth Israel Medical Center in 1957, serving as assistant director. His role changed later years and he supported the Beth Israel Medical Center as acting executive director, executive director and as a member of the board of trustees.

I had the opportunity to work closely with Mr. Bornstein when I was a member of the Newark Municipal Council and when he served on my 10th Congressional District health care task force. Mr. Bornstein is an incredibly skilled man who is dedicated to serving his community. He took initiative and helped to ensure that the Beth Israel Medical Center remained in the community at a time when many other city hospitals were leaving.

I admire this commitment that has always been an integral part of this fine man’s persona.

As reporter Angela Stewart of The Star-Ledger noted in her June 21 article, “Those who have watched him work over the years say Bornstein has managed to strike an almost perfect balance between civility and his driving ambition to make the inner-city hospital a respected institution.” His goal has been and continues to be realized. In 1988, Mr. Bornstein helped secure a $10 million loan to construct a patient care pavilion. Recently, the Lester M. Bornstein Center for Emergency Services officially opened to patients. It is clear that Mr. Bornstein has been an important driving force for the Newark Beth Israel Medical Center.

It is an honor for me to have the opportunity to thank Mr. Bornstein for being a strong leader of the Newark Beth Israel Medical Center and for keeping his promise to the community of Newark, Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in applauding his career and wishing him the best in all his future endeavors.

HON. CARDISS COLLINS OF ILLINOIS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, D.C. Subcommittee Chairman TOM DAVIS and the subcommittee’s ranking member, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, are to be commended for once again having collaborated in a bipartisan manner to produce legislation to aid the District of Columbia. I commend them for their efforts.

The District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority Act of 1996 will permit the issuance of revenue bonds necessary to finance much needed capital improvements at the District’s Blue Plains Wastewater Treatment Plant and within the District’s drinking water distribution system.

I understand that on April 5, 1996, the District government and the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] reached an agreement which requires the District to engage in a 2-year, $20 million capital improvement program designed to halt the further deterioration of the Blue Plains facility and to make significant improvements in the maintenance and treatment procedures at the plant.

In addition, I understand that the District has had persistent problems with bacteria turning up in its drinking water distribution system. Several violations were documented between September 1993 and November 1995. This overall situation led EPA to issue an administrative order on November 14, 1995 which directed the District to submit a comprehensive plan and schedule for remedial actions such as making repairs to its drinking water storage facilities.

I urge Members to support this very important legislation. Its enactment will ensure that the Nation’s Capital will continue to have environmentally secure water and sewer systems to meet the needs of its residents and visitors into the 21st Century.

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT OF NEW YORK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which won the 1996 Public Employees Roundtable Public Service Excellence Award in the Federal Category. FEMA’s Disaster Assistance Program faced stiff competition as one of 300 entries considered by the Public Employees Roundtable.

After watching FEMA at work following January flooding in my district, it comes as no surprise to me that FEMA won. When eight of the 25 counties of the State of New York were devastated by winter flooding, FEMA staff rallied to our aid. James Lee Witt, FEMA administrator, and New York Governor George Pataki personally accompanied me on a tour of flood ravaged areas, to see and experience the problem ourselves and to be part of the solution. FEMA was magnificent. Flooding occurred on a Friday and Saturday. FEMA Region II, under Director Lynn Cantor, was providing technical assistance to New York State officials on Friday, monitoring the situation and laying the groundwork for the communications, organization and logistics so necessary for an effective recovery effort. And within 10 days of the flood, families who applied for aid were receiving checks. This timely response was invaluable as communities with limited resources struggled to cope with overwhelming devastation.

Equally invaluable is the continuing support FEMA provides. Four months after the flood, FEMA is still on the job and my office is in direct contact with the District Field Office in our State capital. This office performs follow-up work on projects and provides guidance to State and local governments as well as to citizens who are still rebuilding.

In addition to my personal experience working with FEMA, as chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over Stafford Disaster Assistance programs, I know from a broader perspective how well FEMA does in the field. From earthquakes to floods to hurricanes, this is a Federal agency that prides itself on responding quickly and efficiently. Apart from natural disasters, FEMA also is on hand when man-made disasters strike. The bombing in Oklahoma City is a case in point. In the midst of grief and horror, FEMA staff helped the victims and residents of that shocked city in their recovery efforts.

The human spirit is capable of amazing things in times of trouble. With FEMA at the helm, that also can be said of the U.S. Government. In an era when government bashing is a popular sport in some quarters, FEMA shows us the importance of coordinated Federal efforts to overcome adversity. They do us proud.

THE RURAL HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1996—ENSURING ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICA’S RURAL CITIZENS OF WISCONSIN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, June 27, 1996

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate have made great strides toward producing a bill to bring about affordable health care. While Mr. POSHARD and I applaud the Congress for working on the issues of affordability and portability of health insurance, the problem in rural areas is not only affordability and portability but also accessibility.

Rural hospitals are closing throughout the country because Medicare payments are inadequate to cover costs. The current Medicare...
structure does not provide sufficient flexibility to allow hospitals to network or merge, vital steps which rural hospitals must take to ensure survival. While the 1995 Balanced Budget Act contained several provisions that would have accomplished many of our goals, those provisions were killed by President Clinton’s veto vetoed.

During floor consideration of H.R. 3103, the Health Care Availability and Affordability Act, I tried to offer an amendment that would have addressed many rural concerns. Although my amendment was not allowed, I received a personal assurance from the House leadership that rural health would be dealt with yet this year.

In mid-May, I gave a speech before the National Rural Health Association in which I outlined the primary needs of rural health care as I saw it. Following that speech, we held several meetings with the core membership of the Rural Health Care Coalition and our constituent health associations.

The result is a comprehensive consensus bill that reflects a broad view of how to better provide access to health care for rural America.

This bill seeks to increase access to health care for rural citizens in four areas:

First, it reduces the wide variation existing between urban and rural areas in the Medicare payment per capita cost (AAPCC) payment made to health maintenance organizations (HMOs). While HMOs serving some urban areas are receiving upwards of $650, the AAPCC payment in 1995 for Vernon County, WI, was $211. This kind of disparity results in HMOs failing over themselves to serve urban areas while shunning rural Americans who have paid the same Medicare tax all of their lives.

Improving the payment formula will actually allow for greater health care options and competition in rural America. This bill will help to make HMOs and PSOs an option for Medicare beneficiaries in western Wisconsin, an option that does not currently exist.

Second, it encourages rural providers to form networks to reduce costs, share services, and provide more efficient services. It does so by providing grant money for communities to create rural health networks, creating new categories of hospitals under Medicare, and encouraging community health centers to expand into areas not presently served.

This bill also provides to States and private entities (1) grants to develop comprehensive plans to increase access to health care for rural communities, and (2) technical assistance and development grants to assist hospitals in creating provider networks.

At the result, when we are trying to balance the budget, the Federal Government can no longer carry under-utilized facilities. However, rural communities cannot afford to go without essential emergency and primary care services. To address these needs, we create two new categories of limited-service hospitals under Medicare. Rural Emergency Access Care Hospitals provide only 24 hour emergency care to communities in need of an emergency facility, but not a full-service hospital. Rural primary care hospitals may provide a broader range of services and for a period of up to four years.

Further, in order to bolster an expansion of community health centers, our bill directs the Secretary of DHHS, when making new grants under the Public Health Service Act, to give priority to areas not presently served by community health centers [CHCs] and to CHCs located in or adjacent to community hospitals.

This bill also expresses the sense of the Congress that the Federal Trade Commission should promptly complete its review of the anti-trust standard to be applied to provider networks. Rural providers need anti-trust relief that will allow them the flexibility necessary to provide adequate care with limited resources, and to ensure that network arrangements do not violate current laws and regulations. A thorough review of current law there is a need for further legislation in this sensitive area.

Third, this bill provides incentives to physicians and other health care professionals to locate and provide services in rural areas. We exempt National Health Service Corps loan repayments and scholarships from federal income taxes and direct the Secretary of DHHS to give priority placement to areas that have created community rural health networks.

In addition, this bill increases the Medicare incentive payment already paid to providers in health professional shortage areas [HPSAs] from 10 to 20 percent. However, we limit the payment to primary care providers in rural HPSAs, where recruitment efforts are more difficult.

Finally, it provides a good first step toward recognition of tele-medicine as an emerging technology with enormous potential in rural medicine. Our bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a payment methodology under Medicare for tele-medicine services in rural areas.

Mr. POSHARO and I, as well as key coalition members, realize that the introduction of this bill represents the first step in the legislative process. We are committed to working with the chairman on the committees of jurisdiction to ensure that essential rural health access provisions are enacted into law this year.

SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1996

SPEECH OF
HON. JANE HARMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 25, 1996

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3604, the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments. This bill is supported by environmentalists, industry, State and local governments, and consumer advocates. This bill is an attempt to pass long environmental legislation if it worked together on a bipartisan basis.

In my view, keeping our water clean is one of our Nation's most pressing environmental concerns. A strong Clean Water Act is necessary to keep our oceans, lakes, and rivers clean for all to enjoy. Similarly, a strong Safe Drinking Water Act is essential to keep harmful pollutants out of our drinking water, which is literally our bloodstream.

This legislation will do just that. The bill, for the first time, authorizes $7.6 billion for the State drinking water revolving loan fund, which is used by our communities to build and improve drinking water treatment facilities. Equally as important, the legislation guarantees that Americans will be informed of exactly which pollutants are in their drinking water. My State of California already has a successful right-to-know statute—I'm glad that the rest of the Nation has now followed our lead.

This legislation also proves that there is an effective way to balance environmental protection with economic concerns. The bill reforms rigid regulations by providing EPA with more flexibility in setting standards for drinking water contaminants. I’m pleased that the bill will allow EPA to consider costs and benefits in establishing standards for new contaminants.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is proof that Congress can pass strong environmental legislation on a bipartisan basis. It is evidence of how successful we can be if we put partisanship behind us.
goal will certainly prove detrimental to the safety and well-being of our citizens.

My constituents call daily to say they oppose decreased funding for the Community Development Block Grant by 10 percent in fiscal year 1997. In fact, Chicago’s Mayor Daley recently contacted me to pass along his thoughts about the Republican cuts.

The Community Development Block Grant program is exactly the kind of program this Congress should be holding up—and preserving—as a model for how partnerships between the Federal, State, and local governments should operate.

John H. Stroger, Jr., President, Cook County Board of Commissioners, also predicted that the reduction of $1,579,100 under H.R. 3666, would translate to many of our low-income constituents not receiving needed assistance for housing rehabilitation, senior citizen facilities and services, and neighborhood improvements. Definitely unacceptable cuts indeed!

Mr. Speaker, cuts in veterans benefits also impacts my district. The bill before us today has a total of $38.8 billion in fiscal year 1997 for programs and benefits provided by the Veterans Affairs Department.

By the year 2010, the majority of our veterans will be over the age of 62, while the fastest growing veteran population today is over 80 years of age. It is estimated that about 2.9 million patients will receive VA medical treatment in fiscal year 1997. This is a matter of grave concern to me, because many veterans in my district depend on veterans compensation as a sole source of income. But equally important, these veterans also need their eligibility for access to adequate health care.
Chamber Action
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Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1910-1921, S. Res. 273 and 274, and S. Con. Res. 66.

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 3540, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 104-295)

S. 1194, to amend the Mining and Mineral Policy Act of 1970 to promote the research, identification, assessment, and exploration of marine mineral resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 104-296)

S. 1225, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an inventory of historic sites, buildings, and artifacts in the Champlain Valley and the upper Hudson River Valley, including the Lake George area, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 104-297)

S. 1646, to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance safety, training, research and development, and safety education in the propane gas industry for the benefit of propane consumers and the public, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 104-298)

S. 1703, to amend the Act establishing the National Park Foundation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 104-299)

H.R. 1823, to amend the Central Utah Project Completion Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to allow for prepayment of repayment contracts between the United States and the Central Utah Water Conservancy District dated December 28, 1965, and November 26, 1985. (S. Rept. No. 104-300)

H.R. 2967, to extend the authorization of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978. (S. Rept. No. 104-301)

H.R. 3008, to amend the Helium Act to authorize the Secretary to enter into agreements with private parties for the recovery and disposal of helium on Federal lands, with an amendment. (S. Rept. No. 104-302)

S. 1648, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel Herco Tyme. (S. Rept. No. 104-303)

S. 1682, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel Liberty. (S. Rept. No. 104-304)

S. 1825, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel Halcyon. (S. Rept. No. 104-305)

S. 1826, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel Courier Service. (S. Rept. No. 104-306)

S. 1828, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel Top Gun. (S. Rept. No. 104-307)

Measures Passed:

Congressional Adjournment: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 192, providing for an adjournment of the two Houses.

Defense/Security Assistance: Senate passed H.R. 3121, to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts, and to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, after agreeing to committee amendments.

Saudi Arabia Terror Attacks: Senate agreed to S. Res. 273, condemning terror attacks in Saudi Arabia.

North Platte Refuge: Senate passed H.R. 2679, to revise the boundary of the North Platte National
Wildlife Refuge, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto:

McCain (for Chafee) Amendment No. 4385, in the nature of a substitute.

Federal Securities Laws: Senate passed H.R. 3005, to amend Federal securities laws in order to promote efficiency and capital formation in the financial markets, and to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to promote more efficient management of mutual funds, protect investors, and provide more effective and less burdensome regulation, after striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. 1815, Senate companion measure, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Senate insisted on its amendment, requested a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair appointed the following conferees: Senators D'Amato, Gramm, Bennett, Sarbanes, and Dodd.

Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse: Senate passed S. 1636, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 235 North Washington Avenue in Scranton, Pennsylvania, as the "William J. Nealon Federal Building and United States Courthouse", clearing the measure for the President.

Mark O. Hatfield Courthouse: Senate passed S. 1636, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 235 North Washington Avenue in Scranton, Pennsylvania, as the "William J. Nealon Federal Building and United States Courthouse", clearing the measure for the President.

McCain (for Heflin/Shelby) Amendment No. 4375, to require the Secretary of the Army to type classify the "Electro Optic Augmentation (EOA) system" for purposes of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996.

Hayes Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 2704, to provide that the United States Post Office building that is to be located on the 2600 block of East 75th Street in Chicago, Illinois, shall be known as the "Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building", clearing the measure for the President.

Madigan Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 1880, to designate the United States Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, Illinois, as the "Edward Madigan Post Office Building", clearing the measure for the President.

DOD Authorizations: Senate resumed consideration of S. 1745, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, with committee amendments, taking action on amendments proposed thereto, as follows:

Adopted:
By a unanimous vote of 96 yeas (Vote No. 177), Nunn/Lugar Amendment No. 4349, to authorize funds to establish measures to protect the security of the United States from proliferation and use of weapons of mass destruction.

Pryor Amendment No. 4365, to express the sense of the Senate that the generic drug industry should be provided equitable relief in the same manner as other industries under the transitional provisions of the Uruguay Round of Agreements Act of 1994.

By 53 yeas to 45 nays, 1 responding present (Vote No. 179), Hatch Amendment No. 4366 (to Amendment No. 4365), in the nature of a substitute.

Harkin Modified Amendment No. 4177, to provide for defense burden-sharing.

By 74 yeas to 18 nays (Vote No. 180), Cohen Modified Amendment No. 4369, to authorize additional disposals of material from the National Defense Stockpile.

McCain (for Warner/Smith) Amendment No. 4372, to require a study of ship self-defense options for the Cyclone class patrol craft.

Levin (for Glenn/Abraham) Amendment No. 4373, to place a condition on authority of the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of certain tugboats to the Northeast Wisconsin Railroad Transportation Commission.

McCain (for Cohen) Amendment No. 4374, to clarify the definition of the term "national security system" for purposes of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996.

Levin (for Heflin/Shelby) Amendment No. 4375, to require the Secretary of the Army to type classify the Electro Optic Augmentation (EOA) system.

McConnell Modified Amendment No. 4368, to provide that the report of F-22 aircraft program costs include a comparison with an earlier estimate of costs.

Levin (for Simon/Conrad/Levin) Amendment No. 4377, to provide funding for research and development relating to desalting technologies.

McCain Amendment No. 4378, to propose an alternative to section 366, relating to Department of Defense support for sporting events.
Levin (for Reid) Amendment No. 4379, to provide for the payment by the Department of Energy of costs of operating and maintaining the infrastructure of the Nevada Test Site, Nevada, with respect to activities of the Department of Defense at the site.

McCain (for Kyl) Amendment No. 4380, to express the sense of the Senate concerning export controls.

McCain (for Helms) Amendment No. 4381, to attach conditions and limitations to the provision of support for Mexico for counter-drug activities.

Levin (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 4382, to control the sale of chemicals used to manufacture controlled substances.

McCain (for Moseley-Braun/Lott/Cochran) Amendment No. 4383, to continue funding for computer-assisted education and training.

Levin Amendment No. 4384, to require that operational support airlift aircraft excess to the requirements of the Department of Defense be placed in an inactive status and stored at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base pending any study or analysis of the costs and benefits of operating or disposing of such aircraft.

Rejected:

Lautenberg Amendment No. 4218, to block the transfer of $76 million of federally-owned weapons, ammunition, funds, and other property to a private Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety. (By 71 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. 178), Senate tabled the amendment.)

Withdrawn:

Warner (for Pressler/Daschle) Amendment No. 4350, to express the sense of the Congress on naming one of the new attack submarines the “South Dakota”.

Grigg Amendment No. 4364, to provide for the forfeiture of retirement benefits in the case of any Member of Congress, congressional employee, or Federal justice or judge who is convicted of an offense relating to the official duties of that individual, and for the forfeiture of the retirement allowance of the President for such a conviction.

Grassley Amendment No. 4370, to establish a commission to review the dispute settlement reports of the World Trade Organization.

Bryan/Reid Amendment No. 4371 (to Amendment No. 4369), to delete the provisions relating to titanium sponge.

Pending:

Nunn Amendment No. 4367, to require the President to submit a report to Congress on NATO enlargement.

A third motion was entered to close further debate on the bill and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on the third cloture motion could occur on Saturday, June 29, 1996.

By unanimous-consent agreement, the vote on the second motion to close further debate on the bill, scheduled to occur today, was rescheduled to occur on Friday, June 28, 1996 at 9:30 a.m.

Measure Indefinitely Postponed: Senate indefinitely postponed further consideration of the following measure:

Iranian Bahá'í: S. Con. Res. 42, concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Bahá'í community.

Treaties Approved: The following treaties having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including presentation of resolutions of ratification, upon division, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolutions of ratification were agreed to:

Treaty Doc. 103-35, Treaty Between the United States and Jamaica Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment, with annex and protocol.

Treaty Doc. 103-36, Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of Belarus Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with annex and protocol.

Treaty Doc. 103-37, Treaty Between the United States and Ukraine Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with annex.


Treaty Doc. 104-10, Treaty Between the United States and Mongolia Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, annex and protocol.


Treaty Doc. 104–14, Treaty Between the United States and Republic of Trinidad and Tobago Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with annex and protocol.

Treaty Doc. 104–19, Treaty Between the United States and Albania Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with annex and protocol.


Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:
- Thomas C. Hubbard, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Palau.
- Glen Robert Rase, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Brunei Darussalam.
- Raymond W. Kelly, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement.
- Wendy Jean Chamberlin, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Lao People’s Democratic Republic.
- James Francis Creagan, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Honduras.
- Lino Gutierrez, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua.
- Dennis C. Jett, of New Mexico, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru.
- Tibor P. Nagy, Jr., of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guinea.
- Donald J. Planty, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guatemala.
- Leslie M. Alexander, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ecuador.
- John Christian Kornblum, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.
- Barbara Mills Larkin, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.
- John W. Hechinger, Sr., of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Security Education Board for a term of four years.
- Avis T. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bulgaria.
- Marisa R. Lino, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania.
- John F. Hicks, Sr., of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the State of Eritrea.
- Alan R. Mcke, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Swaziland.
- Arlene Render, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zambia.
- Harold Walter Giesel, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador of the United States of America to the Republic of Seychelles.
- Marcia E. Miller, of Indiana, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission for the term expiring December 16, 2003.
- Gerald S. McGowan, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation for a term expiring December 17, 1998.
- Madeleine May Kunin, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to Switzerland.
- Vicky A. Bailey, of Indiana, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2001.
- A. Vernon Weaver, of Arkansas, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador.

Routine lists in the Foreign Service.

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:
- A routine list in the Foreign Service.

Messages From the House:

Petitions:

Executive Reports of Committees:

Statements on Introduced Bills:

Additional Cosponsors:

Amendments Submitted:

Notices of Hearings:

Authority for Committees:

Additional Statements:

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—180)

Adjournment: Senate convened at 8:15 a.m., and adjourned on Friday, June 28, 1996, at 12:06 a.m., to reconvene at 8:30 a.m., the same day. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S7218.)
Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Committee ordered favorably reported, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, H.R. 3540, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997.

APPROPRIATIONS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on District of Columbia held hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1997 for the government of the District of Columbia, focusing on the District of Columbia public school system, receiving testimony from Karen Shook, President, Jay Silberman, Member At Large, Franklin L. Smith, Superintendent of Schools, and Shelia Handy, Deputy Superintendent for Educational Accountability, Assessment, and Information, all of the District of Columbia Board of Education; and Christopher Cross, Council for Basic Education, Roberts Jones, National Alliance of Business, and Mark Root, Tech Corps, all of Washington, D.C.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY


Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 983 military nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

FEDERAL ASSISTED HOUSING

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Housing Opportunity and Community Development concluded hearings on a proposal to restructure the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Federal Housing Administration insured and assisted multifamily housing portfolio that receives project-based rental assistance, after receiving testimony from Nicolas Retsinas, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for Housing/Federal Housing Commissioner; Patricia J. Payne, Maryland State Department of Housing and Community Development, Crownsville, Maryland, on behalf of the National Council of State Housing Agencies; John K. McIlwain, National Housing Conference, and Benson F. Roberts, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, both of Chevy Chase, Maryland; Eugene F. Ford, Mid-City Financial Corporation, and Michael Bodaken, National Housing Trust, both of Bethesda, Maryland; John J. Koelemij, Tallahassee, Florida, on behalf of the National Association of Home Builders; and Billy Easton, New York State Tenants and Neighbors Coalition, Albany.

FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee held hearings on proposals to improve the management and organization of Federal natural resources and environmental functions, receiving testimony from Senator Craig; Michael Gryszkowiec, Director of Planning and Reporting, and Charles S. Cotton, Assistant Director, and Chester Joy, Senior Evaluator, both of Energy, Resources and Science Issues, all of the Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, and Susan Irving, Associate Director, Budget Issues, Accounting Information Management Division, all of the General Accounting Office; Alan L. Dean, National Academy of Public Administration, Washington, D.C.; and Robert H. Nelson, University of Maryland, College Park, on behalf of the Competitive Enterprise Institute.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Arthur Gajarsa, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit; Joan B. Gottschall to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Robert L. Hinkle, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida, Lawrence E. Kahn, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, and Frank R. Zapata, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.
CHURCH BURNINGS
Committee on the Judiciary:
Committee concluded hearings on the Federal response to recent incidents of church burnings in predominantly black churches across the South, after receiving testimony from Senators Faircloth and Kennedy; Deval L. Patrick, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, Department of Justice, and James E. Johnson, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, Department of the Treasury, both on behalf of the National Church Arson Task Force; Mac Charles Jones, National Council of Churches, New York, New York; Ralph E. Reed, Jr., Christian Coalition, Chesapeake, Virginia; and Jonathan Monzan, Manning, South Carolina.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 24 public bills, H.R. 3730–3753; and 7 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 192–195, and H. Res. 468–470 were introduced.

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 361, to provide authority to control exports (H. Rept. 104–605, Part II);

Report of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight entitled “Fraud and Abuse in Medicare and Medicaid: Stronger Enforcement and Better Management Could Save Billions (H. Rept. 104–641);

H.R. 3308, to amend title 10, United States Code, to limit the placement of United States forces under United Nations operational or tactical control (H. Rept. 104–642, Part I);

H.R. 2560, to provide for conveyances of certain lands in Alaska to Chickaloon-Moose Creek Native Association, Inc., Ninilchik Native Association, Inc., Seldovia Native Association, Inc., Tyonek Native Corporation, and Knikatnu, Inc. under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, amended (H. Rept. 104–643);

H.R. 2670, to provide for the release of the reversionary interest held by the United States in certain property located in the Country of Iosco, Michigan, amended (H. Rept. 104–644);

H.R. 3326, to designate the Southern Piedmont Conservation Research Center located at 1420 Experimental Station Road in Watkinsville, Georgia, as the “J. Phil Campbell, Senior Natural Resource Conservation Center” (H. Rept. 104–645);

H.R. 2925, to modify the application of the antitrust laws to health care provider networks that provide health care services (H. Rept. 104–646);

H.R. 3458, to increase, effective as of December 1, 1996, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans (H. Rept. 104–647);

H.R. 3643, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend through December 31, 1998, the period during which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is authorized to provide priority health care to certain veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange or who served in the Persian Gulf War and to make such authority permanent in the case of certain veterans exposed to ionizing radiation (H. Rept. 104–648);

H.R. 3673, to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve certain veterans programs and benefits, to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to enter into arrangements for the repair and long-term maintenance of war memorials for which the Commission assumes responsibility (H. Rept. 104–649);

H.R. 3674, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the causal relationship required between a veteran's service-connected disability and employment handicap for purposes of determining eligibility for training and rehabilitation assistance, to transfer certain educational assistance entitlements from the Post-Vietnam Era Educational Assistance Program to the Montgomery GI Bill (H. Rept. 104–650);

H.R. 3734, Welfare and Medicaid Reform Act (H. Rept. 104–651);

H.R. 248, Traumatic Brain Injury Act of 1996 (H. Rept. 104–652); and


Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein the appointed Representative White to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Church Arson: By unanimous consent agreed to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3525, to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the Federal jurisdiction over offenses relating to damage to religious property—clearing the measure for the President.
District of Columbia Revenue Bonds: The House passed H.R. 3663, to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to permit the Council of the District of Columbia to authorize the issuance of revenue bonds with respect to water and sewer facilities. Agreed to the Davis technical amendment in the nature of a substitute. Pages H6982–H7026

M-F-N Status—People’s Republic of China: By a recorded vote of 141 ayes to 286 noes, Roll No. 284, the House failed to pass H.J. Res. 182, disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People’s Republic of China. Pages H6985–H7026

U.S. Concerns—People’s Republic of China: By a yeo-and-nay vote of 411 ayes to 7 nays with 3 voting “present”, Roll No. 285, the House agreed to H. Res. 461 regarding U.S. concerns with human rights abuse, nuclear and chemical weapons proliferation, illegal weapons trading, military intimidation of Taiwan, and trade violations by the People’s Republic of China and the People’s Liberation Army, and directing the committees of jurisdiction to commerce hearings and report appropriate legislation. Pages H7027–40


H. Res. 465, the rule which provided for consideration of the concurrent resolution was agreed to earlier by a yeo-and-nay vote of 248 yeas to 166 nays, Roll No. 286. Pages H7040–50

Question of Privilege of the House: The Chair ruled that H. Res. 468, relating to a question of the privileges of the House, did constitute a question of privilege of the House and was in order. Pages H7050–51

Subsequently, agreed to the Army motion to table the resolution (agreed to by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 170 noes with 7 voting “present”, Roll No. 287). Pages H7050–51

Personal Privilege: Representative Dornan rose to a point of personal privilege and was recognized for one hour. Pages H7051–67

Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations: By a yeo-and-nay vote of 403 ayes to 2 noes, Roll No. 292, the House passed H.R. 3675, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997. Pages H7067–H7100

Agreed To:
The Wolf technical amendment that adjusts funding for Federal Transit Administration formula grant expenses;
The Traficant amendment that expresses the sense of Congress that entities expending funds comply with the Buy America Act, purchase American made equipment and products to the greatest extent practicable, and further prohibits contracts with persons falsely labeling products as made in America;

The Hunter amendment that limits loan guarantees for international railroad projects until studies relating to criminal activities have been completed and made available to the public; and

The Collins of Georgia amendment that prohibits the use of funding by the National Transportation Safety Board to determine the feasibility of allowing individuals who are more than 60 years of age to pilot commercial aircraft (agreed to by a recorded vote of 247 ayes to 159 noes, Roll No. 291).

Rejected:
The Oberstar amendment that sought to increase funding for the Federal Aviation Administration by $1 million and decrease funding for the Department of Transportation Inspector General by $1 million (rejected by a recorded vote of 193 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 288);

The Filner amendment that sought to provide authority for $490,000 in loan guarantees for the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Program (rejected by a recorded vote of 162 ayes to 238 noes, Roll No. 289);

The Andrews amendment that sought to require that States conduct a cost-benefit analysis when contracting for surface transportation projects usually performed by employees of the State (rejected by a recorded vote of 123 ayes to 280 noes, Roll No. 290).

A point of order was sustained against language that sought to authorize $5 million to the Coast Guard to establish a discretionary boating safety grant program;

The Gutknecht amendment was offered, but subsequently withdrawn that sought to apply a 1.9 percent reduction to all discretionary funding.

Designation of Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Morella to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through Monday July 8.

Meeting Hour: Agreed that when the House adjourns on Monday, July 8, it adjourn to meet at
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12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, July 9 for morning hour debates. Agreed that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, it adjourn to meet at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, July 10.

Prime Minister of Israel: Agreed that it be in order at any time on Wednesday, July 10 for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel.

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of July 10.

Extension of Remarks: Agreed that for today all members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the record entitled "Extension of Remarks".

Resignations—Appointments: Agreed that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, July 8 the Speaker and the Minority Leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

Recess Filing of Committee Report: It was made in order that the Committee on Small Business be permitted to file its report on H.R. 3158, the "Pilot Small Business Technology Transfer Program Extension Act of 1996", before 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, July 3.

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate appear on pages H 6975 and H 7100.


Adjournment: Met at 12:00 p.m. and pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 192, adjourned at 1:16 a.m. on Friday, June 28 until 12:00 noon on Monday, July 8.

Committee Meetings

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Ordered reported the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriations for fiscal year 1997.

ONE-CALL NOTIFICATION PROGRAM

Committee on Commerce. Subcommittee on Energy and Power held an oversight hearing on the One-Call Notification Program. Testimony was heard from Representative Franks of New Jersey; Richard Felder, Associate Administrator, Pipeline Safety Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation; Robert Chipkevich, Chief, Pipeline/Hazardous Materials Division, National Transportation Safety Board; and public witnesses.

PATIENT RIGHT TO KNOW ACT

Committee on Commerce. Subcommittee on Health and Environment approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 2976, Patient Right to Know Act of 1996.

CORPORATE AMERICA—WAR ON DRUGS

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice held a hearing on Corporate America and the War on Drugs. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

CASTRO’S CUBA—HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere held a joint hearing on Human Rights Violations In Castro’s Cuba: The Repression Continues. Testimony was heard from Representative Diaz-Balart; Michael Rannenberger, Coordinator for Cuban Affairs, Department of State; and public witnesses.

FOREIGN BUILDING OPERATIONS

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on International Relations and Human Rights held a hearing on Foreign Building Operations. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: Patrick Kennedy, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Administration; and Jacquelyn L. Williams-Bridgers, Inspector General; and Benjamin Nelson, Director, International Relations and Trade Issues, GAO.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; OVERSIGHT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law approved for full Committee action the following resolutions: H.J. Res. 113, granting the consent of Congress to the compact to provide for joint natural resource management and enforcement of laws and regulations pertaining to natural resources and boating at the Jennings Randolph Lake Project lying in Garrett County, MD, and Mineral County, WV, entered into between the States of West Virginia and Maryland; and H.J. Res. 166, granting the consent of Congress to the mutual aid agreement between the city of Bristol, VA, and the city of Bristol, TN.

Prior to this action, the Subcommittee held a hearing on these resolutions. Testimony was heard.
from Senator Sarbanes; Representatives Mollohan; Bartlett of Maryland; Boucher and Quillen; Herbert Sachs, Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin; Lt. Col. Thomas Turner, Deputy Superintendent, Natural Resources Police, State of Maryland; and William B. Daniel, Assistant Chief, Law Enforcement Section, Department of Natural Resources, State of West Virginia.

The Subcommittee also held an oversight and re-authorization hearing on the Negotiated Rulemaking Act. Testimony was heard from Joseph A. Dear, Assistant Secretary, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor; Wilma Liebman, Deputy Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service; Neil B. Eisner, Assistant General Counsel, Regulation and Enforcement, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Crime held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 3565, Violent Youth Predator Act of 1996; and H.R. 3445, Balanced Juvenile Justice and Crime Prevention Act of 1996. Testimony was heard from the following U.S. Attorneys: Department of Justice: Karen Schreier, District of South Dakota; and Charles Wilson, Middle District of Florida; Jeff Sessions, Attorney General, State of Alabama; Elizabeth Weaver, Justice, Supreme Court, State of Michigan; and public witnesses.

WAR CRIMES ACT
Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims approved for full Committee action H.R. 3680, War Crimes Act of 1996.

TACTICAL AVIATION PROGRAMS
Committee on National Security: Subcommittee on Military Procurement and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development held a joint hearing on tactical aviation programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Paul Kaminski, Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology; and Gen. Joe Ralston, USAF, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff and Chairman, Joint Requirements Oversight Council; the following officials of the National Security Division, CBO: Cindy Williams, Assistant Director; Lane Pierrot and JoAnn Vines, both Principal Analysts; and the following of the GAO: Richard Davis, Director, National Security Issues; and Louis Rodrigues, Director, Defense Acquisitions.

OVERSIGHT—NATURAL GAS-ROYALTY-IN-KIND PILOT PROGRAM
Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held an oversight hearing on Roy-alty-In-Kind for natural gas (lessons learned from the Gulf of Mexico pilot program). Testimony was heard from Cynthia L. Quaterman, Director, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior; Stroud C. Kelley, Special Counsel, Energy Policy, General Land Office, State of Texas; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans approved for full Committee action amended the following bills; H.R. 3287, Crawford National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act; H.R. 3546, Walhalla National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act; and H.R. 3557, Marion National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES
Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 2122, amended, to consolidate the management of the national forests in the Lake Tahoe region from four forests to one; H.R. 2438, amended, to provide for the conveyance of lands to certain individuals in Gunnison County, Colorado; H.R. 2518, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange certain lands in the Wenatchee National Forest for certain lands owned by Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County, Washington; H.R. 2693, to make a minor adjustment in the exterior boundary of Hells Canyon Wilderness in Oregon and Idaho; H.R. 2709, amended, to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the Del Norte County Unified School District of Del Norte County, California; H.R. 3547, amended, to provide for the conveyance of a parcel of real property in the Apache National Forest in Arizona to the Alpine Elementary School District 7 to be used for the construction of school facilities and related playing fields; H.R. 3147, to provide for the exchange of certain lands in the State of California managed by the Bureau of Land Management for certain non-federal lands; H.R. 2135, amended, to provide for the correction of boundaries of certain lands in Clark County, Nevada, acquired by persons who purchased such lands in good faith reliance on existing private land surveys; H.R. 2711, to provide for the substitution of timber for the canceled Elkhorn Ridge Timber Sale; and H.R. 2466, amended, Federal Land Exchange Improvement Act of 1995.

COMPETITION FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTS
Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing on Small Business Competition for Federal Contracts: The Impact of Federal Prison Industries. Testimony was heard from Steve B. Schwalb, Chief Operating Officer, Federal Prison Industries, and Assistant Director,
Industries, Education and Vocational Training, FBI, Department of Justice; and public witnesses.

**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Met in executive session to consider pending business.

**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT; DEEPWATER PORT MODERNIZATION ACT; CONSTRUCTION RESOLUTION**

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Ordered reported amended the following bills: H.R. 3592, Water Resources Development Act of 1996; and H.R. 2940, Deepwater Port Modernization Act.

The Committee also approved an amendment to a previously approved construction resolution.

**HEALTH CARE**

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care concluded hearings on the future of health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Testimony was heard from Robert Kolodner, M.D., Deputy Chief Information Officer, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; RAdm. William R. Rowley, USN, M.D., Commander, Naval Medical Center, Portsmouth, VA; David Baine, Director, Health Care Delivery and Quality Issues, Health, Education and Human Services Division, GAO; representatives of veterans organizations; and public witnesses.

**BARRIERS TO ADOPTION**

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing on Barriers to Adoption. Testimony was heard from Senator DeWine; Representatives Miller of California, and Fawell; Connie Binsfeld, Lt. Gov., State of Michigan; D. Bruce Levy, Administrative Judge, Juvenile Division, 11th Judicial Circuit, Miami, Florida; and public witnesses.

**SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND**

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security concluded hearings on the use of Social Security Trust Fund money to finance union activities at the Social Security Administration. Testimony was heard from Shirley Sears Chater, Commissioner, SSA.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1996**

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

**Senate**

Committee on the Judiciary, to resume hearings to examine the dissemination of Federal Bureau of Investigation background investigation reports and other information to the White House, 9 a.m., SH-216.

**House**

Next Meeting of the SENATE
8:30 a.m., Friday, June 28

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 1745, DOD Authorizations, with a second cloture vote to occur thereon at 9:30 a.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12 noon, Monday, July 8

House Chamber

Program for Monday: No agenda as yet announced.
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