

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 4, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

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

On this National Day of Prayer, we give thanks, O gracious God, for the rich blessings that have been given to us and to our Nation. May we be worthy of the high calling that comes to each person of our land and be faithful in our work and in our service. May we learn to respect each other and gain a greater appreciation of our different traditions that growing together in the bond of unity and in the spirit of respect, we may live our lives in useful service to others. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. LOWEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FROM COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 4, 1993.

Hon. TOM FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit my resignation from the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Small Business to the House of Representatives effective this date.

It has been a distinct honor to serve on both of these committees. However, in accordance with the rules of the Republican Conference, my selection for the Committee on Ways and Means precludes my service on the Agriculture or Small Business Committee.

I look forward to my continued service as a voice for agriculture and small business on

the Ways and Means Committee. The many important issues which come before the committee will be of vital concern to farm families, employers, and employees across Michigan and America.

With deepest appreciation,
Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 66) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 66

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. Camp of Michigan;

Committee on the District of Columbia: Mr. Ballenger of North Carolina;

Committee on House Administration: Ms. Dunn of Washington; and the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Pombo of California with two remaining vacancies.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to speak before the 103d Congress. I cannot express the wealth of emotion I feel at this moment—the first occasion I have to speak on the House floor. My experiences while campaigning made me sensitive to the importance of voter registration. Therefore, it is appropriate that the subject matter of this first opportunity to address Congress concerns H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

As national director of voter registration for Clinton-Gore 1992, I am intimately acquainted with voter registration practices.

The three registration methods contained in the bill will reach the entire eligible population, including our young people. America's young adults have often been left out of the demo-

cratic process and ignored by our generation. This act will provide registration facilities where young people are most likely to be found, driver's license and motor vehicle registration facilities.

The right to vote is a fundamental right in America. It is the duty of the Federal Government to protect this right. The motor-voter bill provides simple and effective means to ensure this right for all Americans.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

FRUSTRATION WITHOUT HESITATION

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton, in his campaign for President, promised the American people taxation without hesitation.

The Democratic majority, on the first day of this Congress, gave Delegates representation without taxation.

Now, both President Clinton and the Democrats in the House want to give the American people delegation without compensation.

In the voter registration bill coming up today, the Democrats require the States to implement costly voting procedures without giving them any money to help comply with the mandate.

So, now we have taxation without hesitation, representation without taxation, and delegation without compensation.

What's next? My guess is frustration without hesitation as the Democratic majority and President Clinton continue to implement their legislative agenda.

MOTOR-VOTER LEGISLATION

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to day to speak of new beginnings.

A few weeks ago, a new President took the oath of office and announced that "a new season of American renewal [had] begun." President Clinton told the American people that they had "changed the face of Congress, the Presidency and the political process itself."

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

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

By voting for change, the American people had "forced the spring," the President said, and he urged us all to "do the work the season demands."

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that the National Voter Registration Act offers us a new beginning. We can expand democracy by supporting this legislation.

Voting is a fundamental right. It is a responsibility of citizenship. Yet, for many Americans, it is not easy to register to vote. It is difficult.

This legislation will make it easier and more convenient for people to vote. It will increase voter participation.

Mr. Speaker, when more Americans vote, it renews the strength and vitality of our political process. We must tear down remaining barriers to voting. We must pass the National Voter Registration Act.

GAY BASHING IS WRONG

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to President Clinton's proposal to lift the gay ban in the military. I am opposed, as well, to those who advocate that homosexuality constitutes a normal lifestyle. It does not.

But I am furthermore opposed to the gay bashing that has occurred across our country in recent days. These self-appointed bullies, thugs, see themselves as the country's law enforcers. They grab gay patrons at the bar, haul them into dark alleys and proceed to assault and batter their helpless victims.

These enforcers apparently believe these tactics will preserve the enforcement of the gay ban.

□ 1210

Their foolish, insensitive acts may well accelerate the band's demise. This controversial issue in my opinion should not be before us. It is before us, however, but it must be resolved in a thorough, deliberative manner within the appropriate legislative halls.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2, THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. This legislation is extremely important because it will greatly enhance voter participation by citizens throughout this Nation. My district in Los Angeles has a large number of low- and middle-income families. Many are headed by a single parent or have both parents working. These hard-working citizens

find it difficult to participate in the current voter registration process. Their lack of participation is due to the inconvenience of the process, not to lack of interest.

H.R. 2 will also serve to educate the electorate on the most significant aspect of any democracy, the fundamental right to vote, and H.R. 2 will help ensure that citizens throughout our country will have a greater opportunity to exercise that right. I urge my colleagues to support the final passage of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

VOTER FRAUD AND ILLEGAL ALIEN EMPOWERMENT ACT

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, this bill mandates that government workers at welfare and unemployment offices automatically register to vote all people seeking their services. In order not to register, the applicant must affirm in writing, that he is not eligible to vote.

Under this bill, Zoe Baird's chauffeur—an illegal alien from Peru—would have been registered to vote when receiving his driver's license, unless, he said "I can't register to vote. You see, I'm an illegal alien."

This bill could register to vote a great deal of the estimated 11 million illegal aliens in this country.

My home State of California will pay over \$26 million per year, to pay for this unfunded Federal Government mandate. Even worse, they would be forbidden to require verification of citizenship and will face an onslaught of fraudulent voters.

Our cherished right to vote should not be diluted by the Democratic leadership of this House who sponsor this fraud in hopes of maintaining their 39-year death grip on this House of Congress.

VOTER REGISTRATION LEADS TO POLITICAL EMPOWERMENT

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

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my strong support for H.R. 2, the National Registration Act. I wonder if people over this country understand that there are 70 million eligible voters who are not registered because of the burdensome registration policies and procedures which we have in this country.

The 1992 elections demonstrated that easing voter registration procedures can have a positive impact on increased voter participation. In States that have a "motor voter" program,

the voter turnout has increased, voter registration has increased. Enactment of H.R. 2 will further establish this important trend.

People have found it very difficult. Mr. "Joe Lunchbucket" and other common people that have found it difficult or inconvenient to register will be given new opportunities, if this bill is passed, to get on the voter rolls. Registering at driver's license agencies, registering by mail, registering at State agencies such as welfare and employment offices, will ensure that every eligible voter, and I do not think that any American would want to block the opportunity for any eligible voter, to vote in this country.

The history of voter registration, particularly in the South, demonstrates the importance of procedures. Poorly understood voter registration procedures have the greatest impact on the less educated and the poor. Making registration more accessible will substantially increase registration among these groups.

We are going to meet the needs of all Americans. Everyone surely will be impacted by this. Let us get on with it, House, and let everybody have a chance to vote.

AMERICA NEEDS THE LINE-ITEM VETO TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, the American people have begun to hear the ominous rumbling of major tax increases and senior citizen benefit cuts emanating from this administration. Do we not have a responsibility to do everything else possible to reduce our chronic deficits before entertaining these damaging options?

One important step in the direction of positive change and fiscal sanity is to give the President of the United States the line-item veto authority.

During the recent campaign the President thought it was a good idea and many of us were elected supporting this commonsense tool for the Executive.

Unfortunately, the President seems to be backing away from this in the face of opposition by the forces of the status quo here in the Congress.

If the States are truly the laboratories of democracy then the line-item veto must be judged to be a very successful experiment, 43 Governors use it to keep their budgets under control and balanced. The line-item veto works, and it's necessary now more than ever on the Federal level to once and for all stem the tide of red ink in our budget.

We owe it to the taxpayer and senior citizen to do the right thing.

MOTOR-VOTER BILL PROVIDES PROTECTION AGAINST ABUSE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to answer a specific charge made by opponents of the National Voter Registration Act.

Opponents say too many noncitizens—or illegal aliens as a few of my colleagues like to call them—will rush to register and vote.

This is simply not the case.

To paraphrase Illinois Cook County Clerk David Orr, who will oversee registration in the second largest county of the Nation.

The procedures we currently use and would continue to use under the act *** will be adequate to ensure registration of citizens only.

So we must ask ourselves two simple questions today.

Are we fulfilling our duty to remove obstacles to registering to vote?

Are we fulfilling our responsibility to protect against abuse and fraud?

I know the answer is "yes"—because this bill meets these two important criteria.

I would suggest to my colleagues who fear being overwhelmed in the voting booth by noncitizens that their fears are completely unsubstantiated, so let us pass the motor-voter bill today.

MOTOR-VOTER: FAIRNESS FOR THE INSUFFICIENTLY LIFELIKE

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

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give voice to a group of Americans who have no voice in this debate over motor-voter legislation.

I am speaking, of course about dead Americans.

Dead Americans or, better yet, the insufficiently lifelike have presently no voice in American democracy.

Think of all the dead Americans whose wise counsel our Nation could use at the ballot box: George Washington, and Abe Lincoln.

And who can forget Senator Earl Long, who said:

I hope that when I die, I get buried in Louisiana so I can stay active in politics.

Under motor-voter the late Senator Long's dream can come true.

How? Because motor-voter does not allow the purging of the insufficiently lifelike from the voter rolls.

If you wish to give the last neglected class in America a voice in politics, in the name of fairness and justice, give the vote to dead Americans by casting your vote proudly for the motor-voter bill.

□ 1220

IT IS "THE ECONOMY, STUPID"

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has scheduled a major address before the Congress on February 17 to unveil his economic plan. It is time for the House and all of the politicians here to stop talking and start doing. It is time for this body to demonstrate a willingness, Republican and Democrat alike, to work with the new President on behalf of the American people.

An essential component of the President's package will be long-term deficit reduction. This body will be challenged to match our political posturing with the tough votes necessary to attack and fix the problems. In his inaugural address, President Clinton warned America that sacrifices will be necessary to gain control of the deficit. Polls show Americans understand and accept this fact. Let us move forward with the complete deficit-reduction package.

Mr. Speaker, the President and the administration are working night and day to craft this plan. I look forward to the President's address, and working with the administration to put people back to work in my district and across the Nation. I trust that the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle will have the political courage to seek solutions and to seek agreement, and not take the easy political course of only talking about what they oppose in a proposed program.

MOTOR-VOTER

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, like far too many pieces of legislation with good intentions, the so-called motor-voter bill will compound the problems it is trying to solve.

Motor-voter will not increase voter turnout. The Congressional Research Service has found that 8 of the 10 States that adopted some type of motor-voter registration system prior to the 1988 Presidential election actually saw a decline in voter turnout.

It is another costly mandate on States. As a former Arkansas State legislator, I know the resentment we cause when we impose costly mandates on States already strapped with budget shortfalls.

Illegal immigrants would be registered to vote when they got their drivers license. Zoe Baird's chauffeur had a driver's license—but he had no legal right to be here or vote here.

Welfare agencies must provide voter registration, and other governmental

agencies such as public schools and libraries are not required to do so. This leads to a serious imbalance of who has easy access to voter registration.

As an Arkansas legislator, I led the effort to make voter registration more accessible by sponsoring the election code revision bill—and that is the appropriate jurisdiction for reform—the State—not heavy-handed Federal mandates.

POLITICAL NONSENSE ABOUT MOTOR-VOTER BILL

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

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could remember who it was who said, "It's not what you don't know that hurts, it's what you know that ain't so." I have got to tell Members we have heard more nonsense this morning in the well about the motor-voter bill than you can find in a Marx brothers' movie. We have heard that dead people are going to vote, we have heard that noncitizens are going to vote and a bunch of other nonsense.

We are going to be getting into the debate on this bill. Any Member who is concerned about all of the misinformation that is being trumpeted from the other side should listen with care to the debate.

What we have is a bill that is going to give access to the ballot for every American citizen more easily than they have it today, and that is all it is going to do, remove the heavy hand of government from between a citizen of this country and their access to the ballot box.

I think when Members hear the debate and when they hear what in fact this bill really will do, they will be eager to support it.

AUTO FRAUD: AN OPEN INVITATION TO FRAUD

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, today we take up H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. Some will try to sell this as civil rights legislation.

I say only if we defeat it do we win a victory for civil rights.

Motor-voter, also known as auto fraud, will guarantee voter fraud.

Every dead person's vote, every illegal alien's vote, and every multiple vote by a party hack dilutes the voice of law-abiding Americans exercising their franchise legally.

Auto fraud contains none of the tough antifraud provisions that we know are necessary. It does not allow for address verification. It does not contain any purge provision. It guar-

ingly avoids the issue of citizenship verification. In other words, it is an open invitation to voter fraud.

We need to increase voter participation, and in a perfect world, we would not have to worry about voter fraud. But this is not a perfect world, and voter fraud hurts each and every American who legally participates in the electoral process.

For that reason, I urge all of my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2.

THE MOTOR-VOTER ACT

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Voter Registration Act.

Voter participation in this country is much too low. While individuals must take responsibility for exercising their right to vote, we elected officials must take responsibility for reducing any existing impediments associated with registering to vote.

Not too long ago, the Congress permitted laws and practices that prevented all Americans from exercising their constitutional right to vote. Many citizens of the 11th District of Georgia were victims of those laws and practices.

I am in Congress today because of efforts to expand voting rights and voter participation.

On behalf of Mrs. Emma Gresham, Margie Pitts Hames, Kathy Wilde, State Representatives Tyrone Brooks and John White, my father Billy McKinney, Henry Turner, and Mary Young Cummings—folks who have dedicated their lives to voting rights for all Americans—I urge my colleagues to support this effort to make democracy a little more real for all citizens of the United States.

NATIONAL MOTOR-VOTER REGISTRATION ACT WOULD INCREASE VOTER FRAUD AND CORRUPTION

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I support efforts by individual States to simplify the voter registration process. What I do not support, however, is a bill which would increase voter fraud and corruption.

The National Motor-Voter Registration Act of 1993 would increase voter fraud and corruption. Since this bill permits individuals to apply to register to vote while they apply for a driver's license, the potential for fraud is enormous.

Driver's licenses are in high demand with illegal aliens since licenses are

used as a form of identification for employment purposes.

While this bill requires citizenship attestation in certain circumstances, it does not require proof. Do the cosponsors of this bill actually believe that an individual applying for a driver's license would admit that he or she was an illegal alien?

There is a financial concern as well. The cost of implementing this legislation rests wholly on the States.

Protect your home State from another unfunded Federal mandate and vote against the National Motor-Voter Registration Act of 1993.

PROVIDING BASIC HEALTH CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, he is a carpenter. He is 27 years old. And he has cancer. Several weeks ago, his mother wrote to tell me that the trauma of his initial diagnosis was compounded by the fact that he has no medical insurance. Like 36 million of his fellow citizens who have no health coverage, this young man cannot afford to pay for his expensive, life-sustaining medical care.

His mother wrote to me in anguish—in desperation—urging that the Congress take prompt action to effectively reform the American health care system. Mr. Speaker, the threat of serious illness need not be exacerbated by the further risk of bankruptcy. Wealthy citizens can afford coverage. Impoverished citizens have access to Medicaid. But middle-income wage earners, like the young man I've just described, can no longer afford even basic health insurance coverage. We can do better.

I'm greatly encouraged by President Clinton's action in establishing his task force on national health reform. I am heartened by his pledge that the task force will submit proposed health care reform legislation within the first 100 days of the Clinton administration.

The cost of health care continues to rise at three times the rate of inflation. Small business struggles to provide even modest group coverage. And although we spend 13 percent of our GDP on health care, 29 percent of our Nation's children remain without coverage. Health care reform will not come easily. But with leadership from the President and bipartisan cooperation from the Congress, it can be accomplished. That 27-year-old carpenter is counting on us.

□ 1230

VOTE FOR EMPOWERMENT OF PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO VOTE

(Mr. EDWARDS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I find it incredulous that a Member from the other side of the aisle would suggest that Abraham Lincoln and George Washington would oppose the motor-voter bill today.

What I do know, Members, is that all across this country there is a crying out for reform in this Congress, for the need to make democracy work better. In the history of our Nation, there has been no more effective reform of democracy than to empower the people's right to vote.

Today we can vote for meaningful reform, not window dressing, but effective reform of our democracy. A vote for H.R. 2, the motor-voter bill, will make voting easier for American citizens. If you truly want to lessen the influence of special interests on Congress, vote for H.R. 2.

A vote for H.R. 2 is a vote for reform. And let us be clear, a vote against H.R. 2 is a commitment to the status quo.

FLOODWATERS OF INCREASED REGULATION DESCENDING

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think after yesterday's action we can certainly say that gridlock is over and that the floodwaters of increased regulation and big Government are now descending upon an innocent America. Now, in the name of no more gridlock, another irresponsible bill is being haphazardly pushed upon us.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2, the motor-voter bill. I do this for a number of reasons.

No. 1, we have already talked about the bill will increase voter fraud. That is plain and simple. I cannot even see that meriting debate.

No. 2, it unfairly requires welfare recipients to be coerced into registering to vote. That is a right that they have to make their own mind up about without having big Government, Big Brother shove that on them.

No. 3, however, maybe more importantly to your local municipality and your local county, is that it is an unfunded mandate. Whenever Congress passes an unfunded mandate, simply the local municipality, your city or county has to increase your taxes in order to offset the costs.

As a candidate for this office, I heard repeatedly "No more unfunded mandates. They are killing the States and the local governments."

For this reason alone, I request and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

THE CLINTON ECONOMIC AGENDA

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, in less than 2 weeks, President Clinton will unveil his economic package to Congress and the country, during his State of the Union Address.

We know that while there have been encouraging signs in the economy, unemployment remains at 7.3 percent and underemployment is even higher, as people take what they can get.

We believe the President wants to do three things: Create jobs, raise incomes, and reduce our Federal debt. We also believe that this is what the American people want.

Second, I wholeheartedly support the President's proposal to invest in our infrastructure, and put people back to work building and repairing our bridges and roads.

I also support the President's proposal for tax incentives for private investment, and his plan to overhaul health care.

Let us also remember the President's inaugural message of shared sacrifice; all segments of society must share in the pain, and in order to achieve long-term deficit reduction. In this regard, the President has promised a balanced approach, and I support that.

In President Clinton's inauguration speech, he stated that this is our time. I view it as a challenge to right the wrongs of the Reagan-Bush era. It is a challenge to step up to the plate and make the tough decisions, just as past generations faced depressions, world wars, and the problem of integrating our society.

The President is right. It is our time, and it is also our turn.

VOTER REGISTRATION ACT PASSES COSTS ON TO OTHERS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this idea has merit. However, in Michigan, the costs are estimated to be \$1 to \$3 million additional money, so I am concerned about the Federal Government mandating good ideas and not letting the States gradually implement them the way that they can afford them.

So I am concerned about us not taking the responsibility to fund the ideas we have, whether it was H.R. 1 yesterday where we passed some ideas that have merit on to businesses, or whether it is H.R. 2, where we are passing those ideas on to State governments.

We have in Michigan already everybody who gets a driver's license are asked whether or not they want to register. So I think it is important that not only we have good ideas, that we also be concerned about the imposition as we pass these costs on to other enti-

ties in our society, whether it be local government or whether it be business.

THE PRESIDENT INSPIRES CONFIDENCE

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

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, the dark clouds of recession, gridlock, and aimlessness, have broken, and they have given way to a rainbow of hope for new growth, cooperation, and decisiveness.

Just this week, the Commerce Department announced what is becoming a trend of good news about our economy. The Index of Leading Economic Indicators is up. Housing starts are up. The expectations of economists are up. But probably more importantly, the confidence of the American public is up.

Partly responsible for this surge is a President who inspires confidence. He is not afraid to make the tough decision, decisions not made in the past that have resulted in our Nation's \$4.1 trillion debt and growth that has been sluggish at best.

President Clinton inspires confidence because he has had the courage to tell us that sacrifices are going to be required, sacrifices shared by all for the benefit of all.

I look forward to the plan that President Clinton will present in this Chamber in 13 days. I expect it to be bold and innovative, and the pot of gold at the end of that rainbow to be a renewed and robust America.

MOTOR-VOTER BILL STRENGTHENS DEMOCRACY

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

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I am from Birmingham, AL. I am a product of the civil rights movement.

All of my life I have believed that the right to vote is fundamental. It is a privilege of democracy that should be universal and that should be extended to every citizen, to every American anywhere they reside in America or in any possession of America.

I ask for support for H.R. 2, the motor-voter bill, because it will extend my belief; it will extend democracy to everyone.

I recall in my lifetime in Alabama the poll tax. I myself recall being required to take an examination to register to vote, and I know that that was a deterrent for persons to register to vote. I know that it was a deterrent for citizens to participate fully in democracy.

□ 1240

This bill will erase those historical things and bring democracy into the

21st century. It will extend it to all Americans.

So I ask each one of you today to support H.R. 2.

WE SHOULD CAREFULLY EXAMINE, AND AMEND, H.R. 2

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In response to the gentleman who preceded me, I think he has well stated the motivation of this bill. Unfortunately, he has not stated what this bill does.

This bill prevents notarization or verification of people who send in their names on postcards. We do not know who is going to send in postcard registrations.

The bill encourages same-day registration. A person could walk into one precinct after another and cast his vote. The bill discourages illegal aliens from telling people that they do not want to be registered. Once they get registered, of course, then they can vote.

This bill does a lot of things that the best of intentions behind this bill never even contemplated. This bill, frankly, should have been amended in subcommittee to make it a good bill, to make it do the things that all the people who have spoken a few minutes ago wanted it to do.

But none of the amendments that we offered to make this bill a better bill were permitted. And I think our colleagues, before they vote on this thing, ought to go back and talk with their registrars or commissioners in charge of elections and consider that we are imposing tremendous mandates, with no money, on those people who carry out the mandates that the American people are not going to like.

H.R. 2, THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT

(Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. E.B. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on one of the most important civil rights in our democracy—the right to vote. As a black American woman, and a new Member of this institution, I have known in my lifetime what it means to be denied. I have seen the pain of my people who were refused this fundamental liberty, and I have known those willing to sacrifice their lives to end this injustice for future generations. It is nearly 30 years since Michael Schwerner, Andrew Goodman, and James Chaney died in Philadelphia, MS, fighting for voting rights for all Americans—for them, the price for freedom and voting rights was su-

preme. It is our duty to finally fulfill that goal of universal voter registration through passage today of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

While a record 104.4 million people turned out to the polls in 1992—an impressive 85 percent of all the registered voters—that number was only 45 percent of the entire voting age population. There are still, today, roughly 70 million eligible citizens who are not registered to vote. I am very proud to say that my home State of Texas has been a leader in helping its residents vote—our Secretary of State, John Hannah, Jr., devised an innovative program whereby Texas could vote during a full 3-week period. By placing voting sites in widely accessible locations, the State ensured that every eligible individual had the opportunity to be heard at the ballot box. And in the area of voter registration, Texas implemented a virtually cost-free motor-voter program simply by redesigning the forms and reprogramming the necessary computer systems.

H.R. 2 is hardly radical. It provides national guidelines for 3 types of voter registration accessible to all citizens: Motor-voter, which will target the near 90 percent of eligible voters who have driver's licenses; agency registration which will register the remaining 10 percent of voters, especially those with disabilities, the poor and unemployed; and standard mail-in forms. Dozens of States, like Texas, have already implemented such programs at nominal costs. By retaining States' flexibility, while ensuring simplified registration for eligible voters, H.R. 2 strikes a fair and balanced approach that has been arrived at after years of bipartisan negotiations.

To vote is a protected right in our democracy, and we have an obligation to make that process simple, fair, and honest—I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2, without amendments.

H.R. 2 OPENS UP THE POLITICAL PROCESS FOR MORE PEOPLE TO PARTICIPATE

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address you today on the motor-voter bill, H.R. 2. I am one of the cosponsors.

You have heard a lot of things, but as I moved around in my own campaign for the House of Representatives, I was surprised at the horror stories that I heard around my own district about people who had attempted to register to vote but were shut out of the process.

When I got here and talked to fellow Members of the House, I heard the same kinds of stories from Georgia, Florida, from Missouri, Illinois, and from across this great Nation.

You have heard from the other side of the well some creative interpretations of this law. I want you to listen to the debate today, and I do not want you to believe that it was going to have just an increased cost, that it is going to open it up for fraud. In fact, it brings in Federal antiperjury laws which come into play with this law.

It is a law that does open up the political process for more people to participate.

By voting, maybe some of those people will also be moved to also run for Congress. Imagine that.

"IT'S STILL THE ECONOMY, STUPID"

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

Ms. DANNER. Mr. Speaker, Presidential candidate Bill Clinton had a sign in his campaign headquarters which read, "it's the economy, stupid."

That phrase, that reality was true last fall—and it's still true today.

We have all read the headlines—Sears, for example, has recently announced the layoff of 50,000 people. IBM has laid off 25,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, these are not mere numbers—these are men and women who have lost their jobs. And all too often, their dignity and self-esteem.

Today, we find ourselves faced with an unacceptable situation: An incredible number of unemployed and underemployed Americans.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, all America eagerly awaits President Clinton's economic stimulus package. By providing much needed revenue to rebuild our infrastructure and provide incentives for private investment, we will fortify and complement the promising statistics released by the Commerce Department this month.

A stronger and more robust economy will be the American people's reward for trusting us to remember: It's the economy, stupid.

ON BEHALF OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD FORD

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to a matter which could potentially affect any Member of this body. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the ongoing legal battle of our colleague, HAROLD FORD, of Tennessee. At this moment a jury is being selected in Mr. FORD's case. Not only is this jury not a jury of his peers, it is a jury which is being selected 100 miles from his hometown, in Jackson, TN, on the premise that the jurors are less likely

to be affected by the media coverage. The jurors, once selected, will then be bused 100 miles from Jackson, TN to the trial in Memphis.

The implications of selecting a jury outside a Member's congressional district are staggering. Our colleague from Tennessee is being stripped of his constitutional rights. If this can happen to our colleague from Tennessee, what will prevent the same thing from happening to any one of our colleagues. It is imperative for this body to take note of this disturbing legal precedent.

OUR FISCAL CRISIS: WE DO NOT NEED PERFECTION, WE NEED PROGRESS

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

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, in less than 2 weeks, President Clinton will present his economic plan. While we lack all the specifics, we do know what we need: job growth, increases in real family incomes, and serious, long-term deficit reduction.

We also know that the President's plan will not be perfect. Many of us will find parts uncomfortable, and special interests will lobby against certain provisions. The plan will change things for those who have grown too comfortable from years of borrow and spend.

Yet I believe Americans understand this Nation's fiscal crisis. We know we cannot rely on spending cuts or tax hikes that affect only someone else. We know that the time has come for shared sacrifice and shared responsibility. Most important, we know that we do not need perfection—we need progress.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, in less than 2 weeks, we begin a crucial test of our responsibility. Let us craft a program that may not be perfect, but will begin to fix this Nation's economic problems.

□ 1250

"IT'S THE ECONOMY, STUPID"

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, during last year's Presidential campaign, President Clinton and his staff posted a sign to remind them of the No. 1 issue facing this country.

They posted that sign so that they could remain focused and not get sidetracked into other peripheral issues. The sign read, "It's the economy, stupid."

After watching this body over the past month, I am convinced that maybe we need to post a similar sign in

this Chamber. To put it simply, I fear we are getting sidetracked.

I know that all of us have different responsibilities and demands to meet. But I also know that if we do not keep focused on getting this economy moving and growing, we will have failed and failed miserably.

President Clinton and his staff are preparing a blueprint for economic growth. That blueprint will be here 2 weeks from today. On one side will be incentives for business to invest in their future, and increased spending on infrastructure. On the other side will be cuts in wasteful Government programs, and deficit reduction.

On this floor last week I challenged my colleagues to put aside partisan and ideological differences, to put our heads together, and to do the job we were elected to do. Need I remind us all that job is simple: "It's the economy, stupid."

EASIER TO BUY A GUN IN AMERICA THAN TO VOTE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, why is it in some States you have to climb every mountain and jump through hoops just to exercise your constitutional right to vote?

Tell me, is there something sinister here that I am not seeing? I mean, really what is going on?

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong is simply this. It is easier to buy a gun in America than it is to vote. Let us tell it like it is.

Think about that and also think about the Constitution today.

I think many people are worried about a lot of people voting. It is a right, Mr. Speaker. Let us get back to the Constitution and support Chairman SWIFT today. It is a good bill.

PERMANENT EXTENSION OF RESEARCH TAX CREDIT

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to encourage this country's businesses to expand their research efforts. I am sure we all agree that part of the solution to our ailing economy is to promote the type of needed research into advanced technologies that will yield operating efficiency and economic growth. This is one part of a multifaceted approach to improving our industrial base and its competitiveness.

The legislation I am introducing will make permanent the research tax credit. The credit expired in June of last year. By making the tax credit perma-

nent, we remove many of the threats that could inhibit its regular reextension. Business leaders deserve the confidence of knowing that the credit is not in jeopardy and that their research efforts should continue to grow and be rewarded.

If you believe in encouraging business to expand their research efforts to promote growth and job creation, please join me in cosponsoring this measure.

CALLING FOR AN END TO THE AZERBAIJANI BLOCKADE

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, the American public has followed changes in the former Soviet Union, initially, with excitement and hope, but now, increasingly with horror. Two former republics of the U.S.S.R., Azerbaijan and Armenia, are now locked in deadly conflict. The recent causes of this conflict are clear.

Two years ago, Azerbaijan imposed an energy and rail blockade on Armenia. The blockade has cut off the fuel supply of Armenia, depriving its 3.6 million population of all electricity, heating fuel, public transportation, and water supplies.

Furthermore, the blockade threatens a potential nuclear catastrophe. Due to the lack of electricity, the safety system of the Medzamor nuclear powerplant has been forced to close, raising the specter of a nuclear disaster for the entire region. Carrying the nuclear threat one step further, this past November, the Azerbaijani Interior Minister reportedly warned that "unless the Armenians come to their senses", he would authorize a nuclear strike against the Armenian capital.

The European Parliament has condemned this Azerbaijani blockade.

I am calling on the United States Government, in coordination with its allies, and working within the United Nations and elsewhere, to end this blockade, and to immediately open corridors for the transport of food, fuel, medicine and other humanitarian supplies to Armenia.

Furthermore, I urge the strict enforcement of the Freedom Support Act, legislation which specifically prohibits the transfer of United States aid to Azerbaijan until it has ceased all blockades and other offensive uses of force against Armenia. The human suffering caused by this blockade must end.

THE SITUATION IN ARMENIA

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, as we speak today, the Armenian people are without food, electricity, and medicine. Two-thirds of the population is unemployed and most are losing hope.

This inhumane condition is the result of an Azerbaijani and Turkish blockade of Armenia. For months this tiny landlocked nation has been cut off from the world by blockades to the west and south, incapacity to the north in Georgia, and a destroyed infrastructure in Iran to the east. The only remaining fuel pipeline into Armenia has now been closed.

This proud nation has been completely shut down. The telephones do not work. The hospitals have been closed. Public transportation has stopped. The once thriving city of Yerevan has become a ghost town. While our attention has been focused on the deplorable situation in Somalia and the genocide in Bosnia, Armenia has been strangled almost to the point of death.

This has got to end. We must support efforts by the U.N. to condemn Azerbaijani aggression and we must pressure the Turkish Government to end their blockade. We must stop the wars plaguing this region of the world. We must also send emergency supplies of food, medicine, and fuel to save thousands of lives already threatened by starvation and disease. We must act now.

VOTE AGAINST H.R. 2, A FLAWED MOTOR-VOTER BILL

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I along with all my colleagues in the House support efforts to increase voter registration and participation in the electoral process. However, H.R. 2 is a seriously flawed attempt to achieve this goal.

The so-called motor-voter bill not only invites fraud, but requires the States to implement this costly mandate without Federal funding.

While providing for mail-in registration, H.R. 2 expressly forbids States from seeking notarization or other types of verification. This is outrageous. Is it unreasonable to at least verify that the person who registers is indeed at least a citizen of this country? If passed, H.R. 2 would extend the franchise to virtually anyone with or without a mailbox.

According to CBO estimates, the cost of implementing H.R. 2 is less than \$30 million. However, California alone has estimated that the cost for their State would be \$26.1 million annually. Many States including my home State of Maryland are weathering tough financial times. We simply cannot continue loading Federal mandates on the

States without proper funding. If we pass H.R. 2, you can bet that the States will be knocking on our doors next year asking for funds to implement this costly bill.

Our forefathers and succeeding generations of Americans have fought and died to secure and maintain our system of democracy. Do not cheapen their efforts. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2.

UNFAIR SELECTION OF JURY IN TRIAL OF CONGRESSMAN HAROLD FORD

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a matter which is unjust and which could potentially affect every Member of this body. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the ongoing legal battle of our colleague, HAROLD FORD of Tennessee. At this moment, a jury is being selected in Mr. FORD's case. Not only is this jury not a jury of his peers, it is a jury which has predetermined his guilt. The jury is being selected 100 miles from his hometown in Jackson, TN, a community that is not as diverse as the one that is currently being served by Mr. FORD.

Mr. Speaker, the jurors here are being selected and will be bused from Jackson, TN, to Memphis, TN, to judge Mr. FORD. Clearly he is being stripped of his constitutional rights. If this can happen to our colleague from Tennessee, we must all understand that it can happen to any of us. It is imperative for this body to take note of this disturbing and unjust precedent that is being carried on at this moment, because it is indeed a miscarriage of justice.

THE CONTINUING GRIDLOCK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we saw a sad, shameful attempt by Republicans in his Chamber to revive the bad old days of gridlock that plagued this Nation for the past 12 years.

The American people clearly, forcefully, and passionately told their elected officials last November that gridlock must end.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are under any illusion as to why they lost the White House at the polls in November, let me remind them that the American people were fed up with the delaying tactics used by those who say no to everything.

Fortunately, the Democrats in this body yesterday hung together and

acted to free the American family from the hypocrisy of Republican family values rhetoric. Yesterday this body, led by the Democrats, enacted legislation 8 years in the waiting. I trust that we will further free the American people today by enacting the motor-voter registration bill.

□ 1300

THE ROAD TO ECONOMIC RECOVERY

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

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Speaker, recent economic indicators show that the public is optimistic that things will get better, and so consumer confidence is up. But this optimism will recede quickly if we fail to seize the opportunity for fundamental change. And there is only one accurate formula for that change, and there is only one accurate formula for that change, and that is the formula that is embodied in President Clinton's package to be presented here on February 17. It goes like this:

Investment in workers, business, and infrastructure plus debt reduction equals long-term growth.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the debate over whether or not we should have short-term stimuli. Certainly this strange sounding organism has a role in the economic package President Clinton will present. But this President and this Congress know that stimulating wasteful and unproductive spending is short-sighted, and so we will invest, not just stimulate. We will encourage a renewed focus on research and development that will lead to the promotion of advanced technology. We will update equipment and facilities to ensure our productivity.

But we will also pay attention to the second half of the formula: long-term debt reduction. The deficit drain on our budget means that we are literally taking money away from the real needs that exist both in the public and the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, for years both sides have talked about reducing the deficit. Now this President will lead us honestly and forthrightly to a solution. Investment and deficit reduction will put people back to work, and we will begin the true road to economic recovery.

LEHMAN CALLS ON THE UNITED STATES TO PRESSURE AZERBAIJAN TO LIFT BLOCKADE IMPOSED ON ARMENIA

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the tremendous suffering in Armenia due to the blockade imposed by Azerbaijan.

This blockade, which is entering its fifth year, has deprived Armenia of heating fuel, electricity, public transportation, sanitation services, and safe water. Industrial enterprises, with the exception of a few scattered bakeries, have been forced to close. The energy crisis facing Armenia has reached catastrophic proportions. As a result, there are plans to reopen a nuclear power plant closed after the 1988 earthquake.

The shortages of food and fuel in this landlocked republic will result in tens of thousands of deaths by exposure and starvation if action is not taken immediately. The death rate among the elderly and infants has already increased dramatically and the break down of the sanitation raises the risk of widespread epidemics this spring.

As a close friend of the Fresno Armenian community, which has greatly enriched central California, it is my hope the United States will immediately transport fuel to Armenian and pressure the Azerbaijani Government, directly and through the appropriate international channels, to end the blockade of Armenia.

The Armenian people have suffered for too long, and it is time for the United States to take action. The very survival of the Armenian people is at stake.

KILLER AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2 MUST BE DEFEATED

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today the House will pass a second bill that the President will sign, the motor-voter registration, signaling that gridlock in Washington is over, that the President and Congress can work together on significant legislation. This bill will open up voting to all Americans making sure that we participate fully in the American electoral process.

Mr. Speaker, there will be two critical amendments; one, the first Michel amendment, which is a Hispanic-American, which I will be supporting, that basically states that no one but U.S. citizens may vote. That is already in the bill, but it will be reinforced.

There is a second Michel amendment that is a killer amendment because what it does is it guts the bill. In essence it allows officials who oppose the law to delay indefinitely in enforcing it. It states that each State's election officer must certify to the Attorney General that sufficient procedures exist to prevent non-U.S. citizens from registering. The practical effect is that an election official can delay indefinitely proceeding with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is a killer amendment, and we must defeat it.

THE MOTOR-VOTER BILL WILL ENCOURAGE AMERICANS TO VOTE

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we are going to pass today, and deservedly so, the bill that we call the motor-voter bill, which is H.R. 2, the national voter registration bill which allows people to register to vote more easily than is the current situation. I would say that H.R. 2 bears the strong imprint of my home State of Kentucky. The senior Senator in the other body is a major sponsor of the bill.

We all know the bill's details, Mr. Speaker. Let me just simply say that the House passed this bill in the 101st Congress, the House and Senate passed it in the 102d Congress, and only because the then-resident of the White House was counseled by those who were afraid of letting all the people vote, did this bill get vetoed. We want to show by its passage today, Mr. Speaker, that we are not afraid of the American people and not afraid of their vote. Let us encourage their vote. Let us pass this bill.

SUPPORT H.R. 2

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as so many of my other colleagues have already done so, in support of H.R. 2, what is commonly referred to as the motor-voter bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of different arguments from the other side of the aisle as to why this bill should not be passed; probably and perhaps the most prominent of which, Mr. Speaker, has been the allegation that there will be fraud, fraud perpetrated.

However, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues, "Who is really perpetrating the fraud here today?" When we talk about ending the gridlock, when we talk about inclusion, we talk about bringing more Americans into the political process, it is fraud for us to assert that this bill is not going to achieve those ends.

The motor-voter bill, which has already been adopted in many States throughout this country, Mr. Speaker, has already shown that in 1992, in those States where it is already existing, that there was a higher registration and higher voting turnout in those States that it existed than where it did not. So, in effect this motor-voter bill will make more Americans participate, make more Americans register to vote,

and those arguments are not only unfounded, but they are fraudulent.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time in America where we can give public assistance to those who need to be a part of the process, for perhaps our greatest problem in America is voter apathy. This is the time for us to turn that situation around, to make America the great country that it is supposed to be in terms of voter participation, voter registration, and voter turnout.

NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

For all too many Americans, government and the decisionmaking process are irrelevant factors in their daily lives. This is reflected in the fact that our Nation's voting rate in Federal Elections has fallen to the lowest level of any major world democracy.

It's mind-boggling to realize that over 57 million Americans who are eligible to vote are not registered to vote. I would venture to say that a great many of these 57 million Americans have not registered to vote primarily because of our outdated system of voter registration.

If we care about a healthy, participatory democracy in its fullest sense, it's imperative that we facilitate voter registration—the first step in bringing about greater levels of political participation. Today we will move closer to doing just that.

The bill before us combines some of the most successful voter registration methods utilized in many States: motor-voter registration, agency registration, and mail registration. This three-pronged approach will reach 95 percent of the eligible electorate within 4 years. It's an approach we cannot afford to let pass by.

Some of my colleagues have expressed concern that noncitizens will register to vote under the provisions of H.R. 2. These fears are unfounded. First, the documentation required to register under H.R. 2 is more extensive than the documentation currently required to register to vote in any State. Second, the voter registration forms will clearly state in no uncertain terms that only U.S. citizens can register to vote. And finally, it is clear from the evidence in those States that utilize motor-voter and other registration techniques that noncitizens are not registering to vote.

Reaching out to those individuals who are furthest removed from our system of government—and doing everything possible to encourage greater levels of political participation among

our citizens—are critical tasks we as policymakers must undertake. I urge my colleagues to support the National Voter Registration Act.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 59 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 59

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to establish national voter registration procedures for Federal elections, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments recommended by the Committee on House Administration now printed in the bill and the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill as so amended shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except an amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Such amendment may be offered only by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

□ 1310

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all time yielded during the debate on House Resolution 59 is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 59 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2, a bill commonly known as motor-voter, which establishes a national voter registration procedure for Fed-

eral elections. The rule waives the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI, the 3-day layover rule, against the consideration of the bill. The rule also provides for 1 hour of general debate on the bill, which is to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration.

House Resolution 59 provides that when the bill is considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule that the amendments recommended by the Committee on House Administration, which are now printed in the bill, and the amendment printed in part 1 of the report accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole and that the bill as so amended shall be considered as read. The rule provides that no further amendments shall be in order except an amendment printed in part 2 of the report accompanying this resolution, and that amendment may be offered only by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] or his designee. The rule also provides that the Michel amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 1 hour, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent thereto, and that it shall not be subject to amendment.

The Michel amendment contains two provisions. The first relates to eligibility to vote and the second to State certification that noncitizens are ineligible to participate in elections in each of the individual States. This provision would permit a recalcitrant State election official to block implementation of the bill by refusing to issue the certification. It is my understanding that the chairman of the Elections Subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] will move that these two provisions be voted on separately. Without dividing the question, should the Michel amendment pass, the thrust and intent of H.R. 2 will be essentially gutted, and I urge my colleagues to support the position of Mr. SWIFT, and oppose the second part of the Michel amendment. Later in this debate on the rule, I will yield to him in order that he might explain his position on dividing this question.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides that at the conclusion of the consideration of H.R. 2 for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. Finally, House Resolution 59 provides that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act, seeks to extend the opportunity to participate in Federal elections to the greatest number of eligible American citizens as possible. The foundation of our great

democracy, and any legitimate democracy, is the right to vote in free elections. H.R. 2 will make it easier for citizens who want to participate in this process to do so and will be achieved by permitting citizens to register to vote simultaneously with making application for a driver's license, through the mail, or in person at designated Federal, State, and local offices.

H.R. 2 seeks to ensure that no American is denied the ability to participate in Federal elections because of real or artificial barriers. H.R. 2 seeks to make voter registration an inclusive, rather than an exclusive opportunity in the United States. Mr. Speaker, removing barriers to increase participation will make registering to vote as easy as mailing a postcard, and as standard as applying for or reviewing a driver's license. These are things all Americans do on a regular basis. Registering to vote, gaining the opportunity to participate in one of our most basic rights in our democracy, should also be among those things.

A continuing complaint and chronic concern in our country, one that cuts across ideological and party boundaries, is the distressing number of American citizens who do not have the opportunity to vote because they are not registered. The motor-voter bill will allow us to make progress in addressing this serious concern. This legislation will eliminate many of the burdensome requirements found in some States and localities. Rather than forcing Americans to seek out a way to register, this bill brings the opportunity to them.

Mr. Speaker, my own State of Texas has utilized mail-in, postcard registration for 21 years. This form of voter registration has been highly successful, and new residents of Texas are often amazed at how easy it is to register and to participate in the electoral process. I think it is time for this system to be extended to all the States in our Nation, and H.R. 2 will extend that opportunity to all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, registering to vote should not be a series of hurdles to clear, but rather an opportunity readily available to all citizens of our land. Some claim that enactment of H.R. 2 will lead to wholesale voter fraud and extraordinary expenses for the States in administering this program. These arguments are much the same as many that have been made in years past as the electoral process has been opened to more and more American citizens. The House has rejected those arguments in the past and I urge my colleagues to do so again today and vote to pass this legislation. I urge adoption of this resolution so that we may proceed to the consideration of this most important legislative proposal.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule, which is clearly a reflection of a House leadership stuck in a time warp. It seems to be addicted to partisan bickering and an aversion to compromise.

This closed rule is very unnecessary. At a time when there is no other business waiting to come to the floor, when we seem to go into recess every other week, and when the American people are looking to us for serious debate and bipartisan cooperation, the Democrat leadership insists on closed rules intended only to gag debate, block compromise, and hide important issues from the American voters.

It is the height of irony that a bill nominally intended to expand the democratic process is shielded by a rule which is so undemocratic. Of course, that's undemocratic with a small "d", because closed gag rules have become the process of choice for the House Democrat leadership.

Mr. Speaker, passing this bill under cover of a closed rule like this is not breaking the dreaded gridlock. It is just a very poor legislative process.

For example, H.R. 2 needlessly passes millions of dollars of new costs along to local and State governments. In every State, county and precinct, voter registration officials, good hard-working Americans, will be forced to comply with irresponsible mandates, without funding.

Across the country, local and State elected officials will soon learn that this bill mandates millions of dollars of new expenses, without Federal assistance to pay for them. For example, in my State of California, the California County Clerks Association estimates that H.R. 2 will cost \$26 million in the first year alone. That adds to the \$1.4 billion in unfunded Federal mandates which are imposed on my State now.

We have got to stop passing these unfunded mandates onto State and local governments which are hard pressed today. While \$200 million may not seem like much to a Congress addicted to \$400 billion deficits, back in the real world, where local officials must balance budgets, it is an awful lot of money.

In Los Angeles County, 90 percent of the budget goes to pay for Federal and State mandates—and H.R. 2 adds for my county of Los Angeles, just another \$5.5 million.

□ 1320

Two of my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], Democrat and Republican, brought a bipartisan amendment upstairs to our Committee on Rules which would exempt States from meeting the unfunded mandates in this bill. It was, as I said, a bipartisan amendment intended to protect the States from an additional \$200 million in ex-

penses and send a message that Washington is going to stop passing the tab onto State and local governments.

The Committee on Rules, on a party-line vote, prohibited the full House from even debating this issue. Mr. Speaker, that is just plain wrong. We should defeat the previous question here on this rule so that we can allow the Condit-Packard amendment to come to this floor.

In all, Mr. Speaker, there were 19 amendments filed with our Committee on Rules. These were thoughtful, responsible amendments to improve this bill by reducing opportunities for voter registration fraud and corruption, creating a bipartisan balance and ensuring that illegal immigrants are not pushed onto our voting rolls where they do not belong.

The chairman of the subcommittee reporting H.R. 2, the gentleman from Washington, actually came before our Committee on Rules and said that since the House had passed something like this bill four times over the past 3 years, there is no need for free and open debate. This, of course, ignores the fact that 110 new Members, full-fledged Members of the House of Representatives, have never debated or voted on this issue at all.

Mr. Speaker, when almost 30 percent of this body is new, I think the freshman deserve better than a closed rule. They were sent here to debate and vote on important issues, not to rubber stamp last year's partisan decision.

The American people are going to be shocked when they learn just how slanted and partisan this bill is. While it is called motor-voter, it targets some groups for special treatment. This bill mandates voter registration in a few Government agencies along with driver's license registration locations; namely, welfare, unemployment and food stamp offices. You do not get a fair cross section of America in those offices.

My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], another freshman Member, offered an amendment to add IRS tax forms to the agency voter outreach program. He wanted to target taxpayers along with welfare and social service recipients.

The Committee on Rules majority, again on a party-line vote, voted that down.

Finally, H.R. 2 will set up voter registration systems that encourage fraud and abuse, as was outlined in our Committee on Rules by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. The distinguished ranking member is going to speak eloquently on this issue here today.

He tried to offer a number of amendments to us up in the Committee on Rules, but unfortunately, once again, on a party-line vote, his very eloquent arguments were ignored.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate to my colleagues, if we want a voter reg-

istration bill our constituents will be proud of, vote to defeat the previous question, support my amendment to bring H.R. 2 up under an open rule.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlemen from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Elections.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, we have been witnessing for the last week, and I am sure we are going to see throughout the debate today, Members operating on the belief that if they repeat misinformation and repeat it over and over again, often enough, that will make it so.

The fact is that you are also going to hear this side repeat the facts of the case over and over again so that Members will not be misled.

Let me give my colleagues a couple of examples. It has just been said that this is a partisan bill, because we have extended some specific requirements that agencies that deal with poor people should provide them with an opportunity to fill out a registration application. That is not partisan. Here is the underlying rationale of the legislation.

Ninety-two percent of all Americans drive cars, get driver's licenses. Motor-voter will include 92 percent of Americans. And they will have an opportunity to fill out a registration application there. Who does that leave out in that 8 percent without drivers license? People too poor to own a car to drive, and people who because of disability are incapable of driving a car and, therefore, do not have a driver's license. So we do two other things in the legislation so this will cover 100 percent of Americans.

We add postcard registration, which is particularly beneficial to the disabled, and we add agency registration for those who would be dealing with people most unlikely to be able to afford a vehicle.

The purpose of the bill is to see that 100 percent of Americans are covered.

Criticism of this bill suggests that there are some American citizens that the opponents of this bill would just as soon leave behind. Let me give you another example.

We have heard that this bill provides automatic registration. Not. What this bill provides, in all of its instances, and the only thing it provides is the opportunity for a citizen to apply for registration.

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

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield at this time.

That application will then go through all of the same screening processes that applications for registration go through today. There is no, absolutely none, zero, zilch, automatic reg-

istration whatever. It is a misnomer. It is inaccurate.

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

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this nonsense for 2 weeks, and I am going to state my position, and then I will be happy to yield at a later time.

This brings us to the amendment that is going to be offered. I am urging my colleagues to vote for this rule, but I think it is very important that we understand the nature of the amendment that is made in order by this bill.

As the gentleman from Texas indicated, I am going to ask that that vote be divided. The amendment is in two parts. The first part says that one must be a citizen in order to vote. This is in the bill. The bill says that in three separate and distinct places in the legislation.

The first part of the amendment that will be offered is redundant, duplicative, unnecessary and, in my judgment, is the premier candidate for the empty-gesture-of-the-week award.

On the other hand, it does no harm. It simply restates what is already in the bill three times. I would urge Members to vote for it.

The second part of this amendment, however, is very carefully designed to gut the legislation under the guise of hitting one of the political hot buttons we have today. It says that this bill will not go into effect in any State until the chief election official of that State certifies to the U.S. Attorney General that sufficient procedures exist in the State to prevent voter registration by persons who are not citizens in the United States. Again, harking back to the idea somehow that we are trying to register noncitizens, which is absurd on its face. The bill clearly makes the case in three specific points in the legislation that that is not the case. One must be a citizen to register.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on this point?

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield at this time. I want to finish my statement.

What is done here, under the guise of saying "We are fixing it so we are sure that you don't get any illegal aliens to vote" is a gutting of the bill because, listen to what it says: It says "specific procedures," and it does not define them. That is a piece of work for out-of-work lawyers.

And it provides no deadline by which the State official ever has to make such a certification. In short, for a State to not participate, all they have to do is fail to certify.

□ 1330

There is no mechanism in this amendment whatever that would require them at some point to finally certify so the bill could go into effect.

Under the guise of protecting citizenship books, they have in effect, written an amendment that will totally gut the bill.

When we have the vote on this, I strongly urge all people who really want to reform the way we register citizens of this country to vote against this amendment, vote for the rule, and vote "yes" on final passage.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress this morning heard very eloquent testimony from the gentleman from Sanibel, FL. He is the newest member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pasadena and environs for his generous remarks.

Mr. Speaker, for the second time in as many days we are faced with a restrictive rule, which forces us to waive the 3-day requirement and shuts out important amendments even though we are certainly not under any sort of time constraint. In fact, for the second time in 2 days this body is acting on a timetable that seems designed to suit the press needs of the new administration at the expense of the legislative needs of the Nation. Some might claim that gridlock is over. I would say the wheels have been greased with some pretty slippery stuff. Mr. Speaker, the so-called motor-voter bill before us today is destined to cause trouble—not just because it sets up a system powerless to fend off massive fraud, but because it imposes enormous costs on our State and local governments—many of which are suffering under the burden of budget shortfalls, just as we are here in Washington. Unfunded Federal mandates have become a popular tool for Federal legislators—eager to impose new social programs but unwilling to set priorities and make spending cuts to support their projects. Motor-voter, which is estimated to cost my State of Florida \$6.4 million to implement, is another example of this dangerous trend. The annual cost, across the country, could climb to \$250 million. We cannot claim to be serious about fiscal responsibility in one breath and pass such an irresponsible, costly bill in another. Then there is the very serious problem of voter fraud—this bill practically invites it. Can you imagine an illegal alien, applying for a driver's license—and, as the high-profile case of Zoe Baird demonstrates, likely getting one—actively calling attention to his or herself by declaring that he or she does not want to register to vote? In this bill, unless you affirmatively say "No thanks," you will automatically become registered. Making matters worse, this bill provides for no reasonable means for States to purge voter rolls to remove ineligible people. This

bill limits a State's ability to preserve the integrity of its voter registration process through independent confirmation of information given by applicants. Mr. Speaker, as was the case yesterday, there were many good amendments proposed to correct some of this bill's most egregious problems. And, as we saw yesterday, those amendments were defeated in the Rules Committee on an almost automatic party line vote. It is becoming clear to this Member that, for the majority leadership, ending gridlock means limiting the rights of the minority while depriving this House and the people it represents of the right to fully debate and consider the issue. Our system of open government is rapidly giving way to autocratic, one-party rule. As you yourself said, Mr. Speaker, the majority party makes no pretense of being fair when it comes to the Rules Committee and bringing legislation to the floor. Especially when we are considering legislation that directly affects Americans' most basic right of representation according to the one-man, one-vote principle, this is a real tragedy for democracy. I urge my colleagues—and especially the 110 new Members sent here on a wave of voter anger and desire for change—to defeat the previous question so we can open up this process and improve this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for the House, because today we will take a great step for democracy by passing the motor-voter legislation. I commend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] and the other members of the committee who have worked so hard to bring this bill to the floor. It has come over and over, and most of the Members know what is in the bill. Our colleague, Mr. FROST, has laid it out, and I commend him for his efforts on behalf of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, and my time allotment does not allow me to go into the details of the bill, and as I say, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has already spelled them out, but I did want to say, in the words of some other people, what this bill means.

It is important to me as a former State Chair in California, faced with the difficulties of registering voters, I found that the Government in fact not only did not do its share, but in fact it was delinquent, it was derelict in its duties in removing obstacles to participation.

Some of our colleagues have mentioned the cost involved in this legislation. It has been estimated that while there are some startup costs, there are offsets that estimate a savings of up to

\$7 million to \$10 million, because motor-voter and agency-based registration saves money by distributing voter registration over the year and allowing elected officials to save the cost of temporary workers during peak registration periods.

The States will save another \$4 million annually in reduced postal rates, and motor-voter, which will be the primary method of registration, is cheaper than any other technique to register voters.

Registration, as it has been pointed out before, is estimated to cost \$1 to \$13 per transaction, while motor-voter comes to an estimated 3 cents to 35 cents per transaction.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to capture the words of some of those who support this legislation. The National Organization on Disability, for example, whose national vice chairman is Jim Brady, former White House press secretary, says we should pass this legislation because "It would end years of exclusion by providing an inexpensive and efficient system for inclusion in the franchise." He is writing on behalf of the disabled.

The Disabled American Veterans of America also state that—

At issue is an easing of restrictions on the voter registration process nationwide so that all disabled Americans, including those disabled in military service, would have easier access to the most fundamental right our country affords her citizens—that is, the right to be a part of our democratic process.

In closing, I would like to quote a letter from Antonia Hernandez of MALDEF, which says, and I think many of us in this room share this sentiment:

The adoption of this legislation will strengthen the voice of our citizens and help rejuvenate our system of representative democracy.

The support of all of our Members here is crucial to the success of this legislation. Let us get these people on the books. In many States, unless people are registered, they do not receive any educational material relating to the election or any information from the candidates, so this will refresh our process and reinvigorate our system. It is time for us to get on with it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, so I might clarify for the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Rules, we are going to seek to defeat the previous question so we can offer an open rule. Tragically, these amendments have been referred to on the floor as nonsense. They are in fact bipartisan. Democrats and Republicans alike want to have the opportunity to amend this rule so we can consider their proposals here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding to me.

While we are talking about organizations that have some concern about this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentlewoman that spoke a moment ago that certain organizations oppose this bill as it currently stands. They are very violently against any additional mandates from the Federal Government without adequate funding. They include the National Association of Counties, the National Governors Association, the National Association of Secretaries of State, the Association of Towns and Townships, and the National League of Cities.

In addition to that, and I have a number of points, and I do not know if I can squeeze them into 5 minutes, but Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule. This rule stifles debate. This rule denies the opportunity to the minority, or to members of the majority, to amend what has become an incredibly partisan and bad, bad bill, even with the best of intentions.

No one will quarrel with the right to make it easier for legitimate citizens who are qualified to vote to vote. Everybody cares about that. Everybody wants to make it easier for qualified citizens to vote.

□ 1340

But, this bill makes it easier for unqualified citizens to vote. And we offered as many as 20 amendments to the Rules Committee to try to improve the bill, and every one of those amendments were struck down and rejected on a partisan vote.

This Rules Committee has strangled the right of the American people to have open discussion and open debate in this body. For that reason, I urge the defeat of the previous question, and if that fails then the defeat of this bill, because this is a bad bill, and the American people are going to be very frustrated if this bill passes.

President Bill Clinton said he wanted increased jobs, he wanted to reduce the deficit, he wanted to expand or grow the economy. Does this bill have anything to do with any of that? Absolutely not. All it does is provide additional mandates which are going to cost the States, counties, communities, localities, and precincts lots of money, and we do not put up a single nickel to help them afford the mandates that we are imposing on them.

This bill strangles any vestige of States rights because it says to the counties, the localities, and the precincts: You cannot govern under your own election law; we are going to tell you how to do it.

This bill promotes fraud. It promotes illegal registration. Zoe Baird's chauffeur would be able to walk in and get a driver's license, and by the way, he would be able to register to vote, and

later on to vote unless he actively declined to register. And show me an illegal alien that is going to decline to register under those circumstances, because he is not going to want to say "I'm an illegal alien, I cannot register."

This bill denies notarization or verification of signatures on postcard registration, it denies the right to cleanse the nonvoters from the voting rolls. It costs the States about \$200 million in imposed mandates.

It provides for the opportunity to file lawsuits against the secretaries of state, or the commissioners of elections. It provides for attorneys' fees, but we in Congress do not pay the attorneys' fee; the U.S. Treasury does not pay the attorneys' fee. It is the States that have to pay the attorneys' fee if they get sued under this bill. And we provide zero money for mandates in this bill. And, we do make the registration automatic.

And by the way, when we are putting mandates on everybody all around the country to comply with this bill, who do they have to report to? Uncle Sugar, the Federal Election Commission, which is, by the way, going to become one of the biggest, most unmanageable bureaucracies in the history of this country.

I offered an amendment to make this a true motor-voter bill and to really make this bill count. I offered to strike postcard registration, which the Justice Department says is rife with inducements for fraud. I offered to strike the encouragement of same-day registration, and to strike the provision that you could register virtually in any State agency, welfare, or unemployment office. Those amendments were rejected.

I offered to strike the prohibition of notarization and authentication of postcard registration so that we know the people who are registering are who they say they are. That was rejected.

I offered to say that this bill would be voluntary unless the U.S. Government gave the money to the States and the counties to fund it, and that was rejected. I offered to strike the attorneys' fees provision that if you sue the State, you might even get your attorneys' fees back. No, that was rejected.

I offered to strike the FEC oversight provision and to strike the automatic provisions that say you are automatically registered unless you decline to be registered.

I offered to restore the right to remove a person from the voting rolls if he does not vote. I said if you do not vote in 4 years you ought to be stricken from the rolls. They said no. I said if you do not vote in 10 years you ought to be stricken from the rolls. And they said no. I said if you do not vote in 100 years you ought to be stricken from the rolls, and the Rules Committee said no. No such amendment would be allowed.

I think this is an outrageous stifling of debate and discussion on a very important bill, and I urge the defeat of the previous question, and I urge the defeat of the bill if the previous question goes forward.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

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

I listened with great interest, and I was sorry the gentleman from Louisiana could not yield, because he got turned down at every level. The Rules Committee did not listen to him, the committees of jurisdiction did not listen to him.

What is wrong with this body? Nobody listens to the gentleman from Louisiana. Did anybody accept anything the gentleman offered about this bill? I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and the answer is no.

Mr. CONYERS. Why?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And do you know what, I would have been delighted to have had this be a genuine motor-voter bill. Let us make it easier, but let us not make it easier to defraud the election process, and devalue your vote, and devalue my vote and the vote of every legitimate and concerned citizen of this country.

Mr. CONYERS. I would ask the gentleman if he is interested in getting more people in this country to vote?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Frankly, I do not think this bill does it, but of course. Everybody who is qualified to vote and who is eligible to vote should vote.

Mr. CONYERS. And is the gentleman aware that the House has already once passed this bill over his strenuous objections?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman is correct. I voted against it because I do not like this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

I would say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], he was referring to some letters he had received from some officials who opposed the bill because of funding. I just wanted to put on the record the fact that the secretary of state who is responsible for voter registration in California strongly supports, and has written a number of times to the Members of Congress in support of the legislation.

One particular point I want to bring out because the gentleman seems to be concerned about it, and that was the mail registration, and this kind of

motor-voter registration would be, I think the gentleman said, rife with fraud.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Potential for fraud.

Ms. PELOSI. The gentleman might be consoled to know from our experience, the secretary of state writes:

My office has reviewed H.R. 2 with attention to the issue of noncitizens registering to vote. After this review, we have concluded that this bill will make it less rather than more likely that noncitizens will be registered in California. Currently, with California's registration-by-mail system, we have been very vigilant in guarding against non-citizen registration *** the adoption of H.R. 2, the "motor voter" and "agency-based" registration procedures will become the primary registration method. "Motor voter" and "agency-based" registration provided additional opportunities to screen for applicant eligibility.

I do want the gentleman to know that I think we share the same view, that we want more people to be registered, that we do not want fraud in the system, and those with experience in it have supported this legislation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, certainly she is speaking for one individual, and she probably knows that the State of California has certified that this bill will cost the State of California \$27 million to implement, of which the U.S. Government provides not one penny. And she may also know that the national associations of secretaries of state, of Governors, of counties and towns are opposed to it because they do not get any money for this particular bill.

Ms. PELOSI. I would just like to say that in California 5.7 million people who are eligible to vote are not registered to vote, and I believe that the figures the gentleman cites are a small price to pay for that.

How would we judge another country if they said we cannot register voters because it costs too much money?

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 30 additional seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I will take the 30 seconds to say to the gentlewoman from California that nobody keeps people from registering. This bill is not intended to force people to register, although in some respects it does it because they have to actively decline to register. But nobody is kept from registering.

The point is that not enough people are actively going to the registrar of voters and registering, so we are making more places available for them to register. That is fine. But we are not even beginning to consider that we are making it also very easy for people

who are not eligible to vote, and we are also imposing the liability on counties and on associations of townships to institute computers to talk to each other, and all sorts of costs that we are not providing a nickel for.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it was fascinating to listen to my friend, the gentleman from California, read of the support from our secretary of state.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the former mayor of Carlsbad, CA, who was literally on the front line having to deal with the potential Federal mandates that are unfunded in this bill.

□ 1350

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise strongly to urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

The majority has made in order only one amendment. Once again, the majority leadership has impeded the ability of Congress to practice free and open debate.

On Tuesday I appeared before the Committee on Rules along with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDT], with an amendment to request the compliance of all mandates coming from the Federal Government to be accompanied by funds. As was mentioned earlier, in the State of California this bill will mandate that the State of California spend \$26 million just to start the program, and then \$26 million a year to keep it going. California, I do not need to tell you, simply does not have the funds to take on more mandates such as this.

Perhaps the single greatest burden the States and local governments face are unfunded Government mandates. This bill will cost the States over \$100 million per year.

It is time that Congress realized the burden it places on State governments hamstrung by budget shortfalls.

The National Governors' Association this week met here in Washington, and one of their major legislative priorities included a statement of the policy of unfunded Government mandates which I would like to quote:

It is critical that Members of Congress oppose, and that President Clinton veto, any legislation that imposes further mandates without also providing adequate funding necessary for States to provide the service.

And this is from Democratic Governors and Republican Governors.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if States are required to comply with this law, Congress should provide the money to implement it, and the States should not be required to implement it until the money is there.

Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and allow us to debate my amendment, and otherwise we should defeat this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Casper, WY,

the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and to H.R. 2.

It is not the goal of H.R. 2 that I rise to oppose. Rather, it is the incredibly bad implementation of a goal that we all share, and that is increased participation of legitimate and certifiable voters.

What we are about to vote on is a bill that is an invitation to fraud. H.R. 2 is something that only Washington could write, the dreams of special interests and political consultants. H.R. 2 will create a new industry, so-called registration drives across State lines that will result in unscrupulous and systemic manipulation. Ghost voting will take on a whole new meaning.

Wyoming's secretary of state and the majority of the county clerks oppose H.R. 2, because it will lead to voting deception and high costs of Wyoming voters.

It is clearly expensive. It is clearly an unfunded mandate. I think it is an invitation to fraud that we can argue about.

But what puzzles me the most is why Members of this body think they have more compassion, more interest in getting people to vote or are more informed, are more wise than the people on the local level, and I served in the Wyoming Legislature, and we were just as interested as you. The clerk in my county is just as interested as you. And yet I do not quite understand the gentleman from Texas who indicates great satisfaction with their postcards. Fine. I will compare our results in Wyoming with yours.

Why not let us do it our way?

The gentlewoman from California likes what they are doing, fine, and the secretary of state. But why impose a California program on Wyoming? I am puzzled about that.

We talked and waxed eloquently about listening and believing in the Government closest to the people. We talk about local government. Why do we not exhibit some confidence in local government?

I suggest we vote no on the rule and no on H.R. 2.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise also as a former mayor, but as a former mayor who has a little bit of a different point of view than the previous former mayor.

I am in strong support of this legislation. My only reservation is, in fact, that it does not go far enough.

There are six States in this country which, in fact, right now are doing the right thing, and they have same-day

registration. They make the very radical statement that if you are an American citizen, you should have the right to vote in an election even if you do not register 2 weeks before the election date; that, my goodness, you should be able to walk into the polling booth, take your oath of office, and actually vote.

Now, some people have talked about fraud. Let me tell you about fraud. It is a fraud that we have officials elected in the United States in an election in which 70 or 80 percent of the poor people in their districts do not vote. That is a fraud. It is a national disgrace that the United States of America has by far the lowest voter turnout of any industrialized nation on Earth. In Canada they have 70 to 80 percent of their people coming out to vote. Some countries have 80 and 90 percent.

We recently rejoiced that all of 55 percent of the people came out to vote in the recent Presidential election, 55 percent, the lowest voter turnout of any industrialized nation on Earth.

The truth of the matter is that what we are talking about today is more important than the health care crisis, more important than unemployment, more important than the other major problems we are facing. What we are talking about today is whether this country is really going to be a democracy, is really going to involve the people in the political process.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that despite all the big talk about concerns, you know what the real concern is, my friends? You are getting nervous that maybe poor people and working people might participate in the political process, and they are going to take on the big money interest that elect many people here.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in assuming that the 110 new freshman Members who have come to this Congress to try and bring about major change and reform have been prevented from having the right to offer any amendments to this bill at all?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, that is not a valid parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. I think I will let the Chair rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to my friend and classmate from Dodge City, KS, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the new ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

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

I should stress, Mr. Speaker, that while I view this bill as fundamentally flawed, and, yes, even partisan, I do not question the intent of the principal authors in that I do not know of any Member of this Congress, despite what the earlier speaker said, who opposed the stated intent of this bill. I certainly do not question the hard work and the dedication of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Washington.

But there are those of us in the minority who have never signed on with this posse to increase voter turnout by mandating Federal registration and costs and regulations and hoops and hurdles on our State and local election offices. We have been, and continue to be, concerned about what lurks under the banner of reform and the law of unintended effects.

We believe that voter turnout is important but not at the expense of the integrity and the sanctity and the workability of the entire election process. With all due respect to the gentleman from Washington, who is the professor emeritus of good government and good intentions, who is a silver-haired and silver-tongued old rascal when he wants to be, this is not nonsense. We offered our amendments in subcommittee and committee, and they were not nonsense. It was with real intent to improve the bill.

And while he is the Roberts-declared professor emeritus of good intentions, he also may well be the umbragetracker of the House.

Now, let me briefly discuss the three amendments I had hoped the Committee on Rules would make in order. First, the cost: If there is anything that the Members hear today, it is that local counties, local cities, States, and every municipality, not to mention everybody else, is tired of the Federal mandates where we literally dictate very questionable rules and regulations and redtape, and we do not pay for it.

□ 1400

My amendment, in the subcommittee and in the full committee, Mr. PACKARD's amendment, also Mr. CONDIT's amendment simply said this bill would be voluntary for States until we pay for it.

Now, the second amendment would have preserved State fraud provisions that are stronger than the Federal provisions within this act. For example, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, said in 1990 he did not want a similar bill imposed on the State of Illinois because they had stronger fraud provisions.

The last amendment dealt with the fact that the Federal statute allows illegal aliens to qualify for food stamps and other public assistance programs. The Department of Agriculture has informed me that during fiscal year 1992

some 300,000 illegal aliens and 700,000 legal aliens received food stamps. That is a million people that could vote under this bill.

Now, I know you say they cannot, but the amendment that I had was clear; it was explicit. Current language is not clear, and the procedure is confusing.

That was the sum total of the three amendments: We should pay for this new mandate, if it is \$20 million, \$30 million; the truth know, it is about a billion dollars. If it is so vital to the election process, let us pay for it.

Second, let us make sure only U.S. citizens vote.

Last, if you have a State that has stronger fraud provisions, simply keep it. What the heck is wrong with that? I do not understand it. Why can we not debate that here on the floor? No; partyline vote in subcommittee, in full committee, three Congresses ago, two Congresses ago, this Congress ago, and we are still denied the opportunity to debate and vote on those provisions.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL].

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is the most precious of all rights because it is from the right to vote that we secure all other rights. As the most precious of all rights, we must insure that every American who wants to vote is provided the opportunity. I can think of no better way to achieve that vital goal than passage of H.R. 2.

The National Voter Registration Act is straightforward. The bill facilitates voter registration in three ways: Through the driver's license process, by mail, and by expanding voter registration locations. The motor-voter provisions of the bill allow the application, renewal, or change of address for a driver's license or nondriver's identification to serve as an application for voter registration. It is estimated that up to 90 percent of all eligible voters will register within 4 years of enactment.

The bill also permits mail-in voter registration. Some 25 States and the District of Columbia presently allow mail-in voter registration. Mail-in registrants who have not previously voted in a jurisdiction by mail may be required by the States to vote in person, except those voters who are entitled to vote by absentee ballot. And, the bill requires that voter registration applications be available at government offices that provide services to the disabled, unemployment compensation, public assistance, and other public places.

Mr. Speaker, the need for the legislation is quite clear. Some 70 million eligible American citizens, a full 38 percent of the voting age population, did not vote in the most recent Presi-

dential election because they were not registered to vote. And, the cost of implementing such programs is not prohibitive; indeed, once implemented, States will experience considerable cost savings. For example, motor-voter registration can reduce registration costs from as much as \$15 per registrant to no more than 33 cents.

There are other important provisions of H.R. 2. To prevent multiple registration and fraud, the bill makes voter fraud a Federal crime and adds penalties for abuse. In addition, registrants are required to attest under penalty of perjury that he or she is qualified for registration. The bill also includes provision for mandatory purging of voter lists to remove citizens who have moved or died. And, postal reductions are allowed for States who may have financial difficulties in implementing the new law.

Mr. Speaker, we have freedom of speech and freedom of the press in America because that's what we voted for. We are free from illegal searches and seizures, and we have the right to trial by jury because that's what we voted for. African-Americans are now whole citizens, women may participate in the electoral process, and 18-year-olds who can shed their blood in defense of this Nation may determine who commands them to do so because that's what we voted for.

There is no other right that we enjoy which is as important as the franchise. In fact, every right that we enjoy is as a result of the franchise. Each of us here today in the Hall of the House owes his presence to the right of the American people to vote. Voting has no meaning unless it can be exercised. And, so long as there are barriers to registering to vote, many will not exercise their right. I urge all of our colleagues to stand up for our system of government, participatory democracy. Vote for H.R. 2.

Those who are afraid of the right to vote, there is something wrong with you, not the American people. The American people want to vote.

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

Mr. BLACKWELL. I am out of time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask the gentleman what the 1965 Voting Rights Act was all about. I thought that gave everybody the right to vote. We are not talking about the right to vote; we are talking about making people register whether they want to register or not.

Mr. BLACKWELL. We have to make sure that we stop tricking people on election day. There is nothing wrong with an American walking into the polls on election day saying, "I am an American. I live in the neighborhood. I

have the right to vote for the people who represent me." That is all it says. What is wrong with that?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman is absolutely right.

If that is all that is in this bill, I would agree with him. But what is in this bill is for that person to walk into one neighborhood, and another neighborhood, and another neighborhood, and another neighborhood, and another neighborhood, and another neighborhood, and another neighborhood, and vote in each one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has expired.

Mr. BLACKWELL. And we can convict him for fraud, sir. That is in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2½ minutes to one of those new Members who was denied the opportunity to offer his amendment here on the House floor, the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

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

Mr. Speaker, I come here today to urge my colleagues to vote against this rule to H.R. 2. Two days ago, I went before the Rules Committee to ask that my simple amendment to make every taxpayer a registered voter to be made in order. Unfortunately, this amendment and 17 other amendments were not permitted to be debated on the floor of the House.

If the National Voter Registration Act is going to mandate that certain groups should be registered to vote, I believe the average taxpayer is an important group that should be included. My amendment would have registered the average taxpayer. Which in turn would have opened up the registration process even further than the bill we are going to debate shortly.

My amendment took into consideration the American taxpayer. I believe that when an individual writes a check to pay their income taxes—they also should be able to sign up and vote. It is only fair that those who pick up the tab to operate this country, should have the equal opportunity to determine what the Government does and where their taxes get spent. The best way to do this is through their voice at the ballot box. My amendment tied the principles on which this country was founded, and that is, the tie between taxes and representation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to quote a former Member of Congress who spoke on this floor on May 18, 1972. This Congressman stated:

What right have a majority of the members of the House to prevent a member who represents 500,000 people himself—"and it is a bigger question than one-man, one-vote"—

what right have they to say to this member who is elected by the people as a member of the House of Representatives, that he does not have the power to offer an amendment to a bill, and that he is not allowed to have any meaningful participation in the proceedings? * * * That is what happens under a closed rule * * * does a majority, even 434, have the right muzzle the 435th? * * * But I do not think it is really democratic when they (the Rules Committee) take it upon themselves to exclude amendments in the public interest * * * this is a constitutional question, a closed rule is undemocratic * * * it is the majority forcing their will upon the minority, involving constitutional rights and privileges, and they should not be denied.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressman who made that statement was Wright Patman of Texas, a member of your party. Twenty years later, it seems nothing has changed.

The Democratic Party now controls both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. However, it still seems that the leadership of this House is afraid of free and open debate on floor. Mr. Speaker, I understand over the last several years there has been an upward trend of more and more closed rules on the House floor. A real reform in the House would be the ability for every Member, as Congressman Patman spoke of, to have a "meaningful participation in the proceedings."

Finally, I would like to voice my support for the efforts of my colleague, Mr. CONDIT, who proposed an amendment which would make this bill voluntary unless it was fully funded by the Federal Government. Because my amendment and Mr. Condit's were not allowed to be debated on the floor, I am going to vote against this rule. I urge my fellow colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of H.R. 2.

Prior to my election, I served for two terms, 8 years, as Ohio Secretary of State. My top priority as the State's chief election official was to promote greater involvement in the political process.

I joined with the great majority of secretaries of state, Republicans and Democrats alike, with the National Association of Secretaries of State during that time in supporting motor-voter, supporting other kinds of ways of opening up the political process to encourage people to vote.

During that time, Ohio fashioned what many observers said was the best outreach, most extensive voter registration program in America. What is more, we did it with very little expenditure of taxpayer dollars.

Voter registration in Ohio and in many other States, with Republican and Democratic secretaries of state, is an outstanding example of what we can

accomplish when business and government and the labor unions as a partnership work together.

In Ohio we already had in place the tools that H.R. 2 brings; motor-voter, agency-based, and mail-in registration. We used that all-important tool of mail-in registration to build a partnership with private-sector businesses.

McDonald's restaurants paid the costs of printing registration forms in their tray liners; 30,000 Ohioans registered to vote.

United Telephone and GTE paid the costs of printing registration forms and mailed them to their customers with their telephone bills; 25,000 Ohioans registered to vote.

Cable television companies printed registration forms at their cost, mailed them to customers with their bills; 15,000 Ohioans registered to vote. The only cost to the taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, was essentially the normal administrative costs of processing the forms.

H.R. 2 is cost effective as Ohio's program was. H.R. 2 will streamline government. These minimal costs, Mr. Speaker, are a small price to pay for restoring our democracy, greater public involvement in the political process.

□ 1410

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS], another one of our dynamic new Members.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be voting against the motor-voter bill, because the bottom line is a vote for motor-voter is a vote against our senior citizens. A vote for motor-voter is a vote against Social Security recipients.

A vote for motor-voter is a vote against middle class American families.

And finally, a vote for motor-voter is a vote against taxpaying Americans. Working Americans, retired Americans, middle class Americans, taxpaying Americans, all lose with motor-voter; but as you know, when there are losers, there are winners.

Who wins under this bill? Well, motor-voter with its mandatory registration of welfare and entitlement recipients will result in the registration of millions of welfare recipients, illegal aliens and taxpayer-funded entitlement program recipients. They will win.

Motor-voter with its billion dollar regulatory price tag is also a victory for those calling for more programs, more Federal Government, more money for the Federal bureaucrats, a larger welfare state and a bigger welfare system.

To my fellow Congressmen and to our senior citizens, working Americans, Social Security recipients, and taxpaying Americans, I say the bottom line with motor-voter is that we will

have a larger welfare system, a bigger Federal Government, bigger spending, higher deficits, and that means only one thing, higher taxes, and we know where that comes from, because President Clinton has announced and proposed where these higher taxes will come from. He says that we may have a possible elimination of next year's cost-of-living increase for our Nation's 41 million Social Security recipients, part of that to pay for motor-voter. It means that those of you who are covered by Social Security taxes may have an increase.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to this debate and I was reflecting on the fact that this is not the first time that this Chamber has considered a question along these lines. In fact, throughout the history of this Nation we have considered whether we are going to enfranchise and empower Americans to participate in the electoral process.

The interesting thing is what has happened from a partisan viewpoint. A gentleman who hailed from my hometown by the name of Abraham Lincoln is highly regarded as perhaps the greatest Republican President. He is known in history for enfranchising African-Americans. I think the Republican Party is rightly proud of the contributions he made, not only to his party, but to his Nation.

The women's suffrage movement at the beginning of this century had great Republican leadership when an effort was made to finally give to women in America the right to vote. And yet somehow or another in the ensuing 60 or 70 years, the roles have switched. The Democrats are not pushing for empowerment and enfranchisement to bring more voices into the process, while the Republicans consistently say, "Hold back. Don't let all these people in. It gets too expensive. It gets too complicated."

I do not know what has happened, why this philosophy has changed, when the Republicans who enjoyed the political reputation for empowering Americans came to resist it and the Democrats assumed this role instead.

Let me suggest to you, I am not sure how this will end up if H.R. 2 passes. I am not sure it will inure to the benefit of the Democratic Party or to the benefit of the Republican Party or perhaps to an independent party movement. But the basic principle we are arguing for, is as sound as it was in Lincoln's time, at the time of women's suffrage, and it is today. When we can extend more opportunity to bring people into decisionmaking in our democracy, we give more credibility to the decisions.

Why do we construct these obstacles and maintain them to keep people out

of the process? Instead, we should open our doors, bring them in, trust democracy, trust the opinion, the knowledge and the wisdom of the American voter.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the chairman of the Republican Conference Committee, a very dear friend, who is going to bring us the Texas perspective on this.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, this legislation that the Democrats wrote and protected with their power over the process, which is absolutely in this body, was not inspired by Abraham Lincoln. It was inspired by a Texan, Lyndon Johnson.

It is best illustrated by Johnson's campaign workers coming back from a night of voter registration, back from the cemetery. When Johnson looked at the list of registrants he said, "Where is my great-grandfather? He is not on this list."

And the young man who had been registering those patrons of the graveyard said, "Well, that must have been the gravestone that was so covered with mud that I couldn't read it."

LBJ replied, "Well, you get back there and read it and get his name down. He has as much right to vote as anybody."

That is the inspiration behind this bill. That is the kind of quest and thirst and lust for power that inspired this bill.

The Republicans have nothing to do with this bill. This is a Democrat bill. This is a Democrat desire to have even more power; and in total disregard for the rights of the American people.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the National Voter Registration Act.

During the 1992 presidential election, 70 million Americans could not vote because they were not registered. Many of these American citizens were not registered because of the many obstacles to registration throughout our Nation.

This bill will allow all eligible Americans to register to vote when renewing or applying for a driver's license. It will also offer registration opportunities at public agencies including those which serve the poor and the disabled. This legislation should make it possible to reach 95 percent of the eligible electorate within 4 years.

Millions of people in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and Central America have finally been successful in their struggle for democracy. As the leader of the free world, we must set an example for these fledgling democracies. Let us show the world how greatly we value broad democratic participation in our own Nation. Pass-

ing this bill and extending the ballot to millions will send that message.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO], another one of our new freshmen.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motor-voter bill. A vote in favor of this motor-voter bill is a vote to increase taxes in the States. The State of Illinois will have to pay somewhere between \$50 million and \$100 million within the next 5 years in order to implement motor-voter registration.

The State of Illinois will be faced with more opportunities for stealing elections than ever before in the State's history.

We have come a long way in this State in order to clean up the elections. Every single clerk almost to the letter is opposed to motor-voter registration because of the tremendous amount of cost and confusion that will come up if it is enacted.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote against raising taxes back home to pay for this unfunded mandate by voting against the motor-voter bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to close the debate at this time, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me. Hello everybody.

Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes four Delegates are going to come over here when we resolve ourselves into the Committee of the Whole and they are going to cast votes for this piece of legislation which mandates a cost on all 50 States, but not on the territories they represent, because the territories are not included.

□ 1420

This is typical of what is going to happen time after time, after time. That is why it is a shame that my colleagues have let this kind of rule take place. I say to my colleagues, come over here, and defeat the previous question, and I'll have an opportunity to offer an amendment which would include the territories along with us other 50 poor States.

How about that?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I just have one point of clarification. The Congressional Budget Office said this bill is going to cost \$25 million in the first 5 years for the whole Nation. So much for some of the estimates we hear.

I would like to address fraud for just a moment. We have got a couple of quotes from the debate.

Only Washington could write a bill like this.

This is an engraved invitation to fraud.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the three mechanisms that we are using to help people better register to vote all are in practice in the States and were first initiated by the States. This is a classic example of using the States as the laboratories. We have the right to establish the standards for people voting in Federal elections. But all of this is based on things that were initiated by the State.

And with regard to this whole issue of fraud, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter from the secretary of state, Dick Molpus, of the State of Mississippi.

In Mississippi, we initiated Mail-In Voter Registration on July 1, 1992 and became the 27th state to do so. There were cries from the opponents of this effort that there was a great potential for fraud during registration. We conducted an extensive nationwide study of voter registration with particular emphasis on determining the potential for fraud during registration. We found no evidence of registration fraud. The United States Postal Service confirmed that it had virtually no significant instances of registration fraud. Based on these representations, Mail-In Voter Registration is safe and effective.

As Mississippi's chief elections officer, I firmly believe that House Resolution 2 (Motor Voter Bill) will be effective and safe.

Mr. Speaker, the fraud issue that is being raised here today is the biggest fraud in this entire debate.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. DREIER. 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a recorded vote, if ordered, may be taken on the question of adoption of the resolution if the previous question is ordered. Members of the body will have 15 minutes on the first vote and 5 minutes on the next vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 171, not voting 11, as follows:

(Roll No. 23)

YEAS—248

Abercrombie	Bacchus (FL)	Beilenson
Ackerman	Baessler	Berman
Andrews (ME)	Barcia	Bevill
Andrews (NJ)	Barlow	Bilbray
Andrews (TX)	Barrett (WI)	Bishop
Applegate	Becerra	Blackwell

Bonior	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Borski	Hoagland	Payne (VA)
Boucher	Hochbrueckner	Pelosi
Brewster	Holden	Penny
Brooks	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Browder	Hughes	Peterson (MN)
Brown (CA)	Hutto	Pickett
Brown (FL)	Inslee	Pickle
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Bryant	Johnson (GA)	Poshard
Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Price (NC)
Cantwell	Johnson, E.B.	Rahall
Cardin	Johnston	Rangel
Carr	Kanjorski	Reed
Chapman	Kaptur	Reynolds
Clay	Kennedy	Richardson
Clayton	Kennelly	Roemer
Clement	Kildee	Rose
Clyburn	Kleczka	Rostenkowski
Coleman	Klein	Rowland
Collins (IL)	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Collins (MI)	Kopetski	Rush
Condit	Kreidler	Sabo
Conyers	LaFalce	Sanders
Cooper	Lambert	Sangmeister
Coppersmith	Lancaster	Sarpaliss
Costello	Lantos	Sawyer
Coyne	LaRocco	Schenk
Cramer	Lehman	Schroeder
Danner	Levin	Schumer
Darden	Lewis (GA)	Scott
de la Garza	Lipinski	Serrano
Deal	Lloyd	Sharp
DeFazio	Long	Shepherd
DeLauro	Lowe	Sisisky
Dellums	Maloney	Skaggs
Derrick	Mann	Skelton
Deutsch	Manton	Slattery
Dicks	Margolies-	Slaughter
Dingell	Mezvinisky	Smith (IA)
Dixon	Markey	Spratt
Dooley	Martinez	Stark
Durbin	Matsui	Stenholm
Edwards (CA)	Mazzoli	Stokes
Edwards (TX)	McCloskey	Strickland
Engel	McCurdy	Stupak
English (AZ)	McDermott	Swett
English (OK)	McHale	Swift
Eshoo	McKinney	Synar
Evans	McNulty	Tanner
Fazio	Meehan	Tauzin
Fields (LA)	Meek	Taylor (MS)
Flner	Menendez	Tejeda
Fingerhut	Mfume	Thornton
Flake	Miller (CA)	Thurman
Foglietta	Mineta	Torres
Ford (MI)	Minge	Torricelli
Frank (MA)	Mink	Towns
Frost	Moakley	Trafficant
Furse	Mollohan	Unsoeld
Gejdenson	Montgomery	Valentine
Gephardt	Moran	Velazquez
Geren	Murphy	Vento
Gibbons	Murtha	Visclosky
Glickman	Nadler	Volkmer
Gonzalez	Natcher	Waters
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Watt
Green	Neal (NC)	Waxman
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Wheat
Hall (OH)	Obey	Whitten
Hall (TX)	Olver	Williams
Hamburg	Ortiz	Wilson
Hamilton	Orton	Wise
Harman	Owens	Woolsey
Hastings	Pallone	Wyden
Hayes	Parker	Wynn
Hefner	Pastor	Yates

NAYS—171

Allard	Bonilla	Cunningham
Armey	Bunning	DeLay
Bachus (AL)	Burton	Diaz-Balart
Baker (CA)	Buyer	Dickey
Baker (LA)	Callahan	Doolittle
Ballenger	Calvert	Dornan
Barrett (NE)	Camp	Dreier
Bartlett	Canady	Duncan
Bateman	Castle	Dunn
Bentley	Clinger	Emerson
Bereuter	Coble	Everett
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Ewing
Bliley	Combest	Fawell
Blute	Cox	Fish
Boehlert	Crane	Fowler
Boehner	Crapo	Franks (CT)

Franks (NJ)	Kyl	Roberts	Deutch	Lambert	Reynolds	Kim	Molinari	Shaw
Gallely	Lazio	Rogers	Dicks	Lancaster	Richardson	King	Moorhead	Shays
Gallo	Leach	Rohrabacher	Dingell	Lantos	Roemer	Kingston	Morella	Shuster
Gekas	Levy	Ros-Lehtinen	Dixon	LaRocco	Rose	Klug	Myers	Skeen
Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)	Roth	Dooley	Lehman	Rostenkowski	Knollenberg	Nussle	Smith (MI)
Gillmor	Lewis (FL)	Roukema	Durbin	Levin	Rowland	Kolbe	Oxley	Smith (NJ)
Gillman	Lightfoot	Royce	Edwards (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Royal-Ballard	Kyl	Packard	Smith (OR)
Gingrich	Linder	Santorum	Edwards (TX)	Lloyd	Rush	Lazio	Paxon	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	Livingston	Saxton	Engel	Long	Sabo	Leach	Petri	Snowe
Goodling	Machtley	Schaefer	English (AZ)	Lowey	Sanders	Levy	Pombo	Solomon
Goss	Manzullo	Schiff	English (OK)	Maloney	Sangmeister	Lewis (CA)	Porter	Spence
Grams	McCandless	Sensenbrenner	Eshoo	Mann	Sarpalius	Lewis (FL)	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
Grandy	McCollum	Shaw	Evans	Manton	Sawyer	Lightfoot	Quillen	Stump
Greenwood	McCrery	Shays	Fazio	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Schenk	Linder	Quinn	Sundquist
Gunderson	McDade	Shuster	Fields (LA)	Markley	Schroeder	Lipinski	Ramstad	Talent
Hancock	McHugh	Skeen	Flner	Martinez	Schumer	Livingston	Ravenel	Taylor (NC)
Hansen	McInnis	Smith (MI)	Fingerhut	Matsuz	Scott	Machtley	Regula	Thomas (CA)
Hastert	McKeon	Smith (NJ)	Flake	Mazoli	Serrano	Manzullo	Ridge	Thomas (WY)
Hefley	McMillan	Smith (OR)	Foglietta	McCloskey	Sharp	McCandless	Roberts	Torkildsen
Herger	Meyers	Smith (TX)	Ford (MI)	McCurdy	Shepherd	McCollum	Rogers	Upton
Hobson	Mica	Snowe	Frank (MA)	McDermott	Sisisky	McCrery	Rohrabacher	Vucanovich
Hoekstra	Michel	Solomon	Frost	McHale	Skaggs	McDade	Ros-Lehtinen	Walker
Hoke	Miller (FL)	Spence	Furse	McKinney	Skelton	McHugh	Roth	Walsh
Horn	Molnari	Stearns	Gedjenson	McNulty	Slattery	McInnis	Roukema	Weldon
Houghton	Moorhead	Stump	Gephardt	Meehan	Slaughter	McKeon	Royce	Wolf
Huffington	Morella	Sundquist	Geren	Meek	Smith (IA)	McMillan	Santorum	Young (AK)
Hunter	Myers	Talent	Gibbons	Menendez	Spratt	Meyers	Saxton	Young (FL)
Hutchinson	Nussle	Taylor (NC)	Glickman	Mfume	Stark	Mica	Schaefer	Zeliff
Hyde	Oxley	Thomas (CA)	Gonzalez	Miller (CA)	Stenholm	Michel	Schiff	Zimmer
Inglis	Packard	Thomas (WY)	Gordon	Mineta	Stokes	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	
Inhofe	Paxon	Torkildsen	Green	Minge	Strickland			
Istook	Petri	Upton	Gutierrez	Mink	Stupak			
Jacobs	Pombo	Vucanovich	Hall (OH)	Moakley	Swett	Archer	Ford (TN)	Laughlin
Johnson, Sam	Porter	Walker	Hall (TX)	Mollohan	Swift	Bartlett	Henry	Studds
Kasich	Pryce (OH)	Walsh	Hamburg	Montgomery	Synar	Barton	Johnson (CT)	Washington
Kim	Quillen	Weldon	Hamilton	Moran	Tanner	Fields (TX)	Johnson, Sam	
King	Quinn	Wolf	Harman	Murphy	Tauzin			
Kingston	Ramstad	Young (AK)	Hastings	Murtha	Taylor (MS)			
Klug	Ravenel	Young (FL)	Hayes	Nadler	Tejeda			
Knollenberg	Regula	Zeliff	Hefner	Natcher	Thornton			
Kolbe	Ridge	Zimmer	Hilliard	Neal (MA)	Thurman			
			Hinchey	Neal (NC)	Torres			
			Hoagland	Oberstar	Torricelli			
			Hochbrueckner	Obey	Towns			
			Holden	Oliver	Traficant			
			Hoyer	Ortiz	Tucker			
			Hughes	Orton	Unsoeld			
			Hutto	Owens	Valentine			
			Inslee	Pallone	Velazquez			
			Jacobs	Parker	Vento			
			Jefferson	Pastor	Viscosky			
			Johnson (GA)	Payne (NJ)	Volkmmer			
			Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)	Waters			
			Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Watt			
			Johnston	Penny	Waxman			
			Kanjorski	Peterson (FL)	Wheat			
			Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Whitten			
			Kennedy	Pickett	Williams			
			Kennelly	Pickle	Wilson			
			Kildee	Pomeroy	Wise			
			Klecicka	Poshard	Woolsey			
			Klein	Price (NC)	Wyden			
			Klink	Rahall	Wynn			
			Kopetski	Rangel	Yates			
			Kreidler	Reed				
			LaFalce					

NOT VOTING—11

Archer	Henry	Studds
Barton	Hinchey	Tucker
Fields (TX)	Johnson (CT)	Washington
Ford (TN)	Laughlin	

□ 1445

Mr. JACOBS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HAYES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 170, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—249

Abercrombie	Borski	Coleman
Ackerman	Boucher	Collins (IL)
Andrews (ME)	Brewster	Collins (MI)
Andrews (NJ)	Brooks	Condit
Andrews (TX)	Browder	Conyers
Applegate	Brown (CA)	Cooper
Bacchus (FL)	Brown (FL)	Coppersmith
Baessler	Brown (OH)	Costello
Barcia	Bryant	Coyne
Barlow	Byrne	Cramer
Barrett (WI)	Cantwell	Danner
Becerra	Cardin	Darden
Berman	Carr	de la Garza
Bevill	Chapman	Deal
Bilbray	Clay	DeFazio
Bishop	Clayton	DeLauro
Blackwell	Clement	Dellums
Bonior	Clyburn	Derrick

NAYS—170

Allard	Collins (GA)	Gilman
Armey	Combest	Gingrich
Bachus (AL)	Cox	Goodlatte
Baker (CA)	Crane	Goodling
Baker (LA)	Crapo	Goss
Ballenger	Cunningham	Grams
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Grandy
Bateman	Diaz-Balart	Greenwood
Beilenson	Dickey	Gunderson
Bentley	Doolittle	Hancock
Bereuter	Dornan	Hansen
Billirakis	Dreier	Hastert
Bliley	Duncan	Hefley
Blute	Dunn	Herger
Boehlert	Emerson	Hobson
Boehner	Everett	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Ewing	Hoke
Bunning	Fawell	Horn
Burton	Fish	Houghton
Buyer	Fowler	Huffington
Callahan	Franks (CT)	Hunter
Calvert	Franks (NJ)	Hutchinson
Camp	Gallegly	Hyde
Canady	Gallo	Inglis
Castle	Gekas	Inhofe
Clinger	Gilchrest	Istook
Coble	Gillmor	Kasich

NOT VOTING—11

Archer	Ford (TN)	Laughlin
Bartlett	Henry	Studds
Barton	Johnson (CT)	Washington
Fields (TX)	Johnson, Sam	

□ 1457

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 67), and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 67

Resolved, That the following named Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates, be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Pat Williams, Montana; Blanche Lambert, Arkansas.

Committee on Government Operations: Floyd H. Flake, New York; James A. Hayes, Louisiana; Craig Washington, Texas; Barbara-Rose Collins, Michigan; Corrine Brown, Florida; Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky, Pennsylvania; Lynn C. Woolsey, California; vacancy; vacancy.

Committee on Small Business: Maxine Waters, California; vacancy.

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Jim McDermott, Washington, Chairman; George Darden, Georgia; Benjamin Cardin, Maryland; Kweisi Mfume, Maryland; Robert A. Borski, Pennsylvania; Thomas C. Sawyer, Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). Pursuant to

House Resolution 59 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2.

□ 1459

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to establish national voter registration procedures for Federal elections, and for other purposes, with Mr. McDERMOTT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

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

Mr. Chairman, due to an oversight, the following Members were inadvertently omitted from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin; Ms. CORINNE BROWN of Florida; Ms. ESHOO; Mrs. MEEK; Mr. MINGE; Mr. "PETE" PETERSON of Florida; Mr. POMEROY; Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD; and Mr. RUSH.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] be allowed to control 15 minutes of the time allocated to the majority side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, it sometimes seems strange that it takes so much work to do something so simple and so good for the American people as this measure will do. What we are trying to address here is the eradication of a rather unfortunate tradition in this country. We have used voter registration mechanisms in the United States throughout many, many decades to prevent various groups who were from time to time and by certain groups considered undesirable, to make it very difficult for them to vote. At various times those have been eastern Europeans and southern Europeans, the Irish, African-Americans, and others.

There are very few people in this country today, who would condone establishing high registration thresholds for the purpose of discrimination against any American citizen, but we have grown out of that tradition to believe that it is government's right to establish high thresholds for registration; that, in short, government has the right to dictate high hurdles over

which American citizens must jump in order to be qualified to vote on election day.

That is wrong. It is inconsistent with the fundamental beliefs and philosophy of this country, in which we believe that it is a God-given, not a government-given, right for a citizen of this country to vote.

The legislation which we have before us today suggests three specific ways to make it easier for citizens to register. All three are already in practice in this country. All three are working; all three are working well. There is nothing new; there is nothing untried here at all.

Ninety-two percent of Americans have a driver's license. The first thing this legislation does is to say that when one applies for a driver's license or renews the driver's license, they will also at that time have an opportunity to apply for registration to vote.

What of the other 8 percent? Why do they not have driver's licenses? Primarily either through physical disability that prevents them from driving, or economic disability, which prevents them from owning a car, so we do two other things in this legislation: we provide postcard registration, which is particularly useful to the disabled. That is a technique which is currently used by 28 States, a majority of the States. Most Americans today can register to vote through that technique.

For those who are in economic distress, we say in those agencies where they are most likely to seek help they will have an opportunity to apply for registration there as well.

Let me conclude this opening statement by making one other distinction that I think is terribly important. We use shorthand in our language and sometimes come to believe the accuracy of the shorthand. We say, "We register to vote." The truth is, all any of us do is apply to be registered to vote. The registrars register us.

Why is that distinction important? We have heard a lot of rhetoric around here about automatic registration. There is nothing in this bill that provides for that at all. Because whichever of the mechanisms in this bill are used by which to apply for registration, that application still goes, as any application does today, to a registration official who will screen that registration, that application, for eligibility. That is the way it is done now. That is the way it will be done under this legislation.

We do not have vote fraud because of any of these techniques now. There will be no vote fraud because these techniques will be used in every State, rather than in some. In short, this is simply an effort to make a citizen of this country more readily able to register, so come election day he or she will have no problem going into that voting booth and working his or her will.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], who has a great deal of an institutional memory about this bill and who would enlighten us now.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the vineyard of expanding the opportunity for all Americans to vote is not exclusively a Democratic Party initiative. The Republican Party, after all, is the party of Lincoln, and if the Members will examine those various voting schemes devised to deny Americans the right to vote, it is a historical fact that most of them would be laid at the feet of the Democratic Party. I can mention the Texas white primaries, and I can mention any number of poll taxes, and I can mention their horrendous history following the Civil War, but it is not my purpose to do that because I think all of us are interested in expanding the right of all Americans to vote.

Most recently we joined together in a bipartisan effort to make sure that access to the polling place was not denied to all Americans. I was proud to say that that was done in a bipartisan way. Just two Congresses ago we approached the business of expanding the opportunity for Americans to vote in a bipartisan way. Sad to say, most of the provisions that made that bill a bipartisan one were lost just as soon as President Clinton was elected.

What we have in front of us is not one of the brighter moments in our attempt to expand the opportunity of all Americans to vote. No. 1, it is mandatory. It is mandatory even on those States that have motor-voter.

The problem is, if a State, under the existing law for setting up an election procedure that those folks in that State desired, went ahead and already enacted motor-voter, they are now forced to change it to the monolithic model that is being imposed on everyone.

Is it not interesting that the only two agencies that are required to carry out this activity in any State are the unemployment offices and the welfare offices? How in the world is this a requirement that we expand and broaden the opportunity for all Americans? Scratch out "all," write in "some." If the Members want to declare a particular party affiliation in terms of that bias, the choice is theirs. Do not pick ours.

In addition, the governors from all the 50 States were here in Washington. What was their major theme? "Don't give us any more mandated programs unless you fund them." Yesterday the Congress of the United States, in the first bill introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 1, gave them a mandated program with no funding.

Here we are today, taking up the second bill introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 2. It is mandatory, with no funding. The irony of all of this is that the States, that rich diversity of interaction among people within a Federal system who historically have had the power to structure the voting arrangements, are now going to be squeezed and homogenized through the Federal Election Commission, because that is where the major election decisions will reside, not in the States but in the Federal Election Commission.

Ross Perot, President Clinton, and others during the campaign decried the loss of the viability of the American political parties. Do Members know who traditionally carries on the bulk of voter registration? The American political parties, at no cost to the taxpayer. Why in the world are we not working on a creative incentive program to give more responsibility to those broad umbrellas of political ideas, the American political parties, and have them through various incentives, increase the opportunity for all Americans to register, give them a greater role in the system, instead of homogenizing, mandating, and not funding a program which I am sure will pass and fit very comfortably into the Democratic Party's program for this Congress, which is "Don't do as I say, do as I do do; that is, mandate and don't provide for the money to carry it out, force people into a homogenized package, and, by the way, destroy some of the most American, unique institutions in the world, our political parties."

□ 1510

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] the Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for his leadership on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this fall when I went campaigning I met hundreds of people who wanted to vote.

They were fed up.

Fed up with health care costs.

Fed up because family members were out of work.

If the 1992 elections taught us anything it was that people want in.

They want to participate.

So why are voter turnout figures so low in America?

Why 23d in the world—last among the major democracies?

Voter apathy? Cynicism?

No. The big reason is this: the antiquated, unnecessary, obstacles we impose on our voters.

We have barred the methods that make voter registration universal.

We insist hard-working Americans sacrifice wages—risk getting their boss

mad—to take off from work to fill our a form.

Is there a better way? Absolutely. Motor-voter.

It makes sense for three reasons.

First, it works. Eighty-seven percent of the adult public has a drivers license—and this bill provides for disabled voters or those who don't drive. Besides, the States that have linked voter registration to drivers licenses—Nevada, Arizona, Minnesota—have seen lots more people take part.

Second, it prevents fraud. That is because a drivers license is one of the biggest safeguards against fraud. Sales clerks all around the country know that: the sentence they utter most in checking you out is, "I need your drivers license or a major credit card."

Third, it is cost-effective.

In my home State, Michigan, we first tried motor vehicle registration in 1975. We registered 750,000 new voters for 13 cents a vote.

Mr. Speaker, barriers to freedom are falling all around the world.

Lets knock down our own barriers.

Do it for new voters.

Do it for disabled voters.

Do it for people who have been cut out.

America should should lead the way, not pick up the rear.

Let us pass this bill.

Let us put more voters in the driver's seat where they belong.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Back in 1990, February 6, when we debated this bill, I made the point that no one in this Congress stands in the way of participatory democracy. In past years we got rid of literacy tests, poll taxes, residency requirements, property tax requirements, and all of those barriers. Nobody today wants these kinds of barriers in the election process. Let us make that clear.

What we have here today in this Chamber is that perception is reality. We have heard, and we will hear over and over and over again, if we simply increase voter registration by automatically registering everybody who has a driver's license, everybody who walks into the welfare office, the unemployment office, the food stamp distribution center, or where one gets their fishing license, or their marriage license, or their hunting license, or any agency the State may designate, and we make all of these folks election officials, and computer cousins, all of those computers are going to work together without any cost, then we will save democracy and increase voter turnout.

However, the record shows that the eight States that have motor-voter did not see any increase in turnout. Where

they saw an increase in turnout is where they had a choice and where they cared.

I do not know about the State of Michigan, but in Kansas we voted.

Reality check. This is going to turn our election process upside down. Who is saying to the secretary of state of Kansas who sent a letter to me, and I ask permission to include it right after my remarks, who was saying to the secretary of state of Kansas and the local county election officials within my 66 counties of the First District that we have barriers to voting? I do not know of anyone. What makes anyone here think they know more in terms of outreach and voter turnout in Ford County and Dodge City, KS, America, than our county clerk, Rita Slattery, who by the way is a Democrat?

And let me say that all of us, all of us who questioned this approach do not oppose increased voter registration or turnout. We do that in Kansas, and in my State we have the Farm Bureau, the League of Women Voters, Republicans, Democrats, United We Stand for "Ross the Boss," the American GI Forum, the NAACP, veterans' organizations, and the list goes on and on.

Our secretary of state will have a motor-voter plan implemented by 1994. Pass this and we will not get it done until 1996. You will stand in the way of 90 percent voter turnout in the State of Kansas and turn it over to the FEC.

I include for the RECORD the letter I previously referred to from Bill Graves, the secretary of state of the State of Kansas, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
Topeka, KS, January 25, 1993.

Hon. PAT ROBERTS
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: It is clear that President Clinton has made passage of the National Voter Registration Act a high priority in 1993. More than once last year I publicly voiced my objections to any federal motor-voter legislation, including writing a letter to President Bush urging his veto of S. 250.

I wish to reiterate my objections as chief election officer for the state or Kansas. Please consider the following points during your deliberations on H.R. 2.

H.R. 2 is one more unnecessary, unfunded, federally-mandated program foisted on the states, most of which are already having difficulty keeping their necessary existing programs operating with scarce and dwindling resources. To my knowledge, no one has even put a price tag on H.R. 2, but it will be expensive.

Most states already have or are developing motor-voter programs. Kansas passed a motor-voter bill in 1992, and my office is in the planing stage for 1994 implementation. Any additional federal legislation will unreasonably duplicate and complicate those efforts.

H.R. 2 will greatly increase the chance for election fraud, the very thing registration was intended to prevent. This bill would have more government agencies and administrators involved in the voter registration

process, and would provide less time than our state now requires for verification of registration information and preparation of accurate and up-to-date registration lists. We will not be able to maintain our current standards of electoral integrity if H.R. 2 passes.

When implemented, Kansas' motor-voter program will reach, through the vehicle registration process, more than 90% of persons eligible to vote. H.R. 2 will require us to duplicate those contacts for many individuals because they will have the opportunity to register again at other government agencies. This will require an inordinate expenditure of resources to reach just a few of the individuals who did not register to vote during the vehicle registration process. It will also require us to spend an inordinate amount of time eliminating duplicate registrations.

Thank you for your consideration of my ideas. If you need more specific information, please call me at (913) 296-2236.

Sincerely,

BILL GRAVES,
Kansas Secretary of State.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act, or motor-voter bill.

Voter registration officials in my State of Alabama are strongly opposed to the motor-voter bill because it is a gross infringement on States rights. It also imposes significant costs on the States without corresponding funding. I do not know about the other 49 States, but Alabama just cannot afford this expense, particularly when it will serve to promote voter fraud.

H.R. 2 will undoubtedly generate tremendous abuse in the election process. It will prevent any type of verification of postcard registration and encourage same-day registration. It also allows illegal aliens to register. Other questions persist: Can those under age 18 register? Can convicted felons register? I do not believe the supporters of this bill intend that fraud will prevail, but I do believe we should look very carefully at what will happen in reality. Widespread fraud is possible because the bill's safeguards are simply inadequate.

I agree that it is important to encourage participation in the Democratic process. Voting is a fundamental right—indeed, it is a responsibility. The individual States are in a better position to determine how best to get people to register. I am not sure the Federal Government should have a major role in this process, but I do know this legislation is not the right method of involvement.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on the motor-voter bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished delegate for the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not envy the opponents of the National Voter Registration Act. It is bad enough to oppose increasing Democratic participation. But Republicans, for whom Government efficiency and cost cutting have become a mantra, oppose those good things too when they oppose H.R. 2.

Like our economic productivity, our voter productivity needs an assist from modern methods and technology. A comparable law in the District of Columbia has yielded a 50-percent increase in new registrants since 1989.

Last year Americans went from cynical apathy to new levels of participation using new outlets. Let us put them in closer touch with the vote, the outlet that counts most in a democracy.

Support H.R. 2.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the eloquent gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Although it may come as a surprise to some we do not possess unlimited authority to impose our will and good intentions on the States or on the citizens of this Nation. This is not a body possessed with boundless authority, but a constitutionally created legislature with limited powers.

We have a solemn obligation to examine the Constitution to see what it says about the power of the Federal Government to regulate Federal and State elections and our authority to use the resources of State governments, without their consent, to implement a Federal regulatory scheme.

Article I, section 4 of the Constitution, gives Congress the authority to make regulations with respect to the "Times, Places and Manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives." Section 2 of article I, provides that the electors for the House of Representatives in each State "shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature."

Taken together, these two sections indicate that while Congress has authority to regulate Federal elections, States have the authority to conduct State elections and to set the qualifications for voters for State and Federal office, as long as they do not do so in a discriminatory fashion. In addition to these explicit references to voting, there is another section of the Constitution which is instructive. The 10th amendment to the Constitution states that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or the people."

Even if we accept the premise that congressional authority to regulate the times, places and manner of a Federal election authorizes the enactment of a comprehensive and mandatory voter registration scheme, it is a quantum leap to accept the proposition that the Federal Government has the power to commandeer the offices of State governments to impose this scheme.

Last year, in New York versus United States the U.S. Supreme Court struck

down part of a Federal law on the disposal of radioactive waste on the ground that it violated the 10th amendment. Justice O'Connor writing for the majority stated:

States are not mere political subdivisions of the United States. State governments are neither regional offices nor administration agencies of the Federal Government. The positions occupied by State officials appear nowhere on the Federal Government's most detailed organizational chart. The Constitution instead "leaves to the several States a residuary and inviolable sovereignty," reserved explicitly to the States by the Tenth Amendment.

This bill requires States to designate its offices that provide public assistance and unemployment compensation as voter registration agencies. Incredibly, States may not require Federal offices to share the load in implementing this Federal mandate. Federal offices have the option of deciding whether they can afford the commitment of time, resources, and personnel. They cannot be designated as voter registration agencies without their explicit agreement. Not only does this fly in the face of the 10th amendment, it turns any traditional concept of federalism on its ear.

The goal of this bill—increase citizen participation in our Constitutional democracy—is one with which we all agree. We gain nothing, however, if in seeking to achieve that worthy goal, we trample on the very document which we are sworn to uphold.

□ 1520

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN], who was the author of the motor-voter bill in his State.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Members to support H.R. 2, because in an earlier life just 2 years ago, I served in the State senate in Texas, and for a number of years we talked about passing motor-voter. We finally did, and we have a bill in the State of Texas that is actually a little stronger than the one we are considering today. We heard the same concerns from a lot of Members from the other party about how it is going to hurt our voter registration and voter activity.

Well, I know that this last November election we had one of the highest turnouts in history in Texas, and I wish we could claim all of that from motor-voter. I think it helped, because we had an aggressive effort to register voters. We do it at driver's license locations.

One of the oppositions we heard in Texas was that it would slow down the driver's license lines. That is not true, because, frankly, we wait in lines already to renew our driver's licenses, and we just encouraged people to register to vote.

For so many years, we have been concerned about registration. Our politics are based on fear, fear of what may happen, and fear of what may happen, but that is not what we need to be concerned about here. I can use a good example from my own home State of how motor-voter has worked, and it is working like a lot of other States will do, and I think I would hope that the whole Congress, and not just the majority Democrats, would vote for this bill, because our goal is to increase participation in our electoral process and not limit it.

Every opportunity we can do, whether it be this bill or some other bill that would increase the participation of our citizens, we need to do that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. Chairman, there are five excellent reasons why I oppose this piece of legislation, and they are the five local voting registrars in the five counties which comprise my district. Each one of these is a professional in his field and collectively these five have spent more than 100 years working the methodology of according the voting privilege to our fellow citizens in our area.

Last year, contrary to the assertions made by the Delegate from the District of Columbia, this last election they processed the highest number of registrations in 1 year and the highest number of voters in their entire experience without the help of motor-voter. It was the incentive of the election, the issues, and the people's will to vote and to register that brought about these swelling numbers of registrations and voting in those districts.

They tell me that there will be a nightmare of administration, of costs, but worse, it can ultimately damage the voting system that so eloquently responded this past election cycle to the needs of the voting public. It can damage it because of the reliance that these voting registrars are going to have to place on other agencies of the State. Are they going to be able to conform to the election deadlines schedule? Are they going to be able to communicate on a regular basis in a multiparty type of agency kind of registration that this vehicle would present?

I rely on these voting registrars and their good judgment. Those five reasons obtain for all of us. We ought to be not spreading around the registration in a flimflam way but, rather, letting them concentrate their efforts as they did this past election cycle so successfully.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2,

the National Voter Registration Act and in opposition to the Michel amendment. This legislation goes to the very roots of democracy and to very origins of this Nation's founding—the natural right of all to the ballot and to elect their representative government. This natural right is implicit in the words of our Declaration of Independence, "Governments receive their power to rule only through agreement of the people."

This legislation is especially important to me because before my election to Congress, I dedicated many hours and much work in my community to greater voter access. I know that the inadequate voter registration systems that exist today hinder voter empowerment, particularly in minority communities. Archaic and burdensome procedures presently impede some 70 million eligible voters from exercising one of their most important rights as citizens. It was clear to me that fresh opportunities and new vehicles for political empowerment were crucial in order to reach those millions of people historically ignored by the political process.

That is why I launched a voter registration drive in the Puerto Rican community entitled "Atrevete," which means dare to. This program strived to overcome the obstacles and impediments to registration by daring this disenfranchised community to dare to get involved, to struggle for their right to vote—a right that they have earned as citizens of this country. I am very proud to report that our efforts enrolled 200,000 new voters in the Puerto Rican community. Private projects such as Atrevete should continue and, indeed, be replicated, but our Federal Government has a responsibility to be a partner in these efforts. The modest but monumental principles in H.R. 2 accomplish that mission.

It is important to note that voter turnout increased in 1992, the first time in many years, but almost all of that increase occurred in States which had implemented part or all of the registration procedures outlined in H.R. 2. So, it is obvious that these principles have been tested and have been proven effective.

The National Voter Registration Act establishes three major procedures by which to improve voter registration. The first requires States to establish procedures that permits individuals to register to vote in Federal elections when they apply for a driver's license, renew a license, or apply for identification card by a motor vehicle department. The measure does not require that individuals register. As a matter of fact, it contains language ensuring that applicants cannot be coerced or influenced in their decision whether to register or how to register by any official. The measure also requires that the registration form contain a statement of the eligibility requirements

for voting, an attestation that the applicant meets each requirement, and the applicant's signature.

H.R. 2 also improves access to the ballot by requiring each State to accept and use a mail voter registration form to be developed by the Federal Election Commission in consultation with the chief election officers of the States. The third major reform to voter registration procedures contained in H.R. 2 is the designation of public assistance, unemployment, and other agencies as voter registration agencies. These two final provisions are particularly important to our disabled Americans because transportation barriers often make it impossible for them to get to a voter registration site. The bill would help disabled people across the country become full and active participants in the electoral process.

I want to state my strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I warn my colleagues not to be fooled by this deceptive amendment which creates a sizable loophole for States to avoid complying with H.R. 2. Under the amendment if a State's chief election official simply feels that existing procedures for preventing noneligible people to vote are insufficient, then the State does not have to adhere to H.R. 2. The Michael amendment essentially undermines the act by making it voluntary. There are more than adequate existing safeguards to determine eligibility to vote under current law.

In closing Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleagues, especially those who speak often of reform, that today they have a unique opportunity to institute true political reform by facilitating the fullest public participation in the electoral process. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Michael amendment and to support final passage of the National Voter Registration Act.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the goal of this bill and, in fact, I voted for a previous version of this bill.

But I want to advise my colleagues that this bill, though well intentioned, has a number of problems. The secretary of labor in the State of New Mexico, the Honorable Patrick Baca, in a Democratic administration, I might add, has contacted me objecting to the enactment of this bill as it now reads.

He suggests two problems: No. 1, since the unemployment compensation office he administers must give forms to applicants, and the applicants must decline to register in writing, he is afraid that there will be a coercive impact on people who come to his agency, and that individuals will not come for unemployment compensation benefits because they are afraid of some type of political coercion. Second of all, he in-

icates that there is no financial assistance. This bill requires the employees of his agency to provide voter registration assistance but no financing to add more employees or to train existing employees.

He makes that point that the purpose of the employees of the Department of Labor are to serve the Department of Labor.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to talk to your State and local officials before you vote on this bill, no matter what their party affiliation, and get their views.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2, a bill that could dramatically increase participation in our democracy and the electoral process.

□ 1530

Americans who register to vote follow through and cast their ballots in great numbers. Between 80 and 90 percent in the last election. But one-third of the electorate still is not registered, not because they do not want to vote but because of outdated registration policies that vary by State and sometimes even by municipality. That is right, more than 70 million eligible American citizens cannot exercise a fundamental constitutional right simply because our country lacks a consistent national policy for voter registration. But there is hope for a change. We saw increased voter turnout in the 1992 elections, a 20-year record.

Today we could jump start the American electorate, but only if we keep from getting stalled on insubstantial objections to the motor-voter act. What will it do? This bill will not increase voter fraud; it will eliminate discrimination.

Vote with me in favor of the National Voter Registration Act.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am most honored to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY].

Mr. CANADY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to this bill—a bill which will perpetrate a massive fraud on the American people.

The bill under consideration will strike a devastating blow against constitutional order and the American system of democracy. Under the banner of reform, the bill would inaugurate a new era of abuse—an era in which millions of illegal aliens and other non-citizens will flood into the American electoral system.

Less than 1 month ago, the majority of this House trampled on the Constitution by granting voting rights on this floor to delegates from the territories and the District of Columbia. Now, the majority is prepared to as-

sault the constitutional rights of American citizens once again.

In the name of democratic participation, access, and inclusion, this bill will open the floodgates to electoral fraud on an unprecedented scale. It would rob American citizens of their right to elect representatives in a free, open, and fair electoral process.

By encouraging the registration of persons not eligible to vote, the bill would dilute the voting power of American citizens. It would create an electoral system on a par with the rotten borough system of 18th century Britain.

This is not a reform—it is a sham. An ugly partisan attempt to skew the results of elections by corrupting the system for registering voters.

Americans who choose not to exercise their right to vote do so not because of legal barriers to registration—but because of frustration and apathy induced by a lack of confidence in the institutions of government in America—including a lack of confidence in the Congress.

The sorry spectacle of Congress effectively surrendering the franchise to illegal aliens and other noncitizens will only serve further to undermine the confidence of American citizens in their Government. It will produce a result exactly the opposite of the purported intent of this legislation.

To maintain the confidence of American citizens in this Congress and the integrity of the electoral process, this House should defeat this ill-conceived bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this bill begins to tear down the barriers that have so often prevented people from freely exercising their right to vote. It actually does something to help to get more people into the voting booth.

Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the arguments against this bill. If we are to believe the bill's opponents, it will lead to rampant voter fraud and bureaucratic nightmare. These same arguments were made when Wisconsin debated the same-day registration in the 1970's. I am here to tell you that the gloomy forecasts did not come true in Wisconsin.

According to the Wisconsin elections board, in Wisconsin voter fraud is not a problem in our State. More importantly, our law encourages people to vote. Voters are not kept out of the booth because they did not register 30 days before the election. Wisconsin law and the motor-voter law recognize that, as most of us in this public body know, most people do not focus on elections until the last few weeks before the campaign ends.

It is no coincidence that the States with the highest percentages in the 1992 election were Maine, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin, all States that have either same-day registration or no registration at all.

When this bill becomes law, it will truly be a victory for democracy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in opposition to H.R. 2, for several reasons. First of all, this bill does not in fact come through with the intent for which it was proposed. It fails to increase voter turnout. The intent is to increase voter participation, but as CRS has reported, of the 10 States adopting motor-voter registration provisions prior to the 1988 Presidential election, 8 States displayed decline in the percentage of the voting population voting in elections after the adoption of motor-voter registration.

Second, I would like to share with you that the Governor of my State, Gov. George Voinovich, called me personally, as well as our secretary of state, Bob Taft, to urge me to vote against this legislation because it is another example of the arrogant use of Federal mandates without funding to clog up and burden the taxpayers of the State of Ohio and all the States.

Finally, I would like to ask the question: Why is it that in this legislation the language says in section 7, No. 2, that each State shall designate as voter registration agencies all offices that provide public assistance, unemployment compensation, or related services, but it says that each State shall designate other offices, which may include public libraries, public schools, offices of city and county clerks, fishing and hunting license bureaus?

It seems to me, if you look at the population that is going to be at those different offices, it is clear that there is also a partisan intent at the bottom of this which strikes directly to the equity of the bill.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA], a member of the committee.

Mr. KLECZKA. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

As a member of the Elections Subcommittee, I would first like to compliment Mr. SWIFT for his dedication and effort on behalf of this cause. I have had the opportunity to serve on several House Administration panels with the gentleman from Washington, and I must say we can all learn from his even temper and judicious demeanor.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2 is the most important piece of legislation since the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

By simplifying the voter registration process and allowing eligible citizens to apply to register when they receive their driver's license, H.R. 2 ensures the voter registration process is responsive to the needs of voters, rather than Government bureaucrats.

During the consideration of this bill in committee, the ranking member from Louisiana, raised several concerns, which, in the words of Mr. SWIFT, are nothing but straw men.

He claimed this bill will promote voter fraud, require welfare offices to devote as much time to voter registration duties as to their other tasks, and stop State agencies from being able to purge their voter lists. All of these statements, Mr. Chairman, are based on unsubstantiated fears or misconceptions, not the actual legislation before us.

This bill in no way changes any present laws about voter qualification or the responsibilities of the local registrar. While this bill expands where and when individuals may apply for registration, the acceptance of an application remains under the control of State officials.

Contrary to some of the rhetoric espoused by opponents of this measure, it will not create inaccurate voter lists, but rather it requires States and local jurisdictions to maintain accurate lists.

It mandates that the purge processes must be uniform and nondiscriminatory, and stipulates that a registrant who fails to return an address confirmation notice may be removed from the rolls if that person does not vote within a period of two Federal elections.

As for charges that the bill imposes costly mandates on the States, official mailings under the act are eligible for reduced postal rates. Furthermore, it should be noted that under article 1, section 4 of the Constitution, Congress not only has the authority, but the obligation, to prescribe the conditions under which elections are held.

One other point the gentleman from Louisiana raised was his objection to the provision that exempts States which have same-day registration from the motor-voter provisions of the bill. In a Dear Colleague he circulated, he states that this "creates an election day registration loophole," and suggests States will adopt same-day procedures to avoid the costs of the bill. Good.

During the committee consideration of this bill, I was one of the strongest and probably the most vocal proponent of this provision. I did so because my home State—Wisconsin—has same-day registration, and I am surprised that someone could suggest that this practice precludes meaningful verification

and invites fraud, where no such proof exists.

In the 1992 Presidential election, the three States with same-day registration—Wisconsin, Maine, and Minnesota—again ranked heads and shoulders above the national average. According to the election turnouts, Maine was first in the Nation with 72-percent turnout, followed by Minnesota with 71.6 percent. Wisconsin ranked fourth with 69 percent. Nationwide the average was 55.3 percent.

And I am proud to say that since Wisconsin adopted same-day registration in 1976, voter fraud has not been a problem, but long lines of voters at the polling places has been—that is exactly what we hope to achieve.

Mr. Chairman, with one-third of all eligible voters still unregistered, the need to make our political process more accessible to all Americans must be one of our priorities. H.R. 2 is a comprehensive compromise which will increase registration and maintain the integrity of the election process.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this measure, and thank you, Mr. SWIFT, for allowing me to speak on behalf of this fine piece of legislation.

□ 1540

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out that the Justice Department says same-day registration is conducive to fraud and that postcard registration, according to a New York grand jury convened in 1982, says the advent of mail-in registration leads to a most incredible opportunity for fraud.

My own registrar of voters in Jefferson Parish in Louisiana says this bill would be an open invitation to fraud, so the views just expressed are not necessarily shared by others around the country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, when the Michel amendment is offered later, it will consist of two parts; one to make sure that citizens only can be registered, and also a section that would say that has to be certified.

It is my understanding the Democrats are now prepared to divide that question into two parts. What they would do is say they will vote for the idea that people have to be citizens, but then they are going to vote against the certification. Understand what that means. What they are prepared to do is say that you have to be a citizen, but wink-wink, no one will certify it, so no one will know.

Well, this is in reality something that should be called for what it is, legalized voter fraud. That is exactly the problem with what we are doing here.

If you want to know what is sick about the Congress, look at what the

Democrats are prepared to do on the upcoming Michel amendment. If you want to know why people are sick and tired of Congress, look at what the Democrats are prepared to do on the Michel amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Michel amendment's second portion is what is fraudulent, because what it does is say nothing in this bill will go into effect until the State sends the certification to the Attorney General, but it provides no deadline which he ever has to do that.

Under the guise of a hot button political issue, this is simply an effort to eviscerate the central purpose of the bill, pure and simple.

I would make one other point; that is, that the amendment which would suggest that you must be a citizen is redundant. In three separate places inside this bill already, it says that you must be a citizen. That is in the legislation. It is in the legislation three times. They are going to offer an amendment which will say that you have to do it a fourth time. It does not make it any truer. It is redundant. It is harmless. It is unnecessary. It is kind of frivolous.

The fact is, obviously you must be a citizen and the legislation states three times you must be a citizen. The policy will be you must be a citizen. We all support that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, in the story "Citizen Kane," toward the end of the play Citizen Kane, the publisher of the newspaper, is a candidate for the U.S. Senate. The newspaper run is all set up on two different presses. One of them says, "Kane wins." The other press run says, "Fraud at the polls."

I do not know why I happened to think about that in connection with this debate, but I would like to point out for the record that if you are inclined to be dishonest, you can do it pretty well under any system. If you are inclined to be honest, you can also do that pretty well under any system.

Let me give the RECORD just one example. In the election of 1984, it came out very close in the Eighth District of Indiana. Our colleague, Representative FRANK MCCLOSKEY, represents that district and was the Democratic candidate in that election. Initially the Republican Secretary of State of Indiana declared his opponent the winner. A challenge to that declaration was made here in the House of Representatives. Under the clear authority of the U.S. Constitution, the House of Representatives commissioned three Members of this House to conduct a recount which actually was done technically by the General Accounting Office.

In almost every instance, one Democratic member of that three-member

commission, in almost every instance of controversial issue, that one member voted with the Republican member. In other words, the benefit of the doubt always was in that direction.

In the end, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] was determined by those votes and by the count of the GAO to have won, was declared the winner by four votes.

Well, certain Members of the House began a campaign which best be described as slander. They accused the Democratic Party of stealing the election. They talked of fraud at the polls.

Truth crushed to Earth, Mr. Chairman, will rise again, because when the dust and the rhetoric cleared away, the fact was that certain Republican officials in that district of Indiana were indicted and convicted for buying votes in that election.

I do not say this as a reflection on my friends in the House of the Republican Party. The gentleman who has managed the bill knows of my admiration for him.

I simply say it to point out that if you are of a mind to be honest, you can be honest in any system, and if you are of a mind to enforce the law, you can do that in any system, and if you are of a mind to be dishonest you can do that in any system.

I think franchising poor people, and that is what we are really talking about here, people who cannot afford nice houses and cars, is a noble thing, a historically good thing for this House to do.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, coming from a State that has had its experience with voter fraud, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], who has enormous experience on the Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees, of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who has taken the time to read this bill knows that it is one of the most shamelessly slanted pieces of legislation that will come before this Congress.

What my colleagues may not know are the lengths the bill goes to resurrect the glory days of machine politics and throw open the door to voter fraud. The bill contains everything: No purging of voter rolls, no meaningful checks on voter eligibility and—most egregiously—the virtual certainty that illegal aliens will be registered to vote in Federal elections. Missing is only one thing: an accurate name for the bill. It should be called the Illegal Aliens Voting Rights Act of 1993.

In fact, I am convinced that the bill was named motor-voter with Zoe Baird's chauffeur in mind. This bill, as it is now written, will provide illegal aliens with just one more means to

cover their illegal status and thus act as an encouragement for illegal aliens to register. This bill actually facilitates the registration of noncitizens because it does not have the teeth to prevent illegal aliens from registering to vote. We must put protections into this bill and require certification that States are only registering citizens to vote.

Driver's licenses are one of the forms of identification used by employers to verify citizenship status. Now with automatic voter registration in conjunction with obtaining a driver's license, illegal aliens can have an additional, though fraudulent, form for proof of citizenship.

Custom officials allow a traveler returning across the border from Mexico to use a voter registration card, along with a driver's license, to substitute for a passport in providing American citizenship. With this bill, we will have made it even easier for illegal aliens to cross back and forth across U.S. borders without fear of being caught.

H.R. 2 is not about ease of access; H.R. 2 is about ease of excess. By erecting a Tammany Hall in every town in America, this bill will throw open polling places to illegal aliens.

If you want to give illegal aliens the right to vote, then vote for H.R. 2, the Illegal Aliens Voting Rights Act.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

Voting is one of our most prized constitutional rights. I do not believe that voting rights in this country should be conditioned on overcoming obstacles and barriers to voter registration.

Many in my area of the country can still recall the literacy tests and poll taxes required for registering to vote—restrictions solely for the purpose of inhibiting certain people of their right to vote. I am grateful those days are gone, but unfortunately, there are still many people in this country who simply do not have access to the voter registration process.

A recent study by the Institute for Southern Studies ranked my home State of South Carolina as one of the Nation's "Dismal Dozen" States for its low voter turnout rate. It is not with any pride that I stand before you and report that South Carolina ranked 49th in voter turnout in 1992 and 50th in voter turnout for the last 12 years.

Regretably, South Carolina's laws make it difficult for eligible voters to register to vote. The study's numbers show that people are most likely to go to the polls in States that make voter registration the easiest.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know that they do have a voice in the electoral process and that our Government depends on their participation.

The National Voter Registration Act will meet this goal of encouraging and maximizing voter participation in the fullest way possible. I urge adoption of this long-overdue legislation.

□ 1550

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this voter fraud enhancement legislation, and, since I am from Illinois, I guess I am more sensitive than most about the corrosive and devastating effects of vote fraud. Peorians have long heard of the shenanigans that occur in our sister city to the north, Chicago, and we do not want a return to those good old days when relatives, long since passed, rose from the dead on election day and participated in our electoral process, and there are all kinds of stories to be told, from Mayor Daley on down, as to how it all came about.

Why does this bill promote and enhance voter fraud?

First, Mr. Chairman, there is no mandatory address verifications, and, without this important safeguard, people can walk into the voting registration location, register to vote with a fake address, walk away without fear that their action will be discovered, let alone prosecuted; and, second, the bill equates voter registration with receiving a Government check. It specifically targets welfare and unemployment offices for voter registration. This poses another great risk for fraud, and the people who come to these places, many of whom are not even eligible to vote, are vulnerable to pressure to register illegally. I even raised the question: If you're going to go that far, why not have them at Internal Revenue offices where people pay taxes? Then you get some sense of real equality there.

Mr. Chairman, problems with fraud vary from State to State. Some States have not had Illinois' history in this regard and can have easier registration laws. But many others have had similar experiences and need strong regulations to prevent it.

Republicans tried to strengthen the fraud provisions of the bill. We offered an amendment in the committee markup to purge voters who have not voted in 4 years, and 10 years and 100 years, all rejected by the majority, which pretty much suggests to me how serious they were in really trying to correct the problems that a number of us have tried to point out as the pitfalls in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is a frightening prospect, but this legislation, if enacted, could lead to the most massive voter fraud in our Nation's history, and all because the Democrat majority refuses to allow amendments that would have made improvements to the bill.

Then of course we get to the mandate question. The other night I was meeting along with BOB DOLE with some of our Republican Governors, and the big message of that meeting was: Don't impose another mandate on us without paying for it. Don't impose another mandate.

So, here we are, right out of the box, with another mandate on the States, and they are unable, of course, to match the kind of money requested or required to fulfill the obligations of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all my colleagues, to vote against fraud and to vote against Federal mandates. My colleagues should vote against this Fraud Enhancement Act.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, today we consider H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. This act will invite fraud, cost the States millions, and infringe on States rights.

And each dead person that votes, each illegal immigrant who votes, each person who votes more than once in an election, diminishes the voice of every American who votes in a legal fashion.

At a time when States, like Indiana, are undergoing difficult budgetary times, federally mandated spending increases are the last thing States need right now. Ten States estimated that the provisions of the motor-voter bill would collectively cost them \$87.5 million. Even the most conservative estimates show at least a \$200 million cost.

Yesterday, my office polled the opinions of 20 county clerks, Republican and Democrat, in my district and they are overwhelmingly opposed to this measure. This is another case of the tail wagging the dog. I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill and maintain the integrity of our current voting system.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2, The National Voter Registration Act, the so-called motor-voter bill.

The motor-voter bill, at first glance, seems to be a noble piece of legislation.

The reality is that the motor-voter bill increases the size and cost of government, and it invites fraud. It is an auto-fraud bill.

We, as Members of Congress, are not here to mandate the business of our States. Nor are we here to require that our States implement expensive new programs, without any intention of funding one dime of the cost.

In California alone, this legislation will cost taxpayers over \$26 million. Now, this may not seem like much. But when the State of California is experiencing a record budget shortfall of \$8 billion or more, the taxpayers of our

State do not need an additional burden. Nor does any taxpayer.

Nor are we here to require that our States implement programs that invite fraud. The motor-voter bill provides no mechanism to determine whether an applicant is actually eligible to vote. In California alone, there are over 4 million noncitizens who, if this legislation is enacted, may be able to vote illegally. The hard-working American taxpayer does not need to have millions of illegal aliens, now increasingly drawing on welfare and health services, to help decide the course of our Nation.

Governor Wilson has noted that California has 50 percent of the illegal aliens in the United States. The Federal Government should pay the State of California for the \$1.45 billion in services which have been rendered to illegal immigrants because our Nation cannot control its borders.

There are many critical issues more deserving of our attention than the motor-voter bill. Revitalizing our economy, decreasing our budget deficit, and reforming our health care system are among them. However, imposing costly new mandates on our States is not.

I urge a "no" vote on the H.R. 2, the motor-voter bill.

I include for the RECORD an article from the January 18, 1993, Los Angeles Times, and a letter which the Governors of California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas have recently sent to the President.

January 31, 1993.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The United States was founded by immigrants seeking a better life for themselves and their families. America continues to offer a home to immigrants, as well as a safe harbor for those refugees fleeing oppression and persecution. If the federal government wishes to sustain a humanitarian foreign policy which fosters immigration and refugee admissions, then it must allocate the financial resources required to support this population once it has arrived.

Some immigrants and refugees have special needs which require government assistance in order to facilitate rapid assimilation. In setting immigration and refugee policy, the federal government has acknowledged these needs by mandating that both documented and undocumented immigrants be provided with medical, education, and other services. The federal government has formed a partnership with the states to deliver these services to the immigrant population. In forming this partnership the federal government recognized its responsibility to reimburse states for the costs of providing these federally mandated services.

This partnership has broken down, however, because the federal government has failed to honor its commitment to provide the reimbursement to which the states are entitled. States cannot be expected to pay the costs of policies which are fundamentally the responsibility of the federal government. This especially is the case at a time when so many states are struggling with long-term budget problems and are being forced to reassess state programs and expenditures.

We look to your Administration and the Congress to renew the federal-state immigration partnership—one that recognizes the financial strain imposed by federal mandates which are unaccompanied by fair compensation. Several steps should be taken to achieve this objective:

1) The federal government must take immediate action to provide all reimbursement owed to the states for the provision of services to documented and undocumented immigrants and refugees.

2) The federal government must recognize that its decisions to admit immigrants and refugees is strictly a federal one and therefore carries with it a firm federal commitment to provide full reimbursement to the states for services provided to the immigrant and refugee population.

3) The federal government must work with the states to develop an effective federal mass immigration emergency plan.

We look forward to working with you to meet these objective and to renewing the federal-state relationship in this vital policy area.

Sincerely,

PETE WILSON,
Governor of California.

MARIO M. CUOMO,
Governor of New York.

LAWTON CHILES,
Governor of Florida.

ANN W. RICHARDS,
Governor of Texas.

JIM EDGAR,
Governor of Illinois.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 18, 1993]
WILSON'S \$1.45-BILLION PLEA TO FEDS: PAY UP—GOVERNOR MAKES STRONG CASE FOR IMMIGRANT-AID MONEY

California has a proud history of attracting newcomers to the United States. Even before the Gold Rush brought the stampede of fortune seekers from east of the Rockies, settlers from around the world put down roots in this state in search of a better life. The infusion of new residents, whether immigrants or refugees, has helped to enrich and diversify California.

But there have been costs too.

In recent years, California and other states have had to bear too much of the expense of medical, educational and other services provided to immigrants and refugees. This despite the fact that the federal government is supposed to help foot the bill for such federally mandated services.

Repeat: federally mandated.

Washington has not lived up to that commitment, shortchanging California by billions over the years. In response, Gov. Pete Wilson has launched an appropriately aggressive campaign, as part of his 1993-94 budget-balancing act, to secure those funds. He needs the support of President-elect Bill Clinton and the state's huge but often ineffective congressional delegation to bring the money home.

California warrants a big share of federal funding because the state attracts, and thus in part supports, a disproportionately large number of refugees and immigrants—both legal and undocumented. The state is home to 54% of the immigrants legalized under the federal Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA), nearly 40% of the nation's refugees and perhaps 50% of the undocumented in the United States.

The immigration phenomenon is not only a downside cost question, of course. Many immigrants contribute to the state's economy

through their labor and enterprise, and they also pay taxes. But most of their income taxes and Social Security taxes go to the federal government, not Sacramento.

A breakdown of the funding that the government seeks is revealing.

He is claiming from the so-called state legalization impact assistance grant about \$324 million owed to California for services provided to individuals legalized under IRCA. This law established a \$4-billion grant to reimburse states. But that account was raided by Congress to finance other programs.

The governor is claiming from the refugee resettlement funding program \$104 million for services under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children, supplemental security income/state supplementary payment and Medi-Cal programs.

The governor is claiming from the citizen children of undocumented immigrants program \$209 million for AFDC costs and \$31 million in Medi-Cal costs.

And the governor is demanding \$534 million for Medi-Cal costs for both IRCA immigrants and undocumented immigrants. Also, \$250 million for the cost of keeping in state prisons those illegal residents convicted of crimes in California.

All that adds up to \$1.45 billion.

In a year of jockeying for position with the new Administration, Wilson needs inspired help from the congressional delegation to push California's very good case for the \$1.45 billion—with Congress and with Clinton. It is simply not fair for Californians to have to finance all the burdensome costs of federal immigration and refugee policies. Washington owes Sacramento and should put its money where its mouth has been all these years.

□ 1600

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday this Congress trampled on the rights of the free enterprise system. We get more involved in the free enterprise system with more regulations on the free enterprise system, an unfunded mandate on the free enterprise system.

How many companies are going to go down the drain? Nobody knows. How many employees will lose their jobs with what we did yesterday? Nobody will know.

Now today this body is going to trample on States rights, States rights and their ability to run elections in their States.

In addition, we are going to saddle them with another unfunded mandate. These are the 50 States that are all broke. They are not just broke, most of them are more than broke. They do not have enough funds for schools, they do not have enough funds to supply the services that they want to provide.

We all want more people to vote, but for those in the majority to suggest that people do not have access to voting today just makes me want to wonder what happened after the 1964 Voting Rights Act? What happened after all those changes that we made to that act over the years to ensure that every American has access to vote.

Mr. Chairman, really today I wonder why we could not offer the amend-

ments that we wanted to offer. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] had 20 amendments, honest amendments, that were going to bring some sanity to this legislation, that we were not allowed to offer.

What is the majority afraid of? Are we afraid to let the House work its will? Are we afraid to have the deliberative body that the Founders of this country envisioned? Why can we not let the House work its will? Why can we not have due deliberation? Is this the price of ending gridlock? Only God knows what tomorrow will bring.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions regarding the intent of the bill. As you know, in some States, such as Florida, the elections official with authority to act under this bill would be the local elections official. Do I understand correctly that throughout the bill, the term "State election official" or "appropriate State election official" refers to the official with authority under State law, even if it is a local elections officer?

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, as stated in the report, that is the intention of the term.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of the bill, voter registration agencies are given a 10-day period for transmittal of applications to the State elections official and a 5-day period if it falls 5 days before the voter registration books are scheduled to close. Is it permissible for States to reduce the 10-day period to 5 days in all cases if they desire?

Mr. SWIFT. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is no specific language in the bill regarding transmittal times of applications from motor vehicle licensing agencies to the voter registration offices. Is it permissible for States to set a time period?

Mr. SWIFT. It is the intention of this bill to place motor vehicle licensing agencies under the same timeframe as the other voter registration agencies.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, there is no requirement listed in the bill for State voter registration agencies to submit a list of applicants with each batch of applications. Is it permissible for States to require their voter registration agencies to transmit a list of applicants with each batch of applications?

Mr. SWIFT. The bill gives States the flexibility in this area. I do not believe that States can dictate to Federal agencies within their States that serve as voter registration sites, but can do so with State agencies.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, is it permissible under this bill for State or

local election officials to place voters who fail to respond to change of address forms on inactive status?

Mr. SWIFT. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. Voter registration is not a partisan issue.

The right to vote is guaranteed to all citizens by the Constitution. Yet, at this moment in the United States, there are over 57 million American citizens eligible to vote who are not registered. That is because archaic and burdensome procedures have impeded the ability of many American citizens from participating in one of our most precious freedoms—the right to vote.

In fact, the swift passage of H.R. 2 will go a long way toward reconnecting the citizens of this country to their Government. H.R. 2 will boost voting rates and political participation among all segments of American society.

By voting for H.R. 2, more people will be able to enjoy the rights of citizenship and have a voice in their government. I would also like to clarify any misconceptions about this bill.

The legislation has been drafted to ensure that only U.S. citizens can register to vote under H.R. 2. The act explicitly states that only U.S. citizens may register to vote through its motor-voter, mail, and agency registration procedures. State and local government employees will not register ineligible voters. Workers in State motor vehicle departments and social service agencies already receive hours of training on various application procedures and eligibility criteria. States will also easily design voter registration forms that highlight the citizenship requirement, thereby avoiding any possible registration of noneligible individuals.

In fact, H.R. 2's criminal penalties for false registration will prevent non-citizens from attempting to register to vote by jeopardizing their ability to ever become naturalized citizens or otherwise remain in the country. America needs the equitable and efficient voter registration laws proposed by H.R. 2.

We must, as a legislative body, promote the fact that voting is a fundamental right the government must encourage—not discourage. Our Founding Fathers believed that heightened citizen participation is an essential element of our representative government. H.R. 2 should be supported by all those truly interested with preserving and enhancing our democratic form of government.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this procedural vehicle to provide that only U.S. citizens can be registered under this bill.

Even with the language we just adopted earlier, by approving the rule, H.R. 2 will open the door to the ballot booth for illegal aliens. And, it increases the opportunity to register more than once. State's are prohibited from removing ineligible voters from the rolls, and they are limited in their ability to verify application information.

The proponents are arguing that this won't happen, but let's be realistic. Zoe Baird's chauffeur highlights how easy it is for noncitizens to obtain a driver's license—and that's not just one isolated case. Problems like this hit close to home for a lot of us. Just recently, in one of their biggest raids in history, INS found hundreds of illegal aliens working at a beef packing plant in my district.

Now you can't tell me that these people, who will do anything they can to stay in this country, are going to draw attention to themselves by declining to register to vote.

The Michel amendment simply adds a safeguard, to ensure that the States have the ability to prevent the registration of noncitizens.

Mr. Chairman, for the past month I've heard over and over again that finally the gridlock in Washington is breaking. Well, to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let me say this, you don't break gridlock with a bulldozer. Instead, you work together to improve things, and here's a chance to do so.

In my opinion, this amendment will certainly improve H.R. 2.

Mr. Chairman, the Michel amendment is not going to correct the bill totally, but I think it is a start toward fixing the bill. This procedural move I think will make sure that our voting rights as U.S. citizens are truly protected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] if he has read the bill to ascertain that the citizenship requirement occurs on three different occasions in this measure before us?

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding that there is no enforcement mechanism in the bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, so the gentleman understands that there is a requirement, the same that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] proposes in his amendment, the same without an enforcement mechanism.

Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] this: Is the gentleman aware that there

is no enforcement mechanism, as the gentleman chooses to use the term, for anybody that votes in the United States of America?

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I would yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the gentleman is not able to yield to anybody.

Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] does not know the answer to this question, I think it is very important that all of the Members determine what the correct response is, because they will be asked to vote for the so-called Michel amendment.

□ 1610

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds, simply to say that the gentleman in the well knows that sure, there are blandishments in the bill that say one should be a citizen, and maybe even on the registration form, one should be a citizen. But each individual actually has to decline in writing to be registered in order not to register; otherwise it is automatic, and an illegal alien is hardly likely to decline to be registered on the grounds that he is an illegal alien.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished whip for the minority conference, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that I am sort of surprised by his argument. This is clearly the Zoe Baird chauffeur illegal aliens voting act.

In 5 or 10 or 15 years from now, when living, legal taxpaying Americans are watching elections stolen by political machines using illegal aliens by the fraudulent votes of people who no longer live in their precincts that are voting, they will look on this act as a national fraud act.

Here is the exact wording of the law being proposed on page 5:

Each State motor vehicle drivers license application submitted to the appropriate State motor vehicle authority under State law shall serve as an application for voter registration with respect to elections for Federal office.

In fact, the effort to stop this from becoming an illegal aliens act was stopped in both the subcommittee and the committee.

Now, the Department of Agriculture reports that there are an estimated 300,000 illegal aliens getting food stamps. That is, we are paying for 300,000 illegal aliens right now to get food stamps. That does not count the ones who are too timid to show up for food stamps.

Zoe Baird's chauffeur from Peru, who was here illegally, had a driver's license from the State of Connecticut.

Nobody checked to see if he was a citizen.

Under page 5 of this law, it is clear that the application for a driver's license by an illegal alien is, in fact, the basis.

Now, our friends will tell us, the registrar is not supposed to register them. How is he supposed to know? If we have 300,000 illegal aliens getting food stamps right now, and the estimates are there are between 2 and 4 million additional illegal alien adults available to register, how are we going to find out when we apply for the driver's license? Most States do not ask.

It is simply not valid in the real world for people to understand there are big city machines, the big city machines do vote people who are dead. There is no purge provision in this document.

My good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, offered an amendment that if one had died, if one had not voted in 100 years, they ought to be purged. And they would not even accept 100 years as testimony.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on all sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has 2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I am reserving the right to close debate.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill today with grave, grave concerns, as many of my colleagues have expressed, about the immigration implications and the illegal voter implications of this bill. I have served, now, for over 12 years on the Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees in the House of Representatives and am the ranking Republican in this particular term as I was in the last Congress. I know from studies, and many of my colleagues know, that there are over 11 million noncitizens in the United States today. And by census count alone, not counting many illegals that were not, of course, counted in 1990, we have the potential in this bill, as has been stated, for many illegals and many who are noncitizens who are here legally, permanent resident aliens, and others to get to vote for the simple reason that they can walk into a driver's license shop, apply for the driver's license, and get automatically registered to vote.

That is what is going to happen unless they decline. That is far different

from what it is today around the country.

And yes, all 50 States have a citizenship requirement today; but it is interesting knowledge that not a single statute of the U.S. Government, up to this point, requires citizenship for voting. It is not in our Constitution, but I dare say all of us would never want to see anybody who is not a citizen vote.

The way to assure that with these changed procedures, if that is what we are going to do, we are going to have application for driver's license and welfare benefits, and so on, automatically registering to vote, it would be to assure that before it becomes effective in a State, that that State has a procedure to determine if somebody is a citizen or not.

We are going to get a chance to vote on that fact in a few minutes. How do we do that? Have them produce a certificate of their birth, have them produce a certificate of naturalization or a certified copy. It is as simple as that. It does not take much time to do that. A couple of States already require proof of citizenship.

It is the least we can do, to put into law that every State where this is going to apply, since it is going to become so liberal and would be so recklessly abused, if we do not watch it, that every State where this is going to apply require proof of citizenship before this law becomes effective.

I urge my colleagues to vote for whatever we can to put that proof in and, if not, let us vote this bill down because it is an illegal immigrant voting bill otherwise.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished deputy whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. The National Voter Registration Act offers the American people the opportunity to expand democracy in our Nation.

Voting is a basic right. It is a responsibility of citizenship. Yet, for many, it is not easy or convenient to register to vote. It is often inconvenient and sometimes impossible.

By passing the National Voter Registration Act, we can renew our commitment to democracy. The United States has the lowest rate of voter turnout among the world's major democracies. This legislation will make it easier and more convenient for people to vote. It will increase voter participation.

I am sick and tired of hearing arguments that say this bill is too costly.

You cannot and we must put a price tag on democracy. You cannot put a price tag on participating in the political system.

Some of our citizens paid the supreme price with their own lives for the right to vote. In my own lifetime, I have known too many people who shed blood seeking the right to vote.

Not too long ago, people had to pay a poll tax or own property to vote. Women and minorities were prohibited from casting the ballot. In 1964, three young men gave their lives while working to register people to vote near Philadelphia, MI.

Lyndon Johnson stood here on March 15, 1965, and presented to Congress the 1965 Voting Rights Act that made it possible for millions of Americans to enter the political process.

Our Nation has made progress. But many people shed blood and many died to secure voting rights protection for all Americans. They, indeed, paid a high price for the freedom we sometimes take for granted.

Passing H.R. 2 will move this Nation forward. This is an important bill—another significant step down the long road toward the full participation of all Americans in the political process.

Mr. Chairman, when more Americans vote, it renews and energizes the vitality of our political system. We must tear down the remaining barriers to voting.

Yes, the vote is a precious right. It is the most powerful nonviolent tool that people have at their disposal in a democracy. So, let us open up the political process. Let us pass H.R. 2.

□ 1620

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Chair if that is all the time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, the gentleman is correct, that is all the time remaining.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ].

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I must not read very well, because I missed the part of the motor-voter bill that allows—no, more than allows—encourages—noncitizens to vote.

It must be there, or we would not be debating this absolutely unnecessary Michel amendment.

Let me suggest to my colleagues who fear that the Nation's Secretary of State's offices and driver's license facilities are about to be overrun by illegal aliens of all colors, shapes, and sizes from every nation on earth—Democratic illegal aliens, of course—that their concerns are extremely exaggerated.

In fact, I would like to remind them of a simple fact.

It is against the law for noncitizens to register in the United States today. It was illegal yesterday. It was illegal last week. It will be illegal tomorrow. Even if motor-voter passes.

So let's stop kidding each other about concerns about fraud.

This amendment is nothing more than an attempt to distract the American people by trying to exploit prejudice.

We have seen these tactics before. They are an attempt to hide a real issue—which is that we need to make it easier for our citizens to vote—behind a false issue—a fear of newcomers to our country.

The Fourth Congressional District of Illinois is a beautiful mosaic of first and second generation Americans—people who have come from Mexico and Poland, from Central America and Ukraine and Latvia and Estonia.

Every one of them has been proud to become a voter in the United States—The Day they become citizens.

This law will do nothing to change that citizenship requirement; it will only make it easier for them to register once that requirement is met.

Let's put an end to this shameful distraction and reject the Michel amendment.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. H.R. 2 will strengthen our democracy by increasing voter registration and participation. This will help break the gridlock we've heard so much about.

I have long believed that voter registration itself is un-American because it disenfranchises our citizens, who, by virtue of being Americans, are entitled to the fundamental right to vote. In other words, I think H.R. 2 should go further than it does. But my momma always taught me that when you're hungry, half a loaf is better than nothing. Our country should always be hungry for more democracy. So I think H.R. 2 is a good step toward allowing all Americans to vote without hindrance or barrier, and a step toward more democracy.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important legislation and showing the American people and the world that this Congress is intent on assuring democracy to all of our people.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal about illegal aliens. In fact, we have heard so much from the other side about illegal aliens and their opposition to their voting, one almost gets the impression that they would find it all right for legal aliens to vote. The fact is the language of this bill says that no aliens, legal or illegal, may vote. It says in three explicit places in the legislation, "You must be a citizen." That is enforced the same way that any other requirement under our laws is enforced, exactly the same way. Nothing changes in that regard by this legislation.

It does not touch in any way the basic means by which local election officials and State election officials deal with qualifications, not at all. All of the rhetoric about illegal aliens is simply a bugaboo, a Halloween boo-hoo. It is simply a scare tactic to try and scare Members of this body from doing

what is good for American citizens, doing what is right by way of getting the heavy hand of government out from between citizens of this country and their rightful place in the polling booth.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. This bill, better known as the motor-voter bill, is virtually identical to S. 250 which passed this body last year, only to be vetoed by former President Bush. H.R. 2 contains provisions designed to remove many of the barriers that remain to voter registration. I commend the Committee on House Administration, Representative AL SWIFT, chairman of the Subcommittee on Elections, and the House leadership for expeditiously bringing this bill to the floor for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the right to vote is a fundamental right guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States. Unfortunately, our Nation's antiquated voter registration system has unfairly excluded millions of Americans from exercising this right, by denying them equitable access to the electoral process. The fundamental right to vote means little if the opportunity to register and stay registered is limited. H.R. 2 will remove many of the barriers to voter registration and facilitate equal access to citizen participation in the electoral process.

Specifically, H.R. 2 will allow eligible voters to register for Federal elections by mail, when applying for a driver's license, and at State and Federal agencies. Since it is estimated that 91 percent of the adult population in this country either has a driver's license or a photo ID card this provision will dramatically increase the number of registered voters. Those who do not have a driver's license or photo ID, may simply apply to register to vote at designated government agencies. H.R. 2 will also provide for automatic voter registration when individuals apply for, renew, or change their address on such licenses.

Contrary to arguments that these activities would not increase voter turnout and that it would increase the cost associated with voter registration, research has concluded that voter turnout increased between 13 and 26 percent in the four States which instituted effective motor-voter programs, and cost actually fell because the demand to hire additional staff, as voter registration deadlines approached, was eliminated.

H.R. 2 also extends the ability of millions of disabled Americans to register to vote. According to a Harris Poll, disabled Americans show greater interest in politics and public affairs than the general population, but they register and vote at lower rates. Study after study has shown that persons with disabilities list lack of transportation as the first or second obstacle in their lives.

Today, 20 States in this country require a person with a disability to go to either the offices of the board of elections or to a temporary voter registration site where deputy registrars offer voter registration. H.R. 2 removes the barriers to the disabled by mandating all officers primarily engaged in providing services to persons with disabilities to offer voter registration services during intake procedures, recertification procedures and change of address procedures. It guarantees that if

services are provided in a disabled person's home, the agency representative who actually goes to the home must assist the client with voter registration.

Mr. Chairman, new opportunities for political empowerment must be afforded to persons left out of the political system. It is important for us to ensure that everyone in this country has a stake in our democratic form of government and that the people are encouraged to seek change through the ballot box, creating a more representative government.

Although the literacy tests and poll taxes of the past, which excluded potential voters and minorities in particular, no longer exist, inconvenient and cumbersome procedures in many States still serve to inhibit citizen participation in the electoral process.

I encourage my colleagues to join me today in support of H.R. 2 and bring down the barriers which have prohibited participation in the electoral process.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I appear before my colleagues today to offer my wholehearted support for H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. If this bill is enacted into public law, individuals who apply for driver's licenses and fulfill eligibility requirements would also be officially registered as voters. Voting is a right that was traditionally denied to African-Americans. The memories of African-Americans are still fresh with the degrading but legal techniques used to bar them from voting, such as poll taxes, so-called literacy tests, and in some cases physical or emotional intimidation.

Recent political gains in national and statewide elections are a direct result of concerted efforts to register record numbers of voters. In 1993, H.R. 2 is timely, necessary, and practical legislation that will promote efficiency and equity in the voting process. This bill will guarantee that public institutions are used to empower American citizens to easily engage in democratic elections. Additionally, the bill is designed to encourage voter outreach, while protecting against voter fraud. I join with the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the NAACP, and my House colleagues in current efforts to get this bill passed into law.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. The purpose of H.R. 2 is to increase the opportunities to register to vote and, clearly, the timing could not be any better such a bill. The recent election showed us that Americans are well aware of their right to vote and they want to use it. We have a new President and the highest number of new Members of Congress in decades as proof of the increased interest in the electoral process.

But we still have a long way to go before all Americans, or even almost all Americans, exercise their right to vote. In my home State of Illinois, voter participation was higher in November 1992 than it has been in over a decade. The number who actually voted, however, is still not even 60 percent.

The reason for the low participation is no surprise when you consider what people must do in order to register. If you are disabled, it is not necessarily very easy to get to the closest school or library to sign up, especially if you are unsure of the limited hours and days during which you can register. If you are a single working parent, it is neither easy nor con-

venient to go to a neighborhood bank or library during the workday so that you can register to vote. And if you are busy, like most people are, with the day-to-day tasks of raising a family and working or trying to find a job or whatever else, you might not realize that you missed the last election and have been removed from the voter registration list until it is too late.

By having the chance to register whenever you get a new driver's license or renew your old one, it is estimated that almost 90 percent of the voting age population will have the opportunity to become registered. Opening the door of registration to this many voters is one of the clearest reasons for supporting H.R. 2.

The bill also has other provisions to greatly increase voter access to registration, as well as establish fair procedures for removing a voter's name for not voting, which make it especially important and needed. Consider my district in the Chicago metropolitan area—many of the residents in parts of my district are unemployed or live below the poverty line. This means that having a car is not necessarily the norm so registering at a driver's examination office is not likely to happen very often. But by requiring unemployment agencies and public assistance offices to provide voter registration and by allowing eligible voters to register through the mail, the right to vote will be dramatically opened up to these constituents, as well as disabled constituents and many others throughout the country.

The right to vote forms the core of this country. Let's support H.R. 2 so that all Americans can exercise this important right and make voting part of their life.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman. I rise in strong support of the Michel amendment to H.R. 2, because if this amendment is not adopted, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 could become the welfare benefits for illegal aliens act of 1993.

Major Federal welfare programs, including aid to families with dependent children, SSI, and Medicaid, are limited to citizens and permanent resident aliens. The problem here is that the Department of Health and Human Services accepts voter registration cards as a means of establishing eligibility.

If voter registration cards are issued automatically to applicants for driver's licenses—without any verification of citizenship—the potential for illegal aliens fraudulently applying for welfare benefits will balloon out of control. Our hardpressed States and counties, particularly in southern California, cannot afford this increased burden.

For example, a recent study by Los Angeles County found that recent immigrants cost the taxpayers more than \$2.3 billion a year, and as H.R. 2 will make it easier for illegal aliens to register to vote, and therefore to establish eligibility, it is inevitable that this figure will skyrocket.

Illegal aliens who apply for AFDC, housing assistance or any other benefit program will be given a voter registration form which will ask them to attest that they are citizens. Mr. Speaker, these illegal aliens are not going to do anything to raise suspicions about their citizenship, so of course they will say they are. They certainly aren't going to decline in writing to register to vote.

As a result, more illegal aliens will receive Federal benefits unlawfully, and to compound matters, they also will be registered to vote. Instead of tightening controls to make sure illegal aliens don't receive welfare benefits, we will be loosening them.

The Michel amendment will prevent these abuses by requiring States to implement procedures that prevent noncitizens from registering to vote. Without the ability to enforce the citizenship requirement in H.R. 2, the requirement itself is empty and pointless.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to require that only citizens be registered to vote, and to require procedures to enforce this requirement, by voting for the Michel amendment.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, today we have been talking about a topic in which all of us agree, increased voter registration. However, we have failed to recognize that H.R. 2 will result in substantial costs for State and local governments, who will be charged with implementing this legislation. For this reason, I wanted to offer an amendment which would have made the provisions of the National Voter Registration Act voluntary for States and localities until Federal support is provided. Unfortunately, my amendment was not allowed to be presented to this body for consideration.

This bill is going to cost my State of California more than \$26 million. Anyone familiar with California knows that the State is still in the grips of a recession and is suffering from severe budget shortfalls. They cannot and should not have to absorb another financial hit from the Federal Government. Sure California will comply with this legislation if they are required to do so. However, the \$26 million that this bill will cost them will come from further cuts in social services, welfare, and public safety. Prenatal care will be cut, police and fire forces will be reduced, and the quality of services offered will deteriorate.

California is not the only State that will suffer financially from this legislation. In last year's debate on this bill, 10 States; including Alaska, Florida, Kansas, New York, New Jersey, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Virginia estimated that the motor-voter bill will result in \$87.5 million in new costs. The Governor of Illinois estimated that this legislation will cost his State \$37 million. Nationwide, this legislation is estimated to cost State and local governments \$200 to \$250 million per year.

The unfunded mandates contained in the bill will result in our States and localities being forced to eliminate critical social services and/or raise taxes to implement H.R. 2. It is as simple as that. For this reason, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from the State of Washington, Chairman SWIFT, for his leadership on H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

Much has been said about 1992 being the Year of the Woman in American politics. But I can tell you that I would not be standing here today—as 1 of 24 new women in the House of Representatives—if it were not for an amazingly successful voter registration effort in New York City.

This grassroots effort took advantage of several New York State registration proce-

dures, including registration by mail, which is part of the national bill we consider today.

If we are to renew America and make our Government more accountable, we must make voter registration simple and convenient—for our citizens, not for Government bureaucrats.

Otherwise the staggering number of unregistered voters will continue to grow. Right now an estimated 70 million Americans, making up a third of our adult population, are not registered to vote.

This bill puts people first. It is an important and necessary step in making representative government meaningful for all of our citizens.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. Although I strongly support the idea of encouraging greater voter participation by the citizens of this country, I am concerned about the problems States will have in implementing this legislation.

In pursuing the commendable goal of registering more of the citizens who are eligible to vote, we are placing a costly and difficult administrative burden on State and local officials. We are dictating to the States that they create more bureaucracy at their expense and at a time when most of them are facing severe budget crises.

The State agencies that will bear most of the burden of the bill tend to be among the most overworked—the departments of motor vehicles and public assistance offices. DMV agents and social services offices will have to distribute and help applicants complete these forms in the same way they help fill out their own agency forms; this is not a burden those agencies should be mandated by us to undertake.

I am also not convinced that H.R. 2 contains adequate safeguards against voter fraud. For example, States may not require that the mandated mail registration forms be notarized; address verification cannot be required; registrants, in effect, will not have to prove they are whom they say they are.

Under this bill, anyone who can obtain a driver's license through illegal means can also register to vote. In fact, any such person will almost certainly register to vote because to decline to do so on a license application form will only bring attention to the individual. This could turn out to be an especially serious problem in my own State of California where there is a very large undocumented alien population.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to encourage States to experiment with ways to increase voter registration. But the States themselves are in a better position to decide exactly which mechanisms are most likely to increase voter turnout, at a cost they can afford, and in a manner that will not increase the likelihood of election fraud. In attempting to prescribe a uniform registration system, we seem to have forgotten how dramatically diverse and large our Nation is.

The States not only are the best judges of what systems would best work for them, but also have the constitutional authority to regulate their election process. It is, after all, the States' responsibility to determine the system for qualification for voting, except for violations of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am unable to give my support to this legislation, which is ex-

tremely well intentioned and which I know my colleagues have struggled with for several years. I hope my fears about the implementation of the law are unfounded, but I cannot in good conscience vote for H.R. 2.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. By opening up the political process, I believe this bill is good for our system of participatory democracy and good for the American people.

One of the most fundamental rights protected by our Constitution is the right to vote. I believe we would all agree that the American people's ability to vote must be protected, nurtured, and even facilitated if our political system is to be preserved.

In the recent Presidential election, 70 million—or 38 percent—of eligible citizens, were unable to vote because they were unregistered. This comes on the heels of the 36-percent national voter turnout in the 1990 congressional elections, the lowest turnout since 1942. These alarming figures should serve as a warning to our Nation that our constituents are becoming increasingly disenfranchised and detached from the political process.

When tied to driver licensing and State ID's, voter registration becomes readily accessible to over 90 percent of our population, and getting voters registered is the key to high voter turnout. The most often heard explanation for why Americans do not vote is that they do not register in time. This bill would make the registration process virtually effortless, and statistics show 80 to 90 percent of the registered voters participate in Presidential elections, even when overall voter turnout is low.

States that have motor-voter programs have not only increased political participation but have also significantly decreased costs of registration. This, too, is an objective that is non-partisan.

The greatest concerns raised regarding H.R. 2 are the potential risks of fraud through mail registration and lax list-cleaning procedures.

The successes of existing State motor-voter programs are proof that these concerns are unfounded. For example, Oregon has had mail registration for 17 years without a single case of fraud, and Minnesota and Washington have had similar experiences.

In addition, this bill is anything but indifferent to the threat of fraud. It provides for strong criminal penalties for fraud, mandatory address verification procedures, and requirements to remove from the voting rolls the names of those who have died or moved out of the jurisdiction. Also, H.R. 2 contains several elements to protect against registration by those who are not eligible to vote because they are not U.S. citizens.

Mr. Chairman, with passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Congress made a historic stand for the voting rights of the American people. Today, we have an opportunity to again engage millions of Americans, especially the disabled and the elderly, in our government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Let us not pass up this opportunity. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Resolution 2, the National Voter Registration Act, be-

cause I believe it is a worthy and necessary piece of legislation whose arrival is long overdue.

We must build on the momentum of this past election cycle by ensuring that as many eligible Americans vote as possible. It is a disgrace that millions of Americans do not exercise their fundamental right to vote because they cannot or do not register.

H.R. 2 will reach millions of Americans who would not otherwise vote because it will provide new and more convenient ways to register. Citizens will register while applying for or renewing drivers licenses and while at government offices and agencies that service them.

Record numbers of Americans turned out to vote last November. However, the numbers were not high enough. It is now time to act to ensure that in upcoming elections millions more Americans will register and vote.

With passage of the National Voter Registration Act, we will be sending an important message to our citizens: that we believe in our democracy and will act to preserve and strengthen it.

We now have an opportunity, more importantly, the responsibility, to make it easier for all Americans to vote. I urge you to vote in favor of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want to note you my strong support for enactment of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act, also known more popularly as the motor-voter bill.

I am very pleased that the House is moving quickly to enact motor-voter legislation this year. The House has an outstanding opportunity to promote voter participation and provide American citizens with increased access to the ballot box. It is also a pleasure to note that the United States has a President like Bill Clinton in the White House who shares our concern for cutting voter registration redtape.

The United States has enriched its democratic heritage steadily over the past 200 years by promoting increased participation in our political process. Access to the ballot box has been used as a concrete measurement of a citizen's standing in our society.

Every American should be proud of the fact that we have swept away most barriers to voting. Our Nation no longer denies citizens the right to vote on the basis of property holdings, race, gender, the payment of poll taxes, or a number of other hurdles which were used in previous times to discourage voter participation.

H.R. 2, the motor-voter bill, continues this tradition of expanding voter participation by easing the bureaucratic hurdles with which an American citizen must still contend to vote in most States. Under this bill, potential voters will find that registration to vote is more accessible. H.R. 2 promotes the idea of registering to vote with one-stop visits at driver's license registration centers or other State and local government offices. It also helps seniors and the disabled by increasing opportunities to register by mail.

The National Voter Registration Act speaks to the needs of American citizens who often do not focus on voter registration requirements until late in an election year when it may already be too late. It is a fact of life in our busy, hurry-scurry society that time has a great value to most Americans. For a number

of reasons, many Americans regard a visit to a government office as a time-consuming occupation. The motor-voter bill offers potential voters relief from the necessity of making a separate trip to city hall simply for the purpose of registering to vote.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2, the motor-voter bill, strengthens America's democratic system by moving our Nation further along the path of increased access to the ballot box. It is a simple and effective piece of legislation which speaks to the needs of Americans in our busy modern society. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of the National Voter Registration Act.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity to express my strong support for H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. This past November saw for the first time in many years an increase in voter turnout. Many people who never voted before registered and actively engaged in the democratic process. This infusion of new voters and their views changed the political landscape as we know it. The young, the minority, the disenfranchised now feel a part of the political process. No longer will they be looking from the outside.

H.R. 2 will continue this movement toward the broadest possible voter participation. We have seen the increase in voter turnout in States with motor-voter procedures. With the three registration methods in this bill we may finally challenge other industrialized nations who consistently have 75 to 80 percent voter participation in elections.

Mr. Chairman, the right to vote is a fundamental right guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. I believe that any steps we can take to strip away impediments to voting can only improve the American democratic process. Nearly one-third of adult Americans move within a 2-year period. In many parts of the country, voter registration levels are only slightly over 50 percent. It is estimated that difficulties with registration are now blocking 70 million Americans from voting. These new procedures are also a boon for the elderly and handicapped people who have difficulty getting to a municipal building to register in person.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will have the most far-reaching impact on the opening of the democratic process to all Americans since the 1965 Voting Rights Act. The bill also contains important conditions to guard against fraud and misuse of voter lists. The penalties are realistic and enforceable. Many States have taken steps to improve and update their voter lists. This bill sets forth some commonsense registration guidelines. I believe these guidelines are long overdue.

Finally, it's a cost-saving measure. Motor-voter costs pennies per transaction while deputy registration systems used in many States cost \$1 to \$15 per transaction. Mr. Chairman, this past election told us that Americans want to participate fully in the political process. With passage of H.R. 2, we will be moving in that direction.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the motor-voter bill. By streamlining the voter registration process, the motor-voter bill reaffirms our commitment to democracy and, when signed into law, will give a political voice to millions of Americans.

This bill is a commendable step toward removing existing barriers to voter registration. By simplifying and standardizing the voter registration process, it is estimated that the National Voter Registration Act will result in the registration of 90 percent of all eligible voters. However, much work remains in the area of voting procedures. With the number of elderly and disabled voters likely to soar during upcoming decades, it is vital to find alternatives to traditional voting procedures.

New technologies promise potential for providing those incapable of reaching the polls with an opportunity to vote. In the State of New Mexico, an innovative project was conducted during last year's election whereby New Mexico's secretary of state, in conjunction with Sandia National Laboratories, administered a mock election. In this election, participants cast their votes by phone. While this system would never replace normal voting procedures, voting by phone could provide an alternative means of exercising the right to vote to those who have difficulty reaching the polls. Implementation of this project in actual elections would significantly benefit New Mexico, a rural State with a large elderly population. In addition, the success of New Mexico's voting-by-phone project suggests the possibility of nationwide application.

Clearly, the security of such voting procedures must be airtight. Assurances that each voter votes only once, that votes cast are tallied and reported correctly, and that the system is impervious to outside tampering remain to be fully resolved. Sandia National Laboratory's expertise in developing related forms of defense security could provide the technology to solve these security concerns.

The State of New Mexico and Sandia Laboratories are to be applauded for their efforts to explore new voting procedures. The development of new voting procedures must continue where the motor-voter bill ends. I am proud to lend my support to the National Voter Registration Act, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, throughout the Nation's history, we have expanded the franchise to more and more Americans.

We abolished property requirements; we abolished gender restrictions; we abolished racial restrictions; and we lowered the age requirement.

We have done these things because we believe as a nation that any American who is at least 18 years old and wants to vote should be allowed to vote. But, during more than two centuries as a nation, we have also held on to the belief that voting is, in fact, a privilege as well as a right.

Although we encourage all eligible citizens to vote, we continue to believe that a person who really wants to exercise this right has some responsibility to prepare himself—or herself—for that civic responsibility.

In keeping with the philosophy that voting is a right, my State of California allows people to register at the city clerk's office, public libraries, post offices, fire stations, chambers of commerce, and through the mail. But, in keeping with the philosophy that voting is also a privilege, we require citizens to take some affirmative action to express their desire to vote. We require them to make a small effort to

show they are truly interested in voting. We do not automatically sign them up to vote because they own a house, rent an apartment, sign up for welfare, attend a sporting event—or drive a car.

There are many reasons to oppose the National Voter Registration Act, but my primary objection to it is that the Federal Government is forcing the States into a costly effort to register people to vote who may not have the slightest interest in voting, or the slightest bit of knowledge about the issues.

Think about it. If a person finds it too difficult to go to a local public building to register, will that person make much of an effort to study the issues or the candidates before casting his or her vote. I don't think so, and that is why I am opposed to automatically registering people to vote—and it is why I oppose the National Voter Registration Act.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration bill. Voting is central to our form of government. It is a fundamental right of our citizens. This bill provides a convenient opportunity for citizens to register to vote when they obtain or renew a driver's license. H.R. 2 also provides for voter registration by mail.

H.R. 2 provides that the names of individuals who live within the jurisdiction can no longer be removed from voter lists because they have not voted in the past few elections. A voter's name may be removed from the list only if the voter has died or has moved out of the jurisdiction. We should encourage voting and remove obstacles to voting—not penalize citizens who have made the effort to register but have not voted recently.

Many citizens have said that they do not vote because registering to vote is a hassle. They cite that places to register are not at convenient locations and hours to register conflict with work hours.

Voter turnout in this country should be higher. Fortunately, this past election showed an increase in voter participation, but more needs to be done. Elected officials should be moving to remove barriers to voter participation. Inconvenient registration is clearly one of those barriers. This bill removes that barrier. The bill also provides for a nondiscriminatory program to keep voter lists current by using readily available change-of-address information compiled by the Postal Service.

So often in our history, voter registration requirements have been used to systematically prevent minority groups from exercising their fundamental right to vote. H.R. 2, without a complicated, costly set of procedures, ensures that all Americans will be able to exercise this basic, valuable right.

I urge all my colleagues to support voter registration for all American citizens. Vote for H.R. 2.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

I am opposed to legislation to automatically register voters by mail or when applying for welfare, unemployment, or a driver's license. Not because I am against making it easier to vote, but because I am sure this legislation will lead to fraud. No identification will be required to register by mail, so illegal aliens could vote. The bill also restricts clerks from removing

names from voter rolls for failure to vote or for failure to adequately prove residency, thus making it easier for people to vote more than once.

The proposed motor-voter bill will require citizens to register at all government facilities and force all government employees to become cross trained in election procedures. Potential voters that choose not to register must decline registration in writing. However, if they do not, they are automatically registered. Government employees will also be required to provide the same degree of assistance to voter registration applicants that they provide for other government services. Citizens who elect to register by mail are not required to verify their address, which could lead to nontax-paying illegal aliens registering. The appalling fact of this mandate is that States are forbidden to request proper identification of the voter at the polls. Voter fraud would become rampant!

The proposed bill will also make it difficult for State and precinct registrars to purge the files and drop voters from the registration books if they do not vote after several elections. This legislation will also require States to keep voters current for decades even if the citizen has married, moved, or died.

Once again, the Federal Government is infringing upon and trampling individual State's rights. I say this because this legislation will allow the Federal Election Commission to have total jurisdiction over voter proceedings in every State—thus removing the responsibility from the local boards of elections. Also, if we enact this legislation, the Congress will be mandating larger deficit spending by local governments to fund the elections with these new fraudulent proceedings because we are not providing funding for implementation.

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that this legislation is riddled with flaws. I urge my colleagues to vote against the motor-voter bill.

Ms. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from the State of Washington, Chairman SWIFT, for his leadership on H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

Much has been said about 1992 being the Year of the Woman in American politics. But I can tell you and I would not be standing here today—as one of 24 new women in the House of Representatives—if it were not for an amazingly successful voter registration effort in New York City.

This grassroots effort took advantage of several New York State registration procedures, including registration by mail, which is part of the national bill we consider today.

If we are to renew America and make our government more accountable, we must make voter registration simple and convenient—for our citizens, not for Government bureaucrats.

Otherwise the staggering number of unregistered voters will continue to grow. Right now an estimated 70 million Americans, making up a third of our adult population, are not registered to vote.

This bill puts people first. It is an important and necessary step in making representative government meaningful for all of our citizens.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not envy the opponents of the National Voter Registration Act. It is bad enough to oppose increasing Democratic participation. But Republicans, for

whom government efficiency and cost cutting has become a mantra, oppose those good things too when they oppose H.R. 2.

Like our economic productivity, our voter productivity needs an assist from modern methods and technology. A comparable law in the District has yielded a 50-percent increase in new registrants since 1989. The District of Columbia presents the best model in the country of successful outreach to extend the vote. Since 1984 registration has increased from 56.1 to 74.3 percent, a far greater increase than any other State jurisdiction.

The success of motor-voter registration in particular is borne out dramatically in the numbers. Since its inception in May 1989, this system has yielded more than 60,000 new registrants. Of voter address changes, the motor-voter system accounted for 25.5 percent. Thus, almost 15,000 registrants would have been purged from the voter rolls or gone to the wrong polling place without motor-voter, and 15 percent of the changes in party affiliation in the District since May 1989 were accomplished through the motor-voter system. At the time of the November 1992 Presidential election, there were almost 50,000 active registrants who came onto the voter rolls through the motor-voter program. This group represented 14.7 percent of the total registry and came out at a rate of 49.1 percent to vote in the 1992 Presidential election. Attached to my statement is a document entitled "Motor-Voter Facts and Figures," which further elaborates on the success of the District of Columbia program.

The District's results with motor-voter argue for moving even further to democratize access to the vote. Beyond H.R. 2, same day registration allowing those with adequate evidence of their eligibility to vote as they register, is where we should be headed. Americans are ready to go beyond de facto democracy. Are we?

Last year Americans went from cynical apathy to new levels of participation using new outlets. Let us put them in closer touch with the vote, the outlet that counts most in a democracy. Support H.R. 2.

MOTOR-VOTER FACTS AND FIGURES

PROFILE OF THE MOTOR-VOTER PROGRAM IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Background: The Motor-Voter program was designed to increase citizen participation in the electoral process by making voter registration more convenient and accessible.

In September 1988, the program emerged as D.C. Law 7-155 and required the Mayor of the District of Columbia to permit individuals to register to vote when they apply for or renew their driver's permit or non-driver's identification card.

The law provided for the use of a combined application form, covering both voter registration and motor vehicle services. The Board of Elections and Ethics, in cooperation with the District's Bureau of Motor Vehicle Services, developed the new form and a written plan detailing the manner in which the forms would be processed by both agencies when completed by an applicant.

On April 24, 1989, the program became a reality.

Program Operation: The combined application form features a two-part design which provides original signatures and complete information for the two agencies involved. All motor vehicle service application forms are

received by the Board of Elections on a daily basis, reviewed to determine whether or not the applicant has requested voter registration service, and processed accordingly. Forms which are unexecuted ("blank") are destroyed. Others which are incomplete or unclear for voter registration purposes, receive follow-up mail action. Complete, and validated, forms are processed and the new voter is entered into the registry, or, if the application form indicates a change in the voter's record, that change is made, and the individual receives a new voter registration card.

Program Costs: No additional staff cost has been incurred by either of the two agencies involved. The form itself is relatively inexpensive, approximately \$12,000 per year for 200,000 units. From the standpoint of workload, the program has caused some reduction in the usual pre-election registration peak load, because the Motor-Voter program produces a steady stream of new registrants during the normally slow periods.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

Last year's November election saw record numbers of voters cast their ballots. The heightened interest in the issues, the hope to make a difference, the desire to ensure change—all of these motivations and others drew more individuals to the polls than ever before. And yet, in spite of the immense public interest in the election, in spite of record voter turnout, there were still countless citizens who did not, or could not, vote because they were unregistered.

This legislation will help correct this grievous condition by simply making it easier for those eligible citizens who wish to register to vote to do so. The statistics clearly show that current methods of voter registration are inadequate. It is shameful that, in a democracy as unique and precious as ours, almost two-fifths of all eligible voters are not registered to vote.

The right to vote, to shape our Government, to choose leaders who write our laws and ensure the laws are faithfully executed—this right is sacred to our Nation. We are a Nation of the people, by the people, and for the people; suffrage is fundamental to this precept.

The franchise is too sacred to our form of Government to let slip through the hands of the people. The Government must be aggressive in its efforts to guarantee that all citizens who wish to vote can vote. Our Government is obligated to go to all reasonable lengths to make voter registration as uncomplicated as is possible. This legislation is a critical step in the right direction. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is right and make the electoral process open to all individuals who are eligible to vote.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act, better known as the motor-voter bill. H.R. 2 will make it easier for millions of eligible Americans to exercise their constitutional right and civic responsibility to vote.

Although H.R. 2 removes arbitrary barriers to voter registration, it balances this increased participation in the electoral process with Federal protections against fraud, safeguards against abuse, and stiff Federal penalties—up to 5 years in prison—for those who break the law.

Although voter participation in the United States increased during the last presidential

election, we continue to have the worst voting participation rate among the world's leading democracies. Only 6 out of every 10 of eligible American voters is registered. Over 5.7 million eligible Californians are not registered to vote, and many of these people would have voted had they been registered. But, if we can open up the registration process by making it easy and uncomplicated, more of our citizens will register and vote. Most of the 12.3-percent increase, which we experienced nationally in voter turnout between our last two national elections, occurred in those States that had implemented part or all of the procedures outlined in H.R. 2—procedures that have proved to be effective in increasing voter participation.

H.R. 2 establishes uniform, nationwide voter registration procedures and, at the same time, gives States the flexibility to implement these procedures. However, it does not change any State's registration procedures; it just makes the process more available to all of our citizens.

For example, H.R. 2 requires States to establish procedures that permit individuals to register to vote in Federal elections when they apply for a driver's license, renew a driver's license, or apply for an identification card issued by a motor vehicle department. This provision will bring the registration process within reach of about 90 percent of the voter-age population, since 90 percent of American adults have either a driver's license or a department of motor vehicles photo identification card.

H.R. 2 also requires each state to accept and use a mail voter registration form, similar to the extensive register-by-mail program that we already have in place in California, with forms available for government and private distribution. This will be especially important for certain populations, like disabled and low-income citizens for whom travel can be an impediment and who constitute the 10 percent of the voter-age population that does not utilize state motor vehicle agencies.

Disabled citizens are particularly targeted for increased participation in the electoral process. H.R. 2 requires States to designate public assistance, unemployment, and all agencies administering State-funded programs primarily engaged in providing services to persons with disabilities as voter registration agencies. These agencies would then distribute voter registration forms, as we do in California, but also assist applicants in completing these forms, as well as accept completed forms to send to State officials. This is especially important since only about 25 percent of our disabled citizens are currently registered to vote.

Additionally, if H.R. 2 is enacted, States will not be able to remove a voter's name from a voter registration list simply for not voting. Even in States like California, that already have fairly strict regulations governing purging of voter registration lists, it will be more difficult to purge a citizen's name.

Lastly, H.R. 2 does not pave the way for noncitizens to vote; it does not permit noncitizens to fraudulently register. Again, a State's actual registration procedures are not changed. There is no automatic registration; applications, along with other eligibility requirements, are still evaluated and then validated—or not—by the State's election official.

The National Voter Registration Act has the potential to revitalize the democratic process in this country more than any bill that we have considered during the last Congress. It will remove roadblocks that contribute to low election turnout by minimizing Government interference in the registration process. The California Secretary of State estimates that motor-voter and agency-based registration alone will ultimately add over 2 million additional registered voters to our files.

H.R. 2 is almost identical to the bill that was adopted by House of Representatives last year, by an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 268-153. Unfortunately, last year's bill was vetoed by President Bush, and the Senate subsequently did not have the votes to override his veto. But President Clinton has already indicated his strong support for fast enactment of the National Voter Registration Act, as well as his intention to sign it into law once it clears Congress.

Every citizen has the right to choose not to vote. But, for those citizens who want to fully participate as voting Americans, we have a responsibility to protect this fundamental, constitutionally guaranteed right—to insure that the election process is as open and accessible as it can be. Factors like economic status, age, and physical ability should not be obstacles to an American citizen's access to the polls.

I am proud to support the National Voter Registration Act, and encourage my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—to do likewise by supporting final passage of open, impartial access to the polls for all American citizens.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. This act will greatly increase the number of registered voters throughout the country, and thus expand democracy in America to new bounds.

My home State of Texas has been exemplary in its efforts to increase voter registration and participation. We have implemented an extended voting period which emphasizes early voting. Voter registration has become much more accessible by increasing the number of locations at which a citizen may register to vote. Registration forms are available from numerous Federal, State, and county agencies, which in turn give the people more opportunities to register to vote. We have seen great results in allowing citizens to register by mail. To safeguard against the registration of noncitizens, the penalty for fraudulent voting is clearly stated on the registration forms.

The voice of the American people in our Government is the basic principle on which our country was founded. It is essential that we allow each and every citizen a voice in our Government. In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson penned that this democracy derives its "just powers from the consent of the governed." We can only truly represent the consent of the governed if each and every citizen is given the opportunity to participate in the electoral process. H.R. 2 clearly meets this objective by increasing the number of registered voters. With more citizens participating in the election process we will fulfill the objective of our Founding Fathers, a government of, by, and for the people.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues not to take part in what is sure to become one of the greatest political hoaxes of our time, H.R. 2, the so-called motor-voter bill. I urge a "no" vote on this written invitation to commit voter fraud.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to portray this issue as a fight for the enfranchisement of greater numbers of eligible Americans. But while it is sure to enroll more names on the voting lists, there are insufficient safeguards against potential instances of fraud to allow this measure to succeed. The bill's sponsors know this, and yet they are pushing ahead all the same.

I wholeheartedly support increasing voter participation in what is truly the greatest representative democracy in all the world. We should be proud of our biyearly ritual, and we should strive to see that all Americans exercise their right to vote. H.R. 2, however, attempts to accomplish this without providing the means to assure that official voting lists remain current or accurate.

Under this bill, Mr. Chairman, States are required to incorporate voter registration with drivers license application. Registration is automatic unless specifically refused by the applicant in writing. Sure, it includes an eligibility oath, that is citizenship, but one can easily imagine the scene of an undocumented immigrant, wanting a drivers license but at the same time fearful of rejecting his vote registration lest he be suspected illegal and deported. The best way around this is for him to take his chances, register to vote, and hope he is not caught—and he will not be caught. This is not an effective way to buttress our Democratic institutions.

Further prospect for fraud comes in the provision requiring States to accept mail-in FEC voter registration forms while prohibiting them from demanding notarization or, really, any sort of authentication whatsoever. This is a truly curious provision, and begs the question as to why anyone would be so careless in opening up the voter registration process to fraud and abuse?

H.R. 2 mandates that States register voters at public assistance offices and State-funded disability programs—it is clear what type of voter the bill's authors wish to enfranchise. But surely, some thought should be given to safeguarding voter lists.

Perhaps a provision could be included to assist States in purging ineligible or fraudulent voters from the rolls?

Well, no, Mr. Chairman. H.R. 2 specifically prohibits States from removing voters from official lists unless it is done at the registrant's request. Oh, they may also be removed in the case of a criminal conviction or mental incapacity, or upon their death or change in residence—but only then if the move is confirmed in writing or if the person fails to respond to a written notice from the State, and subsequently fails to vote in the next two Federal elections.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is an improper vehicle for mandating State action that will not only prove excessively costly to them, but will do more harm than good. In true bureaucratic fashion, it fixes a problem that does not exist. And the fact that it requires registration at

venues of public assistance without mandating similar registration procedures at places like libraries and public schools, says something about who the authors of this bill wish to see vote more. H.R. 2 is more about partisan politics than franchise.

You will remember that President Bush vetoed this legislation on July 2, 1992 for these very reasons, justly stating in his veto message:

I cannot . . . legislation that imposes an unnecessary and costly federal regime on the states and that is, in addition, an open invitation to fraud and corruption.

These words were true last July, and they are true today.

I urge all my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to vote down this ill-conceived bill, and work sincerely for real increased voter participation.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Chairman, few things outweigh my desire to increase the embarrassingly low voter registration and voter participation we experience in the United States. One of these things, however, is my opposition to the practice of Congress passing unfunded mandates onto State and local governments.

H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act, adds to the already too long list of unfunded Federal mandates. I could not, therefore, support this measure in good conscience.

Before being elected to Congress, I served for 3 years in the Suffolk County legislature. One of the first lessons I learned as a local legislator is that a large percentage of the budget was beyond my discretion. It almost seemed as if the favorite pastime for Members of Congress was to pass legislation creating new Federal programs—then demanding that we in local governments pay for these programs.

It is very easy to hold a press conference or accept an award for championing a worthwhile program. It is particularly easy when you force officials at other levels of government to pay the bill. That is not why I came to Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that Congress should seek to create programs which will expand our electoral access and voter participation. At the same time, I also believe that we in Congress must ourselves make the tough choices and decide which other programs are not as necessary.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, today, we vote on legislation that could provide the most significant change in our Nation's voting law since the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We pride ourselves on having one of the most participatory governments in the world. Yet, for a variety of reasons, the United States has had the lowest voter participation of all major democracies in the world. The motor-voter bill can help remedy this problem and increase voter turnout by simplifying the registration procedure.

The motor-voter bill provides a practical, efficient means to reinvigorate our political system. Indeed, in the 1992 election, voter turnout in States with motor voter procedures increased by 12.3 percent over voter turnout in 1988.

The motor voter bill presents a logical, cost-effective linkage between application, renewal, or change of address for a driver's license with voter registration. That motor vehicle bu-

reaus should be the foundation of voter registration is sensible, since drivers' licenses and photo identifications are almost universally carried.

Furthermore, registration tied in with motor vehicle registrations and agencies that provide public assistance, unemployment or State-funded disability programs, minimizes the administrative and financial burdens to States.

The cost to democracy of leaving out millions of Americans from the voting process is significantly greater than any costs that would be accrued from registration administrative procedures.

Constituencies least likely to participate in democracy but still eligible for voter registration, will experience significantly eased access to the voter registration process. These constituencies include the poor, unemployed, and disabled. But, they are not the only segment of the population that has a low voter registration rate.

Many young, urban and suburban middle class citizens are not registered to vote because they frequently change addresses every 2 to 5 years.

Since a change in address notification must be filed at the county board of elections, some fail to reregister. These combined groups represent an enormous voting block—one that could be reached if voter registration procedures could be simplified and made more convenient.

Let us not lock citizens out of the voting booth simply by adhering to archaic and inconvenient registration procedures. Voter turnout can best be increased by a combination of improved registration procedures and more inspired campaigns. Neither can be effective without the other. Let us today take a step toward offering our citizens an additional incentive to vote.

It is imperative that we continue the momentum experienced in November's elections, when voter turnout increased for the first time in years. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2. A vote for this legislation is a vote for democracy.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2, the motor-voter bill, which we should pass and send promptly to President Clinton for his signature.

Let me say that I have met with the county clerks in my district and have talked with them at great length about some of the concerns they have with this bill. And I believe we should keep an open mind about those concerns and be willing to work with our States and counties to make this work. Because that is the ultimate goal—a system of voter participation that is inclusive and accessible.

One of the true strengths of our system is the role each citizen takes in determining what is best for the common good. They can speak in public, organize around a common goal and petition their government. But the greatest strength comes on election day, when at the ballot box the people decide how their lives will be governed.

I am proud to support this fine piece of legislation and urge its adoption to my colleagues.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, it is truly a national tragedy that the United States has what is arguably the worst reputation in the free

world for voter turnout. This country is the No. 1 guardian of democracy, free speech, and voting rights around the globe, yet barely half of the eligible voters in the Nation show up at the polls during Presidential elections.

The legislation before us today seeks to redress this national disgrace. By making it easier to register, we improve the opportunities for our citizens to take part in one of the most vital functions of our democracy.

In the 1992 election, voter turnout increased for the first time in many years, but the greatest increases occurred in States which had implemented registration procedures similar to those contained in this bill. Turnout in States with motor-voter procedures increased by 12.3 percent, while turnout in States without these procedures increased by only 6.7 percent. It is clear from this data, that the reforms contained in this legislation will dramatically improve lagging voter participation in this country, which is a goal we should all share.

It will not, as its opponents disingenuously claim, compromise the integrity of voter registration process across the country. It contains tough antifraud provisions, including listing the eligibility criteria for voting on all voter registration forms and requiring the signature of applicants to attest, under the penalty of perjury, that they meet each of these requirements. Anyone found guilty of submitting fraudulent registrations would be subject to fines up to \$250,000 and 5 years in prison, or both.

Mr. Speaker, we read and hear every day about how alienated and disenfranchised Americans feel about their Government. Passing this bill today will signal that we want to address these concerns, and promote fuller participation of the voting public in the electoral process.

Our democracy's health depends on the support and participation of the American people. This is an important step toward maintaining that health.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that advocates of this bill have nothing but the best of intentions. After all, in the ideal republic, each citizen will take measures necessary to inform himself or herself of the issues in political races, and each citizen then exercises that most important right of citizenship and casts an informed vote for the individual that will best represent his or her interest. This is the ideal, and it has been long envisioned by great thinkers.

To my great regret, Mr. Chairman, we do not live in an ideal world. We do not even live in an ideal republic. Some citizens simply do not exercise their right to vote—some because of apathy, some because of ignorance, and some because of protest. We should encourage citizens to exercise their right to vote, but this bill does not do that. This bill may put names on a State roll, but it will do nothing to encourage people to actually vote. Thus, despite the best intentions of the bill's advocates, it simply won't work.

More registered voters do not necessarily lead to more participating voters. Several States have implemented motor-voter voluntarily, I might add—and there is simply no convincing proof that automatic registration procedures—whether motor-voter, welfare-voter, marriage-voter, or walk-in-voter—

increase voter turnout. To accomplish that goal, we need more exciting elections, and as much as we hate to admit it, more exciting candidates. If the candidates motivate folks to vote, they'll vote. If the candidates don't inspire folks to vote, they won't vote, regardless of how many times their names appear on an official list somewhere.

If we pass this bill, we are about to take away the States' traditional right to manage their own elections. We are about to force States to accept all mail-in registrations without verifying their truth or accuracy, and to train their welfare workers in registration assistance. We are about to tell States that they cannot remove names from voting lists, even if the voter has not voted for several decades. To add insult to injury, this bill does not give the States even one dime to comply with the costs of this bill. States must come up with millions of dollars to implement this legislation. What should we tell our States when they are forced to cut their budgets—education, law enforcement, health care, and more—in order to implement a motor-voter, welfare-voter, walk-in-voter registration law? That's quite a lot of money to spend on something that doesn't work that well in the first place.

If the advocates of this bill truly believe that motor-voter will accomplish some good, then they should at least have the courtesy to make the implementation of this Federal law voluntary until the costs can be paid by Federal dollars. Don't break the backs of the States in order to implement an ineffective system.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act. The passage of this legislation is long overdue. With enactment assured because of President Bill Clinton's strong support, this legislation will ease registration and increase turnout of eligible voters.

There is no doubt this bill will increase turnout. Between 85 and 90 percent of registered voters go to the polls on election day. In my State of Minnesota with its motor-voter and election-day voter registration, turnout in Presidential elections is very high, frequently leading the Nation. In other States with motor-voter registration procedures, turnout also has significantly increased.

Let me also say that the concerns expressed by opponents of this bill with possible fraud and abuse are not well founded. In the State of Minnesota similar concerns were expressed prior to passage of State motor-voter laws, but have not proven true. With diligent administration, there is no reason for voter fraud to increase.

The bill we consider today is straightforward. H.R. 2 gives all citizens the opportunity to apply for registration to vote in all Federal elections by: first, applying for or renewing their driver's license; second, by mail; and third, agency-based registration at a variety of Federal, State, or local government agencies. The legislation also provides for stringent civil and criminal enforcement to prevent fraud.

Passage of this bill will make it possible for millions of Americans to register and vote for the first time. But H.R. 2 is just the first step the Congress must take to open our American democracy to more citizens. We should also

consider election day registration, which works very well in Minnesota and a few other States. The Congress should also debate and pass a fair ballot access law to make it easier for independent candidates to gain access to the ballot; a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 16 which will enfranchise hundreds-of-thousands of younger voters; and legislation to require presidential candidates to participate in election debates. These measures would further open our Democratic system to more people. I intend to introduce legislation in the coming weeks to make these ideas a reality and to start a debate that in the not too distant future can result in an expansion of our effort today to increase voter turnout.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 2. While it is just a first step, it is the essential first step on the road to making it easy for all Americans to vote.

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this legislation, both on behalf of myself and on behalf of the State of New Hampshire.

We have spoken at length with the New Hampshire secretary of state, Bill Gardner, a Democrat, over the past several days, and he has voiced his overwhelming opposition to this legislation.

This is in addition to many city and town clerks throughout New Hampshire, Republicans and Democrats, who have also voiced their opposition to this bill.

The Democrat secretary said, "there is no guarantee that voter participation will be increased in this State once this new Federal mandate is in place."

I would like to ask unanimous consent that his full written comments be included in the RECORD following my statement.

New Hampshire, with some of the strictest laws in the Nation regarding voter registration, has consistently illustrated that motor-voter is not needed.

For example, while the average voter turnout in Presidential elections in motor-voter States between the last two elections increased 6.6 percent, turnout increased over 9 percent in New Hampshire.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that New Hampshire registered 90,000 new voters in 1992, achieving an 80 percent registration among the voting age population without any motor-voter laws.

Additionally, this bill is another case of the Federal Government forcing expensive mandates on the States. Of the 10 States which have done cost estimates, the total is nearly \$100 million.

If the rest of the Nation is consistent, we're looking at a half a billion dollar Federal mandate here. Add that to the nearly \$8 billion we hit small business with yesterday, and you can just see that economic recovery train coming, can't you?

One final point, Mr. Chairman. The fact that there are practically no safeguards in this bill against illegal aliens voting is particularly troubling to me. If this legislation is enacted, even Zoe Baird's chauffeur would have the right to vote.

While this may please certain officials in our Government, I assure you that the generations of Americans who had to fight for the constitutional right to vote would certainly not be pleased.

I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I insert the following statement for the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE CONCERNING THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT

H.R. 2, a bill to establish national voter registration procedures for federal elections, does not appear to have provisions as written which would be of benefit to the State of New Hampshire.

At present, New Hampshire has a system of local voter registration. Except for handicapped or out of town/overseas citizens, registration is taken and proof of residency and citizenship is given in person to town or city clerks or to supervisors of the checklist in each voting jurisdiction. Voters may be registered up to 10 days before any election. Local officials thus determine the qualifications of voters and must so state on the checklist.

H.R. 2 alleges to make it easier for all eligible voters to be registered. While the aim of registering more voters may be achieved, passage of this act does not necessarily mean that voter participation will be increased and will require the expenditure of large amounts of tax dollars to benefit few.

The most recent study shows a greater increase in voter turnout in New Hampshire than in states with motor-voter registration. The voter turnout increase from the 1988 to the 1992 Presidential Election in New Hampshire was 9% while the average increase in motor-voter states from 1988 to 1992 was 6.6%. The widely fluctuating turnout in individual states shows that voter registration procedures is only one factor in influencing whether people will actually vote. New Hampshire, for instance, which has been sometimes criticized for its voter registration process, registered 90,000 new voters for the 1992 federal election, achieving a total registration percentage of 80% for the current voting age population. The 1992 voter turnout was 64%, higher than that of several motor-voter states, which averaged a 60.1% voter turnout. In fact, New Hampshire, at 55%, had a higher percentage of voter turnout even in 1988 than did the motor-voter states with an average of 53.5%.

In addition, the cost of implementing H.R. 2 appears to be prohibitive for our small state. Pursuant to this legislation, any place of motor vehicle registration, or any office providing public assistance such as welfare offices, vocational rehabilitation offices, or unemployment offices shall provide voter registration forms to all applicants for driver's licenses or assistance. Potential voters could apply anywhere in the state. Any completed forms would be sent by these offices or by the registrants by mail to state election officials. The official would determine the eligibility of the applicants and would notify the applicants as to their placement on the checklist. Not only would these agency offices supplant the local officials in the registration function, the cost of this new mandate to New Hampshire state and local government for materials, mailings, and manpower would be in the tens of thousands of dollars per year. The cost of printing and distributing the forms would also be borne by the state. Local offices could bear the cost of notifying the applicants of the disposition of their applications.

Other provisions of H.R. 2 are also troublesome. All agencies newly responsible for sending completed forms to the state election offices would have 10 days to do so, up

until 5 days before the cut-off date of registering, then the forms must be sent in 5 days. The federal cut-off date allows thirty days before an election, while ours is ten days before an election. If the State of New Hampshire stays with the present dates of registration, some voters will not be placed on the checklist in time, while others may find they are judged ineligible too close to the election to rectify their voting status.

If our state does conform to the 30 day limitation, voters who currently have 20 extra days to register will also lose this opportunity to be registered close to an election.

In addition, H.R. 2 relates to federal elections. In New Hampshire, the question arises as to whether two checklists, one for local, county and state elections and one for federal elections, may be maintained. Supervisors may also object to the addition of federal election applicants too close to an election for verification by them in regards to an applicants' place of residence. Concern for voter fraud could even lead to the rejection of eligible applicants. Chaos would reign at the polling place if in fact voters were responsible for registering under two systems for two checklists.

New voters who register by mail are required to be responsible for verifying their eligibility at the polls. The possible results of confusion, lines, and frustration at the polls could even serve to discourage voter participation.

In addition, first-time voters registered by mail, if required to vote in person under the provisions of H.R. 2 to prove their qualifications, could lose the right to vote by absentee ballot. Since this is a right constitutionally guaranteed to all our New Hampshire citizens, this would also necessitate a change in our state constitution.

The office of the secretary of state of New Hampshire has grave concerns about the passage of H.R. 2 in its present form because of the before-mentioned reasons.

There is no firm evidence that increasing voter registration by such means as motor-voter registration will automatically increase voter turnout. Local control which appears to be working well in its present form in New Hampshire would be overruled.

Another layer of bureaucracy through the cumbersome system of state control and notifications as described in this bill would be imposed to supplant our present procedures. Confusion and lines at the polling place as certain new voters verify their qualifications could actually discourage voters and lower the voter turnout.

Voters may also be required to register 30 days before an election rather than 10, thus losing the ability to register close to an election.

Most troublesome is the potentially excessive cost required to benefit very few in this particular state. At a time when New Hampshire is struggling to fund social services, the expenditure of tax dollars to make it more convenient for only 20% of the population to register is not a high priority. The Secretary of State's Office has been committed to eliminating past barriers to voting and feels strongly that the rights of all eligible persons to vote should be guaranteed, it also assumes that these same persons will take some responsibility as citizens, as President Clinton asked for in his inaugural address.

This bill attempts to describe those voting age citizens who haven't taken the time to register to vote as victims of a system which has deliberately attempted to make it difficult for them to vote. We, on the other

hand, would ask, why should the 80% of the eligible voters in New Hampshire who have made the effort to register spend their tax dollars on the 20% who have not done so, especially when in our depressed economy we have so many other serious needs?

Expecting non-handicapped persons who reside in their jurisdictions to appear in person to register to vote as the present local system requires is not only a less expensive procedure than that mandated by H.R. 2, but it will also help prevent election fraud. It does not, our opinion, constitute an undue burden on eligible voters.

In conclusion, the cost of this legislation not only outweighs the benefits to New Hampshire, but there is also no guarantee that voter participation will be increased in this state once this new federal mandate is in place.

In fact, it is my opinion that the legislation will cause a decrease in voter turnout in New Hampshire because new voters will be required to prove eligibility at the polls rather than prior to election day. Lines could develop, which will discourage voters from waiting to cast their votes.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments printed in the bill and the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 103-11 are considered adopted.

The text of H.R. 2, as amended by the amendments in the bill and the amendment in part 1 of the House Report 103-11, is as follows:

H. R. 2

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Voter Registration Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—
(1) the right of citizens of the United States to vote is a fundamental right;

(2) it is the duty of the Federal, State, and local governments to promote the exercise of that right; and
(3) discriminatory and unfair registration laws and procedures can have a direct and damaging effect on voter participation in elections for Federal office and disproportionately harm voter participation by various groups, including racial minorities.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to establish procedures that will increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote in elections for Federal office;

(2) to make it possible for Federal, State, and local governments to implement this Act in a manner that enhances the participation of eligible citizens as voters in elections for Federal office;

(3) to protect the integrity of the electoral process; and

(4) to ensure that accurate and current voter registration rolls are maintained.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "election" has the meaning stated in section 301(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(1));

(2) the term "Federal office" has the meaning stated in section 301(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431(3));

(3) the term "motor vehicle driver's license" includes any personal identification document issued by a State motor vehicle authority;

(4) the term "State" means a State of the United States and the District of Columbia; and

(5) the term "voter registration agency" means an office designated under section 7(a)(1) to perform voter registration activities.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR VOTER REGISTRATION FOR ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), notwithstanding any other Federal or State law, in addition to any other method of voter registration provided for under State law, each State shall establish procedures to register to vote in elections for Federal office—

(1) by application made simultaneously with an application for a motor vehicle driver's license pursuant to section 5;

(2) by mail application pursuant to section 6; and

(3) by application in person—

(A) at the appropriate registration site designated with respect to the residence of the applicant in accordance with State law; and

(B) at a Federal, State, or nongovernmental office designated under section 7.

(b) NONAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN STATES.—This Act does not apply to a State described in either or both of the following paragraphs:

(1) A State in which there is no voter registration requirement for any voter in the State with respect to an election for Federal office.

(2) A State in which all voters in the State may register to vote at the polling place at the time of voting in a general election for Federal office.

SEC. 5. SIMULTANEOUS APPLICATION FOR VOTER REGISTRATION AND APPLICATION FOR MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVER'S LICENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Except as provided in subsection (b), each State motor vehicle driver's license application (including any renewal application) submitted to the appropriate State motor vehicle authority under State law shall serve as an application for voter registration with respect to elections for Federal office.

(2) An application for voter registration submitted under paragraph (1) shall be considered as updating any previous voter registration by the applicant.

(b) DECLINATION TO REGISTER.—(1) An applicant for a State motor vehicle driver's license may decline in writing to be registered by means of the motor vehicle driver's license application.

(2) No information relating to a declination pursuant to paragraph (1) may be used for any purpose other than voter registration.

(c) FORMS AND PROCEDURES.—(1) Each State shall include a voter registration application form for elections for Federal office as part of an application for a State motor vehicle driver's license.

(2) The voter registration application portion of an application for a State motor vehicle driver's license—

(A) may not require any information that duplicates information required in the driver's license portion of the form (other than a second signature or other information necessary under subparagraph (C));

(B) shall include a means by which an applicant may decline to register to vote pursuant to subsection (b);

(C) may require only the minimum amount of information necessary to—

(i) prevent duplicate voter registrations; and

(ii) enable State election officials to assess the eligibility of the applicant and to administer voter registration and other parts of the election process;

(D) shall include a statement that—

(i) states each eligibility requirement (including citizenship);

(ii) contains an attestation that the applicant meets each such requirement; and

(iii) requires the signature of the applicant, under penalty of perjury; and

(E) shall be made available (as submitted by the applicant, or in machine readable or other format) to the appropriate State election official as provided by State law.

(d) CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Any change of address form submitted in accordance with State law for purposes of a State motor vehicle driver's license shall serve as notification of change of address for voter registration with respect to elections for Federal office for the registrant involved unless the registrant states on the form that the change of address is not for voter registration purposes.

SEC. 6. MAIL REGISTRATION.

(a) FORM.—(1) Each State shall accept and use the mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Federal Election Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2) for the registration of voters in elections for Federal office.

(2) In addition to accepting and using the form described in paragraph (1), a State may develop and use a mail voter registration form that meets all of the criteria stated in section 9(b) for the registration of voters in elections for Federal office.

(3) A form described in paragraph (1) or (2) shall be accepted and used for notification of a registrant's change of address.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FORMS.—The chief State election official of a State shall make the forms described in subsection (a) available for distribution through governmental and private entities, with particular emphasis on making them available for organized voter registration programs.

(c) FIRST-TIME VOTERS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), a State may by law require a person to vote in person if—

(A) the person was registered to vote in a jurisdiction by mail; and

(B) the person has not previously voted in that jurisdiction.

(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply in the case of a person—

(A) who is entitled to vote by absentee ballot under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ff-1 et seq.);

(B) who is provided the right to vote otherwise than in person under section 3(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (42 U.S.C. 1973ee-1(b)(2)(B)(ii)); or

(C) who is entitled to vote otherwise than in person under any other Federal law.

SEC. 7. VOTER REGISTRATION AGENCIES.

(a) DESIGNATION.—(1) Each State shall designate agencies for the registration of voters in elections for Federal office.

(2) Each State shall designate as voter registration agencies—

(A) all offices in the State that provide public assistance, unemployment compensation, or related services; and

(B) all offices in the State that provide State-funded programs primarily engaged in providing services to persons with disabilities.

(3)(A) In addition to voter registration agencies designated under paragraph (2), each State shall designate other offices within the State as voter registration agencies.

(B) Voter registration agencies designated under subparagraph (A) may include—

(i) State or local government offices such as public libraries, public schools, offices of city and county clerks (including marriage license bureaus), fishing and hunting license bureaus, government revenue offices, and offices not described in paragraph (2)(B) that provide services to persons with disabilities; and

(ii) Federal and nongovernmental offices, with the agreement of such offices.

(4)(A) At each voter registration agency, the following services shall be made available:

(i) Distribution of mail voter registration application forms in accordance with paragraph (6).

(ii) Assistance to applicants in completing voter registration application forms.

(iii) Acceptance of completed voter registration application forms for transmittal to the appropriate State election official.

(B) If a voter registration agency designated under paragraph (2)(B) provides services to a person with a disability at the person's home, the agency shall provide the services described in subparagraph (A) at the person's home.

(5) A person who provides service described in paragraph (4) shall not—

(A) seek to influence an applicant's political preference or party registration;

(B) display any such political preference or party allegiance; or

(C) make any statement to an applicant or take any action the purpose or effect of which is to discourage the applicant from registering to vote.

(6) A voter registration agency that is an office that provides service or assistance in addition to conducting voter registration shall—

(A) distribute with each application for such service or assistance, and with each recertification, renewal, or change of address form relating to such service or assistance—

(i) the mail voter registration application form described in section 9(a)(2); or

(ii) the office's own form if it is equivalent to the form described in section 9(a)(2), including a statement that—

(I) specifies each eligibility requirement (including citizenship);

(II) contains an attestation that the applicant meets each such requirement; and

(III) requires the signature of the applicant, under penalty of perjury; or unless the applicant, in writing, declines to register to vote;

(B) to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate in application forms and other forms used at those offices for purposes other than voter registration a means by which a person who completes the form may decline, in writing, to register to vote in elections for Federal office; and

(C) provide to each applicant who does not decline to register to vote the same degree of assistance with regard to the completion of the registration application form as is provided by the office with regard to the completion of its own forms.

(7) No information relating to a declination to register to vote in connection with an application made at an office described in paragraph (6) may be used for any purpose other than voter registration.

(b) FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SECTOR COOPERATION.—All departments,

agencies, and other entities of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall, to the greatest extent practicable, cooperate with the States in carrying out subsection (a), and all nongovernmental entities are encouraged to do so.

(c) **TRANSMITTAL DEADLINE.**—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), a completed registration application accepted at a voter registration agency shall be transmitted to the appropriate State election official not later than 10 days after the date of acceptance.

(2) If a registration application is accepted within 5 days before the last day for registration to vote in an election, the application shall be transmitted to the appropriate State election official not later than 5 days after the date of acceptance.

SEC. 8. REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO ADMINISTRATION OF VOTER REGISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the administration of voter registration for elections for Federal office, each State shall—

(1) ensure that any eligible applicant is registered to vote in an election—

(A) in the case of registration with a motor vehicle application under section 5, if the valid voter registration form of the applicant is submitted to the appropriate State motor vehicle authority not later than the lesser of 30 days, or the period provided by State law, before the date of the election;

(B) in the case of registration by mail under section 6, if the valid voter registration form of the applicant is postmarked not later than the lesser of 30 days, or the period provided by State law, before the date of the election;

(C) in the case of registration at a voter registration agency, if the valid voter registration form of the applicant is accepted at the voter registration agency not later than the lesser of 30 days, or the period provided by State law, before the date of the election; and

(D) in any other case, if the valid voter registration form of the applicant is received by the appropriate State election official not later than the lesser of 30 days, or the period provided by State law, before the date of the election;

(2) require the appropriate State election official to send notice to each applicant of the disposition of the application;

(3) provide that the name of a registrant may not be removed from the official list of eligible voters except—

(A) at the request of the registrant;
(B) as provided by State law, by reason of criminal conviction or mental incapacity; or
(C) as provided under paragraph (4);

(4) conduct a general program that makes a reasonable effort to remove the names of ineligible voters from the official lists of eligible voters by reason of—

(A) the death of the registrant; or
(B) a change in the residence of the registrant, in accordance with subsections (b), (c), and (d);

(5) inform applicants under sections 5, 6, and 7 of—

(A) voter eligibility requirements; and
(B) penalties provided by law for submission of a false voter registration application; and

(6) ensure that the identity of the voter registration agency through which any particular voter is registered is not disclosed to the public.

(b) **CONFIRMATION OF VOTER REGISTRATION.**—Any State program or activity to protect the integrity of the electoral process by ensuring the maintenance of an accurate and

current voter registration roll for elections for Federal office—

(1) shall be uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.); and

(2) shall not result in the removal of the name of any person from the official list of voters registered to vote in an election for Federal office by reason of the person's failure to vote.

(c) **VOTER REMOVAL PROGRAMS.**—(1) A State may meet the requirement of subsection (a)(4) by establishing a program under which—

(A) change-of-address information supplied by the Postal Service through its licensees is used to identify registrants whose addresses may have changed; and

(B) if it appears from information provided by the Postal Service that—

(i) a registrant has moved to a different residence address in the same registrar's jurisdiction in which the registrant is currently registered, the registrar changes the registration records to show the new address and sends the registrant a notice of the change by forwardable mail and a postage prepaid pre-addressed return form by which the registrant may verify or correct the address information; or

(ii) the registrant has moved to a different residence address not in the same registrar's jurisdiction, the registrar uses the notice procedure described in subsection (d)(2) to confirm the change of address.

(2)(A) A State shall complete, not later than 90 days prior to the date of a primary or general election for Federal office, any program the purpose of which is to systematically remove the names of ineligible voters from the official lists of eligible voters.

(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to preclude—

(i) the removal of names from official lists of voters on a basis described in paragraph (3) (A) or (B) or (4)(A) of subsection (a); or

(ii) correction of registration records pursuant to this Act.

(d) **REMOVAL OF NAMES FROM VOTING ROLLS.**—(1) A State shall not remove the name of a registrant from the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office on the ground that the registrant has changed residence unless the registrant—

(A) confirms in writing that the registrant has changed residence to a place outside the registrar's jurisdiction in which the registrant is registered; or

(B)(i) has failed to respond to a notice described in paragraph (2); and

(ii) has not voted or appeared to vote (and, if necessary, correct the registrar's record of the registrant's address) in an election during the period beginning on the date of the notice and ending on the day after the date of the second general election for Federal office that occurs after the date of the notice.

(2) A notice is described in this paragraph if it is a postage prepaid and pre-addressed return card, sent by forwardable mail, on which the registrant may state his or her current address, together with a notice to the following effect:

(A) If the registrant did not change his or her residence, or changed residence but remained in the registrar's jurisdiction, the registrant should return the card not later than the time provided for mail registration under subsection (a)(1)(B). If the card is not returned, affirmation or confirmation of the registrant's address may be required before the registrant is permitted to vote in a Federal election during the period beginning on the date of the notice and ending on the day

after the date of the second general election for Federal office that occurs after the date of the notice, and if the registrant does not vote in an election during that period the registrant's name will be removed from the list of eligible voters.

(B) If the registrant has changed residence to a place outside the registrar's jurisdiction in which the registrant is registered, information concerning how the registrant can continue to be eligible to vote.

(3) A voting registrar shall correct an official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office in accordance with change of residence information obtained in conformance with this subsection.

(e) **PROCEDURE FOR VOTING FOLLOWING FAILURE TO RETURN CARD.**—(1) A registrant who has moved from an address in the area covered by a polling place to an address in the same area shall, notwithstanding failure to notify the registrar of the change of address prior to the date of an election, be permitted to vote at that polling place upon oral or written affirmation by the registrant of the change of address before an election official at that polling place.

(2)(A) A registrant who has moved from an address in the area covered by one polling place to an address in an area covered by a second polling place within the same registrar's jurisdiction and the same congressional district and who has failed to notify the registrar of the change of address prior to the date of an election, at the option of the registrant—

(i) shall be permitted to correct the voting records and vote at the registrant's former polling place, upon oral or written affirmation by the registrant of the new address before an election official at that polling place; or

(ii)(I) shall be permitted to correct the voting records and vote at a central location within the same registrar's jurisdiction designated by the registrar where a list of eligible voters is maintained, upon written affirmation by the registrant of the new address on a standard form provided by the registrar at the central location; or

(II) shall be permitted to correct the voting records for purposes of voting in future elections at the appropriate polling place for the current address and, if permitted by State law, shall be permitted to vote in the present election, upon confirmation by the registrant of the new address by such means as are required by law.

(B) If State law permits the registrant to vote in the current election upon oral or written affirmation by the registrant of the new address at a polling place described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), voting at the former polling place as described in subparagraph (A)(i) and at a central location as described in subparagraph (A)(ii)(I) need not be provided as alternative options.

(3) If the registration records indicate that a registrant has moved from an address in the area covered by a polling place, the registrant shall, upon oral or written affirmation by the registrant before an election official at that polling place that the registrant continues to reside at the address previously made known to the registrar, be permitted to vote at that polling place.

(f) **CHANGE OF VOTING ADDRESS WITHIN A JURISDICTION.**—In the case of a change of address, for voting purposes, of a registrant to another address within the same registrar's jurisdiction, the registrar shall correct the voting registration list accordingly, and the registrant's name may not be removed from the official list of eligible voters by reason of

such a change of address except as provided in subsection (d).

(g) **CONVICTION IN FEDERAL COURT.**—(1) On the conviction of a person of a felony in a district court of the United States, the United States attorney shall give written notice of the conviction to the chief State election official designated under section 10 of the State of the person's residence.

(2) A notice given pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include—

- (A) the name of the offender;
- (B) the offender's age and residence address;
- (C) the date of entry of the judgment;
- (D) a description of the offenses of which the offender was convicted; and
- (E) the sentence imposed by the court.

(3) On request of the chief State election official of a State or other State official with responsibility for determining the effect that a conviction may have on an offender's qualification to vote, the United States attorney shall provide such additional information as the United States attorney may have concerning the offender and the offense of which the offender was convicted.

(4) If a conviction of which notice was given pursuant to paragraph (1) is overturned, the United States attorney shall give the official to whom the notice was given written notice of the vacation of the judgment.

(5) The chief State election official shall notify the voter registration officials of the local jurisdiction in which an offender resides of the information received under this subsection.

(h) **REDUCED POSTAL RATES.**—(1) Subchapter II of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 3629. Reduced rates for voter registration purposes

"The Postal Service shall make available to a State or local voting registration official the rate for any class of mail that is available to a qualified nonprofit organization under section 3626 for the purpose of making a mailing that the official certifies is required or authorized by the National Voter Registration Act of 1993."

(2) The first sentence of section 2401(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and 3626(a)-(h) and (j)-(k) of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "3626(a)-(h), 3626(j)-(k), and 3629 of this title".

(3) Section 3627 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "or 3626 of this title," and inserting in lieu thereof "3626, or 3629 of this title".

(4) The table of sections for chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3628 the following new item:

"3629. Reduced rates for voter registration purposes."

(i) **PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF VOTER REGISTRATION ACTIVITIES.**—(1) Each State shall maintain for at least 2 years and shall make available for public inspection and, where available, photocopying at a reasonable cost, all records concerning the implementation of programs and activities conducted for the purpose of ensuring the accuracy and currency of official lists of eligible voters, except to the extent that such records relate to a declination to register to vote or to the identity of a voter registration agency through which any particular voter is registered.

(2) The records maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include lists of the names

and addresses of all persons to whom notices described in subsection (d)(2) are sent, and information concerning whether or not each such person has responded to the notice as of the date that inspection of the records is made.

(j) **DEFINITION.**—For the purposes of this section, the term "registrars jurisdiction" means—

- (1) an incorporated city, town, borough, or other form of municipality;
- (2) if voter registration is maintained by a county, parish, or other unit of government that governs a larger geographic area than a municipality, the geographic area governed by that unit of government; or
- (3) if voter registration is maintained on a consolidated basis for more than one municipality or other unit of government by an office that performs all of the functions of a voting registrar, the geographic area of the consolidated municipalities or other geographic units.

SEC. 9. FEDERAL COORDINATION AND REGULATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Federal Election Commission—

(1) in consultation with the chief election officers of the States, the heads of the departments, agencies, and other entities of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and representatives of nongovernmental entities, shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this Act;

(2) in consultation with the chief election officers of the States, shall develop a mail voter registration application form for elections for Federal office;

(3) not later than June 30 of each odd-numbered year, shall submit to the Congress a report assessing the impact of this Act on the administration of elections for Federal office during the preceding 2-year period and including recommendations for improvements in Federal and State procedures, forms, and other matters affected by this Act; and

(4) shall provide information to the States with respect to the responsibilities of the States under this Act.

(b) **CONTENTS OF MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.**—The mail voter registration form developed under subsection (a)(2)—

(1) may require only such identifying information (including the signature of the applicant) and other information (including data relating to previous registration by the applicant), as is necessary to enable the appropriate State election official to assess the eligibility of the applicant and to administer voter registration and other parts of the election process;

(2) shall include a statement that—

(A) specifies each eligibility requirement (including citizenship);

(B) contains an attestation that the applicant meets each such requirement; and

(C) requires the signature of the applicant, under penalty of perjury; and

(3) may not include any requirement for notarization or other formal authentication.

SEC. 10. DESIGNATION OF CHIEF STATE ELECTION OFFICIAL.

Each State shall designate a State officer or employee as the chief State election official to be responsible for coordination of State responsibilities under this Act.

SEC. 11. CIVIL ENFORCEMENT AND PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

(a) **ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court for such declaratory or injunctive relief as is necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) **PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.**—(1) A person who is aggrieved by a violation of this Act may provide written notice of the violation to the chief election official of the State involved.

(2) If the violation is not corrected within 90 days after receipt of a notice under paragraph (1), or within 20 days after receipt of the notice if the violation occurred within 120 days before the date of an election for Federal office, the aggrieved person may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court for declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the violation.

(3) If the violation occurred within 30 days before the date of an election for Federal office, the aggrieved person need not provide notice to the chief election official of the State under paragraph (1) before bringing a civil action under paragraph (2).

(c) **ATTORNEY'S FEES.**—In a civil action under this section, the court may allow the prevailing party (other than the United States) reasonable attorney fees, including litigation expenses, and costs.

(d) **RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.**—(1) The rights and remedies established by this section are in addition to all other rights and remedies provided by law, and neither the rights and remedies established by this section nor any other provision of this Act shall supersede, restrict, or limit the application of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.).

(2) Nothing in this Act authorizes or requires conduct that is prohibited by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973 et seq.).

SEC. 12. CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

A person, including an election official, who in any election for Federal office—

(1) knowingly and willfully intimidates, threatens, or coerces, or attempts to intimidate, threaten, or coerce, any person for—

(A) registering to vote, or voting, or attempting to register or vote;

(B) urging or aiding any person to register to vote, to vote, or to attempt to register or vote; or

(C) exercising any right under this Act; or

(2) knowingly and willfully deprives, defrauds, or attempts to deprive or defraud the residents of a State of a fair and impartially conducted election process, by—

(A) the procurement or submission of voter registration applications that are known by the person to be materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent under the laws of the State in which the election is held; or

(B) the procurement, casting, or tabulation of ballots that are known by the person to be materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent under the laws of the State in which the election is held,

shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect—

(1) with respect to a State that on the date of enactment of this Act has a provision in the constitution of the State that would preclude compliance with this Act unless the State maintained separate Federal and State official lists of eligible voters, on January 1, 1996; and

(2) with respect to any State not described in paragraph (1), on January 1, 1995.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is in order except the amendment printed in part 2 of House Report 103-11, which may be offered by the proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to

amendment. Debate time for said amendment shall be 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SWIFT. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the amendment made in order under the rule is not being offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not here to establish whether or not an amendment will be offered or not. The Chair has not yet established that.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, if I may further make a parliamentary inquiry, at what point do we know whether that event is going to occur or not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inquire, does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] or a designee offer the amendment?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is not present and does not intend to appoint a designee for the purpose of offering such an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. McDERMOTT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to establish national voter registration procedures for Federal elections, and for other purposes; pursuant to House Resolution 59, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on House Administration and the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 103-11 are considered as agreed to.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. THOMAS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of California. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of California moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 2) to the Committee on House Administration with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike out line 15-24 on pg. 29 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE AND CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENT

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) this Act shall take effect

(1) with respect to a State that on the date of enactment of this Act has a provision in the constitution of the State that would preclude compliance with this Act unless the State maintained separate Federal and State official lists of eligible voters, on January 1, 1996; and

(2) with respect to any State not described in paragraph (1), on January 1, 1995.

(b) This Act shall not take effect with respect to a State until the chief election official of that State certifies to the Attorney General that sufficient procedures exist in that State to prevent voter registration under the procedures provided for in this Act by persons who are not citizens of the United States. Certification of compliance or a statement of reasons for inability to certify shall be forwarded to the Attorney General not later than January 1, 1996. The Attorney General shall report such communications to the Congress.

(c) No person other than a citizen of the United States may be registered to vote under this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit with instructions does basically one thing. The dates that were read, January 1, 1996 and January 1, 1995, are the dates that are contained in the bill. The 1-year delay is for those States who may have a constitutional provision which would not allow them to comply with the bill, and it therefore provides an additional 12 months to allow their State constitution to be conformed to the requirements.

The new addition is the requirement that the chief election official of a State either certify that they can meet the provisions of this bill or indicate why they cannot meet the provisions of this bill, and to forward that information to the Attorney General of the United States no later than the effective date in the bill itself, January 1, 1996.

There have been allusions made to the fact that this provision presses somebody's hot button and that somehow this is a phony provision because it leaves an open-ended opportunity for States to evade this question.

We have heard an awful lot of rhetoric on this floor about how important it is to make sure that people are able to vote. I support every one of those statements, but Mr. Speaker, equally important to the right to vote is the belief that one's vote counts, no more, no less than anyone else's.

The history of voting in the United States is replete with examples of people who are no longer living, who no longer live there, or who never existed in the first place casting votes, and every one of those votes that are cast dilutes an honest vote. Elections have been won fraudulently.

I know it is popular to argue the point that no fraud exists in voting that can be determined. Let me tell the Members, I invite them to read Robert Caro's book on LBJ. It is entirely possible and certainly plausible that a President of the United States would never have been elected to the U.S. Senate had not all of those folks who never existed along the Rio Grande in Texas not only cast votes not only before the polls closed on the day of election, but who waited until they found out how many votes were needed to offset those who actually voted, to cast the votes.

One of the problems with this legislation in terms of making it easier for people to possibly vote is the threshold of admittance to the registration rolls. What we are saying now is that when a person signs up to get a driver's license, they sign up to vote. Let me assure the Members that the headlines just recently announced that an illegal alien who cost a very bright and talented lawyer the Attorney General position had a driver's license. And more and more people who want a driver's license, citizen or not, eligible to vote or not, are going to go through this process. You tell me whether they want to identify themselves, stick out like a sore thumb, let people know they are concerned with the way in which they have to get a driver's license by publicly admitting they do not want to register to vote.

□ 1630

A number of illegal aliens will end up with a driver's license and on the voting rolls. Whether they vote or not is a moot point. What happens is you discredit an honest person's belief that their vote counts as much as another.

Fundamental to the American system is the right to vote. Fundamental to that right to vote is the sanctity of that vote and the belief that your vote will actually count as much as anyone else's.

All this amendment says is that a State has to certify that they can make sure that the people who are brought into the system are in fact qualified, and are in fact citizens.

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his motion to recommit, and I would only quote former Speaker Tip O'Neill's book, "All Politics is Local," in which he says, "An Irishman named Martin Lomasney, who worked out to the Hendricks Club in the West End," said that he would "meet the new immigrants at the boat and take them straight over to register to vote."

Do I understand from the gentleman's amendment that anyone who votes for this bill knows that this is es-

sentially voting against requiring only citizens to register?

Mr. THOMAS of California. All we are asking is that if we expand the ability to get on the rolls, those who have been added to the rolls meet the minimum qualification of citizenship. There is a date certain, and States have to report back as to their ability to do or not to do what is asked of them in this bill.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

You know, when you cannot win on the merits, you try to win by saying "boo." These are scare tactics, pure and simple.

Citizenship is already a requirement under the law to register to vote in this country. This bill that we are dealing with now in three specific places says citizenship is required.

All of the ways we have of registering in this country today, including the three techniques contained in this bill which are in practice in the States at this very time, deal with effectively assuring that people must be citizens.

The idea that you need certification, that you need quadruplicate statements of citizenship is absurd on its face. This is an effort to simply oppose the bill, pure and simple, no other reason.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, over the years, every time this Chamber has tried to knock down legal barriers to voter registration, over the years, every time State legislative bodies have tried to knock down barriers to voter registration, every year when courageous citizens like JOHN LEWIS and others have tried to knock down barriers to voter registration, opponents raise the shadowy specter of fraud. That is a red herring. There is already a screening process in place, and 28 States have, most of them have the components of this motor-voter bill.

Whenever there are attempts at fraud, it is through transportation, through counting of the ballots, through computer programming, not through individual voters voting that are not allowed to vote. And this bill would not be supported by the likes of the ABA, the League of Women Voters, the Secretaries of State of both parties, most Secretaries of State, if there were any possibilities of fraud.

The Republican attitude in this is wrong. We have to move forward and pass voter registration.

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

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is not 1900, it is not the 1930's, it is not 1965. For those of you who have not checked your calendar, it is 1993.

I can go back and look at the records of my State legislature and find the same reasons basically that were given for the Jim Crow laws that were enacted back in the early part of this century. Those proponents of this motion to recommit know just as well as the rest of us know that this is an attempt to gut the bill, this is an attempt to deny honest American citizens the right to vote, to participate in the democratic process.

I urge Members to vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I just sometimes wonder why anyone would oppose a bill as straightforward, as simple, and as tried and true as this, and I can come to only one conclusion. There are simply people in this world who would oppose the dawn because it would change the night. There are people here who want to keep the darkness. They cannot let go of the darkness.

I think, however, most Members here today are going to want to make registration for American citizens easier. I think most Members here today will welcome the dawn.

I urge Members to vote against this motion to recommit, and I urge them to vote for the legislation.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. 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 166, nays 253, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—166

Allard	Camp	Fish
Armey	Canady	Fowler
Bachus (AL)	Castle	Franks (CT)
Baker (CA)	Clinger	Franks (NJ)
Baker (LA)	Coble	Galleghy
Ballenger	Collins (GA)	Gallo
Barrett (NE)	Combest	Gekas
Bartlett	Cox	Gilchrist
Bateman	Crane	Gillmor
Bentley	Crapo	Gilman
Bereuter	Cunningham	Gingrich
Bilirakis	DeLay	Goodlatte
Bliley	Dickey	Goodling
Blute	Doolittle	Goss
Boehlert	Dornan	Grams
Boehner	Dreier	Grandy
Bonilla	Duncan	Greenwood
Bunning	Dunn	Gunderson
Burton	Emerson	Hancock
Buyer	Everett	Hansen
Callahan	Ewing	Hastert
Calvert	Fawell	Hefley

Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum

McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton

Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—253

Ackerman	Durbin	Kreidler
Andrews (ME)	Edwards (CA)	LaFalce
Andrews (TX)	Edwards (TX)	Lambert
Applegate	Engel	Lancaster
Bacchus (FL)	English (AZ)	Lantos
Baessler	English (OK)	LaRocco
Barcia	Eshoo	Lehman
Barlow	Evans	Levin
Barrett (WI)	Fazio	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Fields (LA)	Lipinski
Beilenson	Filner	Lloyd
Berman	Fingerhut	Long
Bevill	Flake	Lowey
Bilbray	Foglietta	Maloney
Bishop	Ford (MI)	Mann
Blackwell	Frank (MA)	Manton
Bonior	Frost	Margolies-
Borski	Furse	Mezvinsky
Boucher	Gejdenson	Markey
Brewster	Gephardt	Martinez
Brooks	Geren	Matsui
Browder	Gibbons	Mazzoli
Brown (CA)	Glickman	McCloskey
Brown (FL)	Gonzalez	McCurdy
Brown (OH)	Gordon	McDermott
Bryant	Green	McHale
Byrne	Gutierrez	McKinney
Cantwell	Hall (OH)	McNulty
Cardin	Hall (TX)	Meehan
Carr	Hamburg	Meek
Chapman	Hamilton	Menendez
Clay	Harman	Mfume
Clayton	Hastings	Miller (CA)
Clement	Hayes	Mineta
Clyburn	Hefner	Minge
Coleman	Hilliard	Mink
Collins (IL)	Hinchey	Moakley
Collins (MI)	Hoagland	Mollohan
Condit	Hochbrueckner	Montgomery
Conyers	Holden	Moran
Cooper	Hoyer	Morella
Coppersmith	Hughes	Murphy
Costello	Hutto	Murtha
Coyne	Inslee	Nadler
Cramer	Jacobs	Natcher
Danner	Jefferson	Neal (MA)
Darden	Johnson (GA)	Neal (NC)
de la Garza	Johnson (SD)	Oberstar
Deal	Johnson, E.B.	Obey
DeFazio	Johnston	Olver
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Ortiz
Dellums	Kaptur	Orton
Derrick	Kennedy	Owens
Deutsch	Kennelly	Pallone
Diaz-Balart	Kildee	Parker
Dicks	Kleczka	Pastor
Dingell	Klein	Payne (NJ)
Dixon	Klink	Payne (VA)
Dooley	Kopetski	Pelosi

Penny	Schroeder	Thurman	Gutierrez	McDermott	Santorum	Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Stenholm
Peterson (FL)	Schumer	Torres	Hall (OH)	McHale	Sarpalius	Molinari	Roth	Stump
Peterson (MN)	Scott	Torricelli	Hall (TX)	McKinney	Sawyer	Moorhead	Roukema	Sundquist
Pickett	Serrano	Towns	Hamburg	McNulty	Schenk	Myers	Rowland	Talent
Pickle	Sharp	Traficant	Hamilton	Meehan	Schroeder	Nussle	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Pomeroy	Shepherd	Tucker	Harman	Meek	Schumer	Oxley	Saxton	Thomas (CA)
Poshard	Sisisky	Unsoeld	Hastings	Menendez	Scott	Packard	Schaefer	Thomas (WY)
Price (NC)	Skaggs	Valentine	Hayes	Meyers	Serrano	Paxon	Schiff	Torkildsen
Rahall	Skelton	Velázquez	Hefner	Mfume	Sharp	Petri	Sensenbrenner	Valentine
Rangel	Slattery	Vento	Hilliard	Miller (CA)	Shays	Pickett	Shaw	Visclosky
Reed	Slaughter	Visclosky	Hinchey	Mineta	Shepherd	Pombo	Shuster	Vucanovich
Reynolds	Smith (IA)	Volkmmer	Hoagland	Minge	Sisisky	Porter	Skeen	Walker
Richardson	Spratt	Washington	Hochbrueckner	Mink	Skaggs	Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Weidon
Roemer	Stark	Waters	Holden	Moakley	Skelton	Quinn	Smith (OR)	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Stenholm	Watt	Hoyer	Mollohan	Slattery	Ravenel	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Rose	Stokes	Waxman	Hughes	Montgomery	Slaughter	Regula	Snowe	Young (FL)
Rostenkowski	Strickland	Wheat	Inslee	Moran	Smith (IA)	Ridge	Solomon	Zeliff
Rowland	Stupak	Whitten	Jacobs	Morella	Smith (NJ)	Roberts	Spence	
Roybal-Allard	Swett	Williams	Jefferson	Murphy	Spratt	Rogers	Stearns	
Rush	Swift	Wilson	Johnson (GA)	Murtha	Stark			
Sabo	Synar	Wise	Johnson (SD)	Nadler	Stokes			
Sanders	Tanner	Woolsey	Johnson, E. B.	Natcher	Strickland			
Sangmeister	Tauzin	Wyden	Johnston	Neal (MA)	Stupak			
Sarpalius	Taylor (MS)	Wynn	Kanjorski	Neal (NC)	Swett			
Sawyer	Tejeda	Yates	Kaptur	Oberstar	Swift			
Schenk	Thornton		Kennedy	Obey	Synar			
			Kennelly	Oliver	Tanner			
			Kildee	Ortiz	Tauzin			
			Kleczka	Orton	Taylor (MS)			
			Klein	Owens	Tejeda			
			Klink	Pallone	Thornton			
			Klug	Parker	Thurman			
			Kopetski	Pastor	Torres			
			Kreidler	Payne (NJ)	Torricelli			
			LaFalce	Payne (VA)	Towns			
			Lambert	Pelosi	Traficant			
			Lancaster	Penny	Tucker			
			Lantos	Peterson (FL)	Unsoeld			
			LaRocco	Peterson (MN)	Upton			
			Leach	Pickle	Velazquez			
			Lefman	Pomeroy	Vento			
			Levin	Poshard	Volkmer			
			Lewis (GA)	Price (NC)	Walsh			
			Lloyd	Rahall	Washington			
			Lowey	Ramstad	Waters			
			Machtley	Rangel	Watt			
			Maloney	Reed	Waxman			
			Mann	Reynolds	Wheat			
			Manton	Richardson	Whitten			
			Margolies-	Roemer	Williams			
			Mezvinsky	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson			
			Markey	Rose	Wise			
			Martinez	Rostenkowski	Woolsey			
			Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Wyden			
			Mazzoli	Rush	Wynn			
			McCloskey	Sabo	Yates			
			McCurdy	Sanders	Zimmer			
				Sangmeister				

NOT VOTING—11

Abercrombie	Fields (TX)	Laughlin
Andrews (NJ)	Ford (TN)	Quillen
Archer	Henry	Studds
Barton	Johnson (CT)	

□ 1658

Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. BREWSTER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BAKER of California changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on final passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 259, noes 160, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

AYES—259

Abercrombie	Carr	Edwards (TX)
Ackerman	Chapman	Engel
Andrews (ME)	Clay	English (AZ)
Andrews (NJ)	Clayton	English (OK)
Andrews (TX)	Clement	Eshoo
Applegate	Clyburn	Evans
Bacchus (FL)	Coleman	Fazio
Baesler	Collins (IL)	Fields (LA)
Barcia	Collins (MI)	Filner
Barlow	Conyers	Fingerhut
Barrett (WI)	Cooper	Fish
Becerra	Coppersmith	Flake
Berman	Costello	Foglietta
Bilbray	Coyne	Ford (MI)
Bilirakis	Danner	Frank (MA)
Bishop	Darden	Franks (NJ)
Blackwell	de la Garza	Frost
Boehlert	DeFazio	Furse
Bonior	DeLauro	Gejdenson
Borski	Dellums	Gephardt
Boucher	Derrick	Geren
Brooks	Deutsch	Gibbons
Brown (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Gilchrest
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Gilman
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Glickman
Bryant	Dixon	Gonzalez
Byrne	Dooley	Gordon
Cantwell	Durbin	Green
Cardin	Edwards (CA)	Gunderson

Allard	Crapo	Huffington
Armey	Cunningham	Hunter
Bachus (AL)	Deal	Hutchinson
Baker (CA)	DeLay	Hutto
Baker (LA)	Dickey	Hyde
Ballenger	Doolittle	Inglis
Barrett (NE)	Dornan	Inhofe
Bartlett	Dreier	Istook
Bateman	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Bellenson	Emerson	Kasich
Bentley	Everett	Kim
Bereuter	Ewing	King
Bevill	Fawell	Kingston
Bliley	Fowler	Knollenberg
Blute	Franks (CT)	Kolbe
Boehner	Gallely	Kyl
Bonilla	Gallo	Lazio
Brewster	Gekas	Levy
Browder	Gingrich	Lewis (CA)
Bunning	Goodlatte	Lewis (FL)
Burton	Goodling	Lightfoot
Buyer	Goss	Linder
Callahan	Grams	Lipinski
Calvert	Grandy	Livingston
Camp	Greenwood	Manzullo
Canady	Hancock	McCandless
Castle	Hansen	McCollum
Clinger	Hastert	McCreary
Coble	Hefley	McDade
Collins (GA)	Herger	McHugh
Combest	Hobson	McInnis
Condit	Hoekstra	McKeon
Cox	Hoke	McMillan
Cramer	Horn	Mica
Crane	Houghton	Michel

NOES—160

Huffington	Archer	Laughlin
Hunter	Barton	Quillen
Hutchinson	Dunn	Studds
Hutto	Fields (TX)	
Hyde		
Inglis		
Inhofe		
Istook		
Johnson, Sam		
Kasich		
Kim		
King		
Kingston		
Knollenberg		
Kolbe		
Kyl		
Lazio		
Levy		
Lewis (CA)		
Lewis (FL)		
Lightfoot		
Linder		
Lipinski		
Livingston		
Manzullo		
McCandless		
McCollum		
McCreary		
McDade		
McHugh		
McInnis		
McKeon		
McMillan		
Mica		
Michel		

NOT VOTING—11

Archer	Ford (TN)	Laughlin
Barton	Gillmor	Quillen
Dunn	Henry	Studds
Fields (TX)	Johnson (CT)	

□ 1719

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Studds for, with Mr. Archer against.
Mr. Laughlin for, with Mr. Barton of Texas against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1720

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 2, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote 26, I was in the Chamber and had thought that I had voted. But my vote went unrecorded due to an apparent mechanical failure in the electronic voting system. Had my vote been recorded, it would have reflected a "nay" vote on the final passage of H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 688

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 688.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of the day and the week.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Obviously the bill that we have been working on has been completed. There will not be a need for more votes with regard to that legislation. We will now try to move to special orders while we await the Senate's completion of the family and medical leave legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would inform Members that we will try to give 30-minutes notice by the whip system and the Cloakrooms on both sides prior to the resumption of legislative business. It is very hard to give Members a concrete estimate as to when we think this could happen, but it should happen in a few hours, I would say 7 or 8 o'clock. It might be a good thing to think that that is when this might happen. Obviously, we will then take up the rule that will allow us to complete work on that legislation.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman expand upon that a moment on the kind of rule that would be necessary to proceed?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is obvious the Committee on Rules will have to meet and deliberate on the content of the rule that will be used to consider this Senate bill.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I might just point out to the Members that the Committee on Rules did meet and produce a rule which is live out here on the floor right now which waives the two-thirds rule, in other words, the two-thirds vote for a rule to be brought up the same day. That is a very controversial issue.

Mr. Speaker, just so the Members know, as well as those Members that might be at the White House for dinner now, there will probably be a somewhat extended debate on that first rule. So Members can factor that into their time as far as being back here for the first rollcall vote.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire of the distinguished majority leader then after that has been concluded, assuming it is sometime tonight, then where are we and what is the schedule for the balance of this evening or tomorrow?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is no further business once that is completed. There will be no business tomorrow. Then we would return after

the recess on the 16th of February, which is Tuesday.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader, there is a rumor on the floor to the extent that the Senate might, if the gays in the military amendment goes down, take our legislation and pass it, which would mean that there would be no need for any additional votes tonight. Is that a realistic possibility?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the best information we have is they intend to take our number, but add their substance, which would require us to come back here, unfortunately.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 300

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from cosponsorship of H.R. 300.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION AS MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 68) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 68

Resolved, That Representative Schiff of New Mexico, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHEDULE REGARDING H.R. 670, FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify Members regarding the Rules Committee's plans for H.R. 670, the Family Planning Amendments Act of 1993.

The Energy and Commerce Committee is meeting today to mark up the bill. The Rules Committee is planning to meet on H.R. 670 the week of February 15, 1993, to take testimony and grant a rule. In order to assure timely consideration of the bill on the floor, the Rules Committee is considering a rule that may limit the offering of amendments.

Any Member who is contemplating an amendment to H.R. 670 should sub-

mit, to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation of the amendment no later than 12 noon on Tuesday, February 16, 1993.

We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 670.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDERS AND REQUESTS FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my special order for 60 minutes on the following dates: February 4, 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, and ask permission to address the House for 5 minutes on these dates.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO TABLE CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to table the following resolutions: House Resolution 18, House Resolution 19, House Resolution 23, and House Resolution 30.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask my good chairman, are these the four resolutions dealing with the individual re-authorizations for the select committees that have not been acted on on the floor as yet?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is seeking to table those four resolutions?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we certainly have no objection, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY]?

There was no objection.

□ 1230

VOTE AGAINST THE NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to discuss with my colleagues the National Voter Registration Act and to ask them to vote against this piece of legislation though I am quite sure my plea will fall on deaf ears.

The National Voter Registration Act invites serious voter fraud. It mandates registration without verification and it will seriously restrict the ability of the county clerks in my State to keep their voter lists up to date.

Just last week the Democratic administration pledged to the Nation's Governors who were in town that they would look after their interests. If this is a serious commitment, the President should veto this legislation which contains an unfunded mandate. This bill will cost the taxpayers of Illinois over \$30 million next year, and \$3 million the year thereafter, and that is because Congress refuses to put money where its mandate is. It is reasonable to expect that the funds to pay these costs will come out of our Illinois budget for education, children and family services, and other important State programs.

The National Voter Registration Act is an unfunded mandate on States and one which will invite election fraud. I urge you to listen to the message that our voters back home are sending to Washington and vote "no" on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD copies of letters from the Governor of the State of Illinois and two members of the State board of elections of the State of Illinois, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, IL, February 2, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS W. EWING,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EWING: The House this week is scheduled to consider H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act commonly known as the "motor-voter" bill. I am opposed to this legislation and I urge you to vote against it.

The motor-voter bill will require a massive statewide voter registration program at all state offices without providing for the administrative costs of this service. It will, however, increase the waiting time for all applicants for state services, including those applying for unemployment compensation and driver's licenses, as well as contribute significantly to voter fraud in the state. In addition, the Federal Election Commission suggests that registration requirements have no significant effect on participation rates. Voters are motivated by candidates and issues, not by mandating yet another method of voter registration.

H.R. 2 is simply another unfunded federal mandate that places administrative costs and burdens on the state and taxpayers of Illinois while contributing to delays for state services and increasing the risks of voter fraud. For these reasons I oppose H.R. 2, the National Voter Registration Act, and I urge you to vote against this legislation as it comes before the House.

Sincerely,

JIM EDGAR,
Governor.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
January 26, 1993.

Re National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (H.R. 2).

Hon. THOMAS W. EWING,
House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EWING: Last week Congressman Henry Hyde requested that I send him information on how HR2 might affect Illinois. Enclosed for our information is a copy of my response to him along with copies of the other information he requested.

Please note that the members of the State Board of Elections, a bipartisan board, unanimously voted to let it be known that they share the concerns expressed in my letter to Congressman Hyde. However, if the relaxation of registration procedures required by HR2 is counterbalanced by vote fraud preventative measures as outlined in my letter, then HR2 deserves passage.

Sincerely,

THERESA M. PETRONE,
Member.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
January 25, 1993.

Hon. HENRY HYDE,
House of Representatives, Rayburn Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HYDE: In response to our phone conversation I am enclosing copies of letters and testimony in opposition to the implementation requirements included in the proposed National Registration Acts of 1989 and 1991. Many of these implementation requirements remain unchanged in the proposed National Registration Act of 1993, HR2. In my opinion these implementation requirements will place an unnecessary financial burden on the states when many can least afford it and will greatly increase the potential for vote fraud.

Without a doubt I believe that the intent of this proposed legislation to increase voter participation is commendable. Though voter participation greatly increased in the last election, it remains a serious problem. Certainly voter registration should not in any way impose unnecessary barriers to voting. Likewise, methods of increasing opportunities for voter registration should not increase the potential of vote fraud and must be administratively feasible.

Illinois has problems in implementing this legislation which may be unique. Our past reputation for vote fraud, deserved or not, has caused us to establish procedures which ensure the integrity of the electoral process and which we would be most reluctant to eliminate. This proposed federal legislation challenges these procedures.

Under current Illinois law, a registrant's address is verified by mail. Due to the configuration of the state and the requirements of this proposed legislation, this verification process may have to be eliminated. The reasons for this are discussed in the enclosed letter of July 19, 1991 to Senator Robert Dole. The alternative is to develop a network for registration across the state. The estimated cost of such a computer network is approximately \$40,000,000. A breakdown of these costs is attached to the letter of May 31, 1989 to Senator Dole.

Current Illinois law also provides for a signature verification process in the polling place. A second copy of the registration card bearing a verified signature is used for this purpose. The universal registration card provided for in the proposed legislation and the

mail registration most likely will eliminate the second copy of the registration card and the verified signature. I realize that few states require signature verification by the pollworkers as they are not handwriting experts. However, experts or not, I believe that signature verification by anyone is a psychological deterrent to vote fraud. Technology is in place to allow Illinois to retain signature verification with this federal legislation. Such a signature retrieval system is estimated to cost approximately \$12,000,000.

The potential for vote fraud may also be increased by the automatic registration of any person applying for a driver's license or for assistance at a designated agency with the purging restrictions. For example, if HR2 becomes law in its present form, a citizen who applies for a renewal of a driver's license, public assistance and food stamps would automatically be registered to vote three times through no action of his own. If this person signs his name John Doe, John J. Doe and J.J. Doe, under the provisions of this legislation, these three registrations would remain on the official list of eligible voters for a period anywhere from two to almost four years. These multiple registrations would greatly increase the potential for vote fraud.

Many of the provisions in HR2 have been debated in the Illinois General Assembly and rejected. As a firm believer that each state understands best how to facilitate its electoral process, I must oppose many of the implementation requirements in this bill. At a minimum, HR2 should be amended in the following ways:

(1) To change the effective date to 1997 or at a minimum to 1996 to allow Illinois sufficient time to determine how best to implement the legislation and retain the integrity of the electoral process;

(2) To require the individual to indicate his desire to be registered to vote rather than have it be automatic unless he indicates otherwise in writing;

(3) To provide adequate federal funding according to the needs of the states; and

(4) To specifically provide that the State election officer may screen for duplicate registration and purge all but the most recent.

In conclusion, if the relaxation of registration procedures is counterbalanced by the potential vote fraud preventative measures outlined above then HR2 deserves passage.

If I can provide any further input or assistance to you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

THERESA M. PETRONE,
Member.

P.S. I have served as the chief electoral officer of the State of Illinois as well as the vice chairman of the Illinois State Board of Elections. Having been appointed to the State Board of Elections after it was re-organized in 1977, I am currently a Board member and legislative liaison to Federal, State and local governmental units.

I've been deeply involved over the years in investigating and researching the administrative consequences resulting from the concepts reflected in HR2.

Today, Monday, January 25, the State Board of Elections met in Chicago and unanimously approved the following:

Resolved, That the Illinois State Board of Elections share the concerns set out at page two, paragraph (1)-(4) of Board Member Petrone's letter to Congressman Hyde.

ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the plight of the thousands of Americans displaced because of defense cuts across this Nation and to introduce the Defense Economic Reinvestment Act of 1993, designed to play a critical role in assisting these workers.

Our national security needs have changed dramatically in recent years. We have begun to reduce the immense level of resources dedicated to our national security and, by all indications, will continue to do so in coming years. Because of these changes, we have a historic opportunity to restructure our budgetary priorities. Hopefully, domestic challenges which have gone unanswered will benefit from defense savings.

However, there is a dramatic and upsetting downside to this reorganization of our budgetary priorities. Around the country thousands of highly skilled defense workers are being displaced because of the defense drawdown. We cannot afford to simply cast these workers aside. We would be selling the country short by not taking steps to take advantage of the skills and knowledge they possess.

The ramifications of a defense drawdown are not limited to one region or one political party. From Connecticut to California, Democratic and Republican Members of Congress are witnessing too many of their constituents being put out on the street. That these workers are being let go because of their success and not their failure is not only ironic, but sad. The weapons, planes, and supplies built by these workers played a critical role in winning the cold war and pushing Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. Credit for the many impressive displays put on by the U.S. military goes not only to the brave men and women of our armed services, but to the men and women who constructed the weapons used in defense of the Nation.

For these reasons, I am introducing the Defense Economic Reinvestment Act of 1993, which is similar to legislation I introduced last Congress. I am proud to say that several provisions from that legislation were induced in the comprehensive economic adjustment package approved at the end of the 102d Congress and signed into law by former President Bush.

Last year, \$1.7 billion in economic adjustment assistance was appropriated for those impacted by defense cuts as appropriated. I am very proud of the effort put forth by Congress on this issue last year. However, with an administration in support of efforts on this front, rather than blocking the way, I hope that package will be only the beginning. The process started last year is far too important to be abandoned by the 103d Congress.

The Defense Economic Reinvestment Act of 1993 contains three main sections. Each section attends specifically to the needs of workers, communities, and defense industry, respectively. I would like to briefly summarize each of these sections and submit a longer summary for the RECORD.

Title I of this bill deals directly with the needs of displaced defense workers, for they are the ones most immediately hurt by defense layoffs. Included is a provision providing incentives for companies to hire displaced defense workers. Designed to fill the job vacuum left by downsizing defense firms, I hope this incentive will attract new industry to impacted areas. Title I also allows States to use Federal unemployment funds to create reemployment assistance programs, including job counseling, job search, relocation assistance, and retraining. Funding would also be provided for the retraining of displaced engineers as environmental engineers and the enhancement of existing skills in areas of projected employment growth areas.

Title II focuses on communities hard-hit by defense cuts. A \$1 billion grant assistance program, the defense economic development block grant [DEFBG], would be established for defense distressed areas. This money could be distributed within the community to assist in the difficult transition away from a defense dependent economy. I have also called for the Secretary of Defense to establish a loan guarantee program for major defense contractors designed to assist in the conversion of defense-related equipment to nondefense uses. Hopefully, this will encourage firms to undertake alternative activities they may not otherwise be able to sustain, thus preserving jobs.

Title III of this legislation is aimed at our Nation's technology and industrial base. Five hundred million dollars would be authorized for the research, development and application of alternative technologies in specified fields. Activities under this provision will be conducted by appropriately qualified institutes of higher education. My legislation also calls for resources to establish or assist environmental entrepreneurial centers aimed at transferring defense related to growth sectors of the environmental field. Finally, this legislation calls for each State to carry out a survey of its manufacturing firms. Hopefully, this information can strengthen the competitiveness of U.S. manufacturing, a key part of our economy.

We are at an important time in our Nation's history. We simply cannot allow our highly skilled workers to be treated recklessly. This legislation provides a safety net designed to break the fall of displaced workers. I hope you will join me in standing up for the well-being of defense workers and easing their transition to a new world.

□ 1730

CORRECTING THE CENSUS UNDERCOUNT

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, our new President has repeatedly spoken about fairness and sharing the burden and sacrifice. I hope that he means that he is going to help us correct the census undercount and the horribly unfair conditions it imposes on growth States. And we have many growth States in our country, and that means we have much unfairness because of this undercounting.

My State, Florida, for instance, faces a very severe undercount, over 260,000 individuals. That is a lot of folks, and it translates into a dollar loss of somewhere between \$12 million and \$15 million in Federal funding. And that is a lot of money.

These are not just numbers. Today there are more than a quarter of a million mothers and children under the poverty line in Florida who cannot qualify for Medicaid. There are 6,600 persons with developmental disabilities waiting for services that the State of Florida cannot provide. And worse, we have an infant mortality rate higher than most industrialized nations. That is a shameful report card.

Most people love to come to Florida. In fact, most people love Florida. It is a fabulous spot. We have a wonderful climate, nice living conditions and nice people in Florida. And people should love Florida because we are a megadonor State. We are giving much more money to the Federal Treasury than we are receiving back in services from the Federal Government. So Florida is certainly doing its job, and I do not think anybody can accuse a Member from Florida of being parochial when they ask that the census undercount be made true so that we get our fair share.

State budgets across the country are in tough shape. We all know that. But Florida's dismal 75-cent return on every dollar that its taxpayers invest in this Government is clearly an undue burden and one that most people in the United States of America are not sharing and, in fact, one that many are profiting from.

The refusal of the Census Bureau to use updated figures, which was announced conveniently over the Christmas break, when none of us was in town, is clearly another reason why we would like this matter reviewed. The fact that they have come up with bad information, reviewed it and then said, "We understand there is a mistake but we are not going to correct the mistake," seems to me to be an additional insult not only to the people of Florida but to the sense of fair play. And if

there is anything that is peculiarly unique about Americans, it is that we have a sense of fair play.

I think right now that we have got a situation on our hands that with 43 million annual visitors coming to the State of Florida, think of that, 43 million people coming each year to visit Florida and enjoy it, and every day 654 new residents, every day we have to make room for 654 new residents and provide them services that they expect and have reason to expect, there is no doubt that the situation is going to get worse. And it is going to get proportionately worse every day this undercounting continues.

Now, of course, there is a median opportunity to correct that undercount in a few years, but we all know that it will go until the census 10 years from now. So this problem is going to become geometrically worse every day for the next 10 years for the people of Florida and for other growth States where this undercounting situation exists.

I urge my colleagues, I urge the President of the United States, for the sake of equal treatment, to support fair share legislation in census counting.

Bills have been filed. I hope that the chairman involved will have the wisdom and the vision and the sense of fair play to give those bills a hearing and to speed them to a successful conclusion so that when we get accurate information, we can actually apply it.

GENDER EQUITY IN SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is National Girls and Women in Sports Day. I want to take a few moments to talk about the ongoing effort to assure that women and girls athletes are provided the same opportunities given to men and boys.

When I attended the annual NCAA convention last month, there were a chorus of suggestions that gender equity, or the equal opportunities for women collegiate athletes, will somehow diminish men's athletic programs, particularly football.

Such arguments remind me of the opposition 30 years ago against the passage of fair employment laws on the grounds that such laws would mean fewer jobs for white men.

Civil rights opponents were wrong then and those who will argue that a fair share of sports scholarships and funding for women sports programs will mean less for men are wrong now.

The guardians of football and men's basketball are not standing in the doorways of colleges and universities, but they are circling the wagons and talking about, "wait until next year" for equal treatment of women athletes.

It has been over 20 years since the gender equity law was enacted and we shouldn't have to wait any longer for it to be fully enforced. Women athletics have been a part of the NCAA for 10 years.

Last April NCAA executive director, Dick Schultz, in testimony before the Energy Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness testified that gender equity, or the equal treatment of women in college sports, would be put on the association's front burner. But 2 months later, Schultz was quoted in USA Today saying, the NCAA "shouldn't try to rush" to adopt gender equity rules this year.

I attended the NCAA convention knowing that gender equity was not scheduled to be a major topic of discussion, but I wanted to get a personal sense of how serious the association is about eliminating unequal treatment of women in college athletics.

What I found in Dallas, to my disappointment, was a large degree of anger and paranoia from football zealots. Gender equity was not only not on the agenda, but it was apparently not in the hearts of the predominately male delegates. In a recent survey, 26 percent of the division I-A football coaches named gender equity as the No. 1 problem facing football. Even Mr. Schultz expressed concern that football has become a target for some regarding gender equity.

Football is not the target. Equal treatment of women in college and university athletic programs is the target. Is that asking too much when only 20 percent of the average athletic department operations budget of \$1.31 million is spent on women's athletics. When only 48 percent of women's teams are coached by women while 99 percent of men's teams have male coaches. When division I-A schools, where football is king, spend on average twice as much for men's coaching salaries as for women—\$396,791 versus \$206,106.

Don't get me wrong. Football and men's basketball are wonderful sports that I enjoy watching. I have never advocated making football the sacrificial lamb for gender equity. By the same token, football is not the automatic cash cow that some would have you believe. Football programs often lose money and they are subsidized by student fees from women as well as men.

We should not forget that gender equity or equal treatment of women athletes is the law. Under title IX of the Education Amendments of the 1972 Civil Rights Act, schools that do not grant equal access to sports opportunities for both sexes can lose Federal funds.

In the past year, I have held hearings to examine why title IX has not been adequately enforced, I plan to hold further hearings and to consider a bill to have enforcement of title IX taken

from the Department of Education and put in the Department of Justice to perhaps get a more vigorous prosecution of title IX violators.

I am hopeful that the new administration will do a better job of enforcing title IX than past two administrations, but it may still be necessary for Congress to play a more active role in seeing that title IX is enforced.

The NCAA has made no secret of its feelings that Congress should not butt into the business of collegiate sports. Rather than worry about Congress taking steps to ensure that Federal laws such as title IX are obeyed, college presidents should stop dragging their feet when it comes to eliminating sex discrimination in intercollegiate sports. If that does not happen, rest assured, Congress will take the necessary steps to see that women athletes are treated the same as men.

□ 1740

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SLAUGHTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, last month, Japan finished shipping a ton of plutonium halfway around the world from France to use in its breeder reactor program. Thankfully, the cargo arrived safely, this time. Neither the ship nor the plutonium had adequate physical protection against accident or attack. But the real threat remains the long-term risks and precedents of bringing so much plutonium into circulation. A ton of plutonium is enough material to make nearly 200 nuclear warheads and there will be 30 more shipments like it over the next 20 years.

While Japan has very real energy security needs, there are other, safer, and less costly energy alternatives than using plutonium in breeder reactors. Stockpiling uranium, currently at historically low prices, is one.

But there is an alternative version for Japan. For nearly 50 years, the United States and Japan stood together as close allies in the cold war struggle. But now that the cold war is over and the Soviet Union disbanded, our relationship threatens to degenerate into endless quarrels over semiconductors and minivans. In this time of global uncertainty, the United States and Japan could once again join together to take on the new strategic challenge of combating nuclear proliferation.

As a nonnuclear weapon state with a strong nonproliferation record and the only country ever to suffer a nuclear attack, Japan has the credibility and the moral leadership to achieve real improvements in the nonproliferation regime. Tokyo could take the first step in offering to end its plutonium breeder reactor program. It could then join the

United States in asking the rest of the world to adopt these nonproliferation and disarmament reforms:

A comprehensive test ban;
Enhanced disarmament assistance to the former Soviet Union;

Stricter IAEA safeguards and inspections;

Multilaterally enforced nuclear and dual-use export controls, backed up with sanctions imposed by the U.N. Security Council;

A worldwide ban on producing or using plutonium or highly enriched uranium for military or civilian purposes; and

Step-by-step reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the United States, Russia, France, China, and Britain and, eventually, the threshold nuclear states.

These are all realistic measures, many of which have already been endorsed by the Congress and President Clinton.

In 1995, the Non-Proliferation Treaty is up for review and extension. That year also marks the 50th anniversary of the United Nations and the end of World War II, and the 50th commemoration of the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. If Japan is willing, an international conference could be held in 1995, perhaps in Hiroshima or Nagasaki, to begin implementing these initiatives as the first step toward a nuclear free world.

To help promote this discussion and encourage the new administration to consider this approach, I have introduced the United States-Japan Partnership Act of 1993. The bill's text follows below.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States-Japan Partnership Act of 1993."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1968 calls for an end to the nuclear arms race and an abolition of all nuclear weapons at an early date;

(2) pursuing a policy of significant and continuous reductions in the nuclear arsenals of all countries will help reduce the likelihood of nuclear proliferation;

(3) with the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, nuclear proliferation is now the leading threat to United States national security;

(4) the revelations of Iraq's clandestine nuclear weapons program demonstrate the necessity of strengthening international measures to prevent nuclear proliferation;

(5) Japan is the only nation that has endured the nightmare of nuclear explosions;

(6) Japan has a consistently strong record of upholding the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1968 and has made important contributions to International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and to addressing proliferation threats through diplomatic initiatives;

(7) 1995 is the 50th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the 50th

remembrance of the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II, and the date for the extension conference for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1968; and

(8) it is appropriate to mark these anniversaries with a rededication to the cause of peace.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES POLICY.

The United States, in consultation with Japan, and other nuclear and nonnuclear weapon states, shall seek to convene a World Nuclear Disarmament Conference in 1995, with the goal of achieving a worldwide, verifiable agreement to phase-out nuclear weapons from the arsenals of all countries, through a long-term, stage-by-stage process. If acceptable to participants, such conference shall be held in whole or in part at sites in Hiroshima and/or Nagasaki. This denuclearization process shall include such steps as—

(1) a verifiable, comprehensive nuclear test ban agreement;

(2) a verifiable, worldwide agreement, to end production of plutonium and highly enriched uranium for weapons purposes, with existing stockpiles put under bilateral or multilateral controls;

(3) phasing out of the use of plutonium and highly enriched uranium for civilian purposes;

(4) strengthening, and greatly expanding international regimes to prevent countries from developing or assisting others to develop nuclear weapons or their components, and strengthening and creating international mechanisms, such as the United Nations Security Council, to enforce these regimes;

(5) significantly increased investment in the research and development of nuclear safeguard and verification methods and technologies; and

(6) phased reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the United States, the Russian Federation, the Peoples Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and, eventually, the nuclear threshold states.

SEC. 4. REPORTS.

(a) By January 1 and July 1 of each year, the President shall report to the Congress on the actions taken to date and the actions planned for the next six months to carry out each of the policies outlined in Section 3.

BASICARE HEALTH ACCESS AND COST CONTROL ACT 1993

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today a bipartisan group of Senators and Members of the House reintroduced the Basicare Health Access and Cost Control Act of 1993. This bill was originally introduced by Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM and myself in March 1992, before the term "managed competition" became a buzzword here on Capitol Hill and in the Presidential election campaign. Now, it is almost all we are talking about with regards to health care reform.

Well, I think it has become pretty clear that whatever our future health care system resembles, it is not going to be a pure market system. There are too many legislators and policy folks who do not trust the market's ability to keep a lid on costs. The President has been

looking for a solution to our health care crisis which combines market-oriented managed competition, global budgets, and some type of universal mandate. The problem is that about as many people trust the notion of a global budget as trust a pure market approach.

The key is to develop a plan with as little Government regulation as possible but with adequate measures to control cost inflation. With the Basicare bill, I believe we have found the answer. This bill is compatible with the managed competition concept. It simplifies the private health insurance market around a single, uniform Basicare benefit package.

All private insurers would be required to sell the Basicare package and all Americans to carry it. Basicare plans would be subject to community rating and other insurance market reforms to protect beneficiaries. Most importantly, the system is located entirely in the private market, encourages integrated networks of care, and requires little Federal regulation. In fact, it would actually mean less regulation than the leading managed competition plan because it does not require insurers and providers to join regional integrated care networks.

At the same time, this bill has a binding cost control mechanism which is simpler, less regulatory, and less unwieldy than a global budget. By placing an annual limit on premium rate increase, the Basicare bill emphasizes efficiency and cost effectiveness. It will be in carriers and providers best interest to form managed care networks and to compete for consumers within the private insurance market. The beauty of this approach is that it provides binding cost control with a minimum of Government regulatory interference in the health care marketplace.

Our purpose in introducing this bill is to create a forum for discussion among Democrats, Republicans, and the administration about managed competition and global budgeting. We have a bill that is compatible with both concepts. In fact, we believe we have the most logical, workable compromise between advocates of pure versions of each approach, and we invite the President and Mrs. Clinton to take a look at our approach as a good way to combine the two. Most importantly, our minds are open, and we are eager to work with anyone interested in developing a rational approach to national health care reform.

STRONG MARITIME POLICY SHOULD BE PART OF ANY ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PICKETT. Madam Speaker, as President Clinton begins work on his economic program to bolster business activity, create jobs, and restore prosperity in our Nation, nowhere is his leadership more urgently needed than in the task of strengthening our domestic maritime industries.

The decline in this important economic sector has been truly staggering.

According to a report published January 6, 1993, by the U.S. Maritime Administration, the number of privately owned, deep draft vessels in the U.S. merchant fleet totaled just 467 in 1992—an incredible figure for a once-pre-eminent maritime power. Fifty years ago, at the end of World War II, there were over 3,000 of these vessels in the U.S. merchant fleet, and more than 100,000 people manning them.

The report documents similar decreases in other areas. There are only three commercial ships on order or under construction in U.S. shipyards, and amazingly, this is better than we were doing throughout much of the 1980's. There are 3,200 fewer oceangoing shipboard jobs than there were 1 year ago. Fewer Americans work as long-shoremen, and shipyard jobs are vanishing so fast they ought to be covered by the Endangered Species Act.

We cannot allow our Nation's maritime industries to continue on their present course. As every war and conflict in modern history has demonstrated, a strong sealift capability is essential to meeting the heavy force deployment requirements of a major contingency. Fully 95 percent of all American troops and supplies must be moved by sea during a conflict. In an emergency, our Nation will depend on existing U.S.-flag cargo ships under charter to the Navy, as well as fast sealift ships; U.S.-flag liners under contract with the government; and vessels from the Ready Reserve Force.

Despite the allies' success in Desert Storm, the Persian Gulf war did reveal the clear limits of our present sealift capability. Largely unnoticed were the shipyards in my district and around the Nation that worked day and night to get an aging and rusting fleet of reserves seaworthy. We had to round up aging and increasingly rare merchant seamen to man those ships. And while all Americans can be proud of what was achieved on such short notice during Desert Storm, there is some doubt about how we would fare in a longer conflict, with a stronger adversary, and less allied support.

Madam Speaker, national security is not the only reason why our maritime industries are important to this Nation. With a strong maritime policy—grounded in trade policies that eliminate the unfair shipbuilding subsidies of our competitors, the United States can put thousands of Americans back to work and reestablish itself as the world's undisputed maritime leader.

More than 3 years ago the National Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense issued a comprehensive report detailing how this Nation could do just that. The report called for tax incentives, a procure and charter program, and other needed measures to revitalize our maritime industries. The Bush administration never sought to have that report implemented. President

Clinton would do well to make it a part of his economic program.

Madam Speaker, the few remaining men and women who work in U.S. shipyards, who man U.S.-flagged vessels, and who are engaged in waterborne commerce, know that America can compete in the maritime trades, if only it can do so fairly. I urge President Clinton to give them that chance by making a stronger maritime policy a centerpiece of the Nation's economic program.

TIME TO PROMOTE U.S. ECONOMIC INTERESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the Bush administration, leading negotiators on the General Agreements on Trade and Tariffs [GATT], in Geneva, pushed the United States for major concessions in order to wrap up the agreement as quickly as possible.

Major concessions requested were on textiles, agriculture, and the acceptance of the Multilateral Trade Organization [MTO]. The European Community demanded a 50-percent cut in the highest U.S. tariffs, but refused to lower their own by an equal percent.

On agriculture, Mr. Mickey Kantor, the new U.S. Trade Representative told the Senate—in confirmation hearings—that the base year for cuts mandated by the agreement might give too much credit to the EC and limit the benefits for U.S. agricultural exporters.

While there has been little coverage of the power of the Multilateral Trade Organization—which would contain the enforcement powers of the GATT—in my opinion, it should be the greatest obstacle to signing on.

The MTO is modeled along the lines of the dispute mechanism in the Canadian Free Trade Agreement, and the yet-to-be-approved North American Free-Trade Agreement. The Canadian model provides for a panel of lawyers representing both Canada and the United States to sit in judgment on any challenges to the agreement.

In the most recent dispute between pork producers in the two countries, a dispute settled in favor of the Canadians, an investigation of the background of the lawyers showed that, with one exception, every one worked for firms that were registered foreign agents of foreign firms or nations, and one of the lawyers representing the American position worked for a firm registered as foreign agents for Canada.

This mechanism bypasses the American courts and can strike any law of the Congress without a possibility of an appeal to the U.S. courts. Another constitutional guarantee struck by this dispute mechanism is the citizen's

right to litigate. According to the rules onto which we signed, industries or companies that wish to challenge unfair trading practices under the Canadian agreement must secure the approval of the Trade Representative, who must file their challenge. Effectively, this gives the Trade Representative the power of both judge and jury to assess damage before allowing the producers to be heard.

And, there is no appeal from the Trade Representative decision.

I am not a constitutional lawyer, but in the sense of understanding the rights of Americans under the Constitution to a day in court, to a hearing before a judge versed in U.S. law and, if necessary, to an appeal from that judge's decision all the way to the Supreme Court if necessary. That right is destroyed by this agreement.

Also, the power granted to the Trade Representative to screen disputes to judge who will be heard and the power granted to a body of trade lawyers, not sworn to uphold the interests of this Government, or its people, 50 percent of them not even trained in American law, this usurpation of the powers of the U.S. courts is extraordinary. And, the most shocking thing to me, is that no hue and cry has been raised anywhere that this already is occurring in the Canadian agreement.

In the case of Canada, we are hammering out disputes with one nation using this mechanism. In the current GATT group there are 105 nations and 112 are in on the current negotiations. If the Multilateral Trade Organization operates as proposed, our regulations and laws can possibly face challenges from any or all of them, they can gang up with charges that a U.S. law is deliberately disruptive of the free flow of goods and services across our borders. At which point, international trade lawyers meet in Geneva to decide the fate of our laws, our regulations, without appeal, without recourse available to American citizens most affected.

To project what possibly will be considered in this international court, already there have been challenges to our standards for asbestos and to our protection of dolphins. Challenges claiming that the only purpose of our laws has been to protect American fishermen and to close markets to Canadian asbestos.

Because we have not signed onto the Multinational Trade Organization, these challenges have been heard in American courts. The dolphins are still protected and the fate of asbestos, to my knowledge, is not yet decided.

The U.S. courts are sworn to uphold U.S. law. International lawyers will be convened to uphold the GATT agreement. I am heartened that the MTO—so far—has been a stumbling block to our capitulation to European demands.

It crosses my mind, considering the numbers of European countries which

are beginning to drag their heels about going full tilt into the European Community, including Switzerland, the home country of Mr. Arthur Dunkel, director-general of GATT, that if Denmark and Switzerland are concerned about losing their sovereignty to the EC, wait until they study the loss of sovereignty to GATT under the Multilateral Trade Organization.

Under the MTO, the developed nations of the world will be offering lesser developed nations or Third World nations the opportunity to attack our standards, whether on food production or manufacturing standards, as being merely a structural impediment, put into place to keep their substandard products from our markets.

World standards for the MTO will be set by the Codex Alimentarius in Rome, a body of scientists working under the United Nations. Currently, the Codex accepts pesticides banned in this Nation and levels of some pesticides much higher than any acceptable either here or in Canada.

These are just a few concerns raised by the specter of such transferences of power to a new world body—the more immediate concern should be the possible loss of jobs if we give up our tariff positions on textiles.

One tends to overlook the fact that if we lower tariffs for Europe, whose production costs are similar to ours, that all of the other nations whose production costs are much lower than ours will get the same treatment.

With all of this push to give up any protection for our markets, we seemingly also overlook the fact that we are giving up protection of the standard of living of our workers. Recall the report on "60 Minutes" a couple of weeks ago about the use of child labor in Bangladesh? Shirts were being purchased wholesale in Bangladesh for \$1, retailed in the United States for \$12, nearly a 1,200 percent markup for the retailer.

Using 12- to 14-year-old children, paying no Social Security, no unemployment compensation, no medical insurance, and obeying no hours laws, no environmental nor safety regulations, the manufacturer could make a profit on a \$1 per piece.

It is the height, or the depth, of some sort of ethical or social policy to support the idea that the American consumer should have the most cheaply produced product, or conversely that a retailer should be able to mark up by 1,200 percent reporting that he is buying the fruits of exploiting children in order to give the American consumer the cheapest product he can get.

One would be more impressed that the retailer really cared about the consumer if his profits were not so bloated.

But back to the point. What of the American worker who once made those shirts? Do we really expect him to be able to compete against the unprotected children? Should we?

Of course not.

We forget that besides raising revenue, the purpose of tariffs was to level the playing field, to protect the domestic worker from unfair competition. Of course, that was before we enshrined the rights of the consumer above all other human rights. Try explaining that to more than one-half million textile workers who have been thrown out of work in the last 10 years.

We have been so obsessed with this consumer-driven economy that we have begun to sacrifice our own people, and with them, our once-vaunted standard of living to buy just one more item, to bloat corporate profits with sky high markups, all the while the standard of living of average Americans continues to fall.

Looking at projected tax increases, the need created, I am convinced, by a shrinking manufacturing base—and the loss of highly skilled jobs, everyone is paying for consuming beyond what we are able to produce for our own needs. It is a situation ripe for a return of inflation and an energy tax will add to that possibility.

I recall the stagflation of the mid-1970's, inflation driven by increased gas and energy prices which when passed on to the consumer dried up discretionary income to purchase the higher priced goods.

We are not condemned to repeat history. We have choices, if we are aware of how the system works and what we must do for our people.

In any negotiations with the European countries on trade, we must always take into account their taxing system. The value added tax [VAT] used by the European nations is a far greater trade barrier than a tariff.

Products exported to Europe are subject to a tax upon arrival. On average, it is 19 percent representing to the Europeans the amount of tax that would have been paid to them had the product been manufactured there. They recoup their losses on letting foreign products in.

Conversely, when a European product is exported, the exporter-manufacturer receives a rebate of approximately the same amount so the VAT offers what is tantamount to a bonus for exporting.

At no point in the trade negotiations with the Europeans have we ever asked them to redress the imbalance of the VAT on our products going in, nor am I aware that we have ever defended our tariffs as a balance to their demand that our producers pay value added taxes.

With a new administration coming in, negotiations on the GATT and the North American Free-Trade Agreement are up in the air. It is hopeful to me reading some of the statements by Mr. Kantor, the new Trade Representative, that he sees many options still open. The Journal of Commerce, January 20, 1993, reported,

When it has to act, the Clinton administration will be more concerned with the reaction of the U.S. voters than of the trading partners.

He promised to support a renewal of the controversial Super 301 provision which requires the U.S. trade representative to single out countries with excessive trade barriers for negotiation and perhaps retaliation.

The Journal quotes Mr. Kantor as saying, "The days when we could afford to subordinate our economic interests to foreign or defense concerns are long past."

I hope so, Mr. Kantor.

□ 1800

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REPEAL THE SECOND AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, last week I reintroduced the resolution to repeal the second amendment. The second amendment is construed to be the amendment which gives everybody the right to own a gun. It is really not the case, because the language talks about the right to maintain a well-organized militia.

A well-organized militia in this day and age should be interpreted as a police department or a National Guard unit. Those who wish to justify the proliferation of guns in our society continue to manufacture guns and sell them as if they were a piece of hardware. Those persons insist on distorting the Constitution and distorting the second amendment, making it appear that the second amendment gives every American the right to own a gun, and anybody who tries to control or regulate guns is automatically considered unpatriotic, or in violation of the Constitution. That is not the case.

The Supreme Court has ruled on several occasions that government has the right to regulate guns and the use of guns in any way it wishes, that the second amendment does not rule out a State government, a city government, or the National Government from regulating guns. But as long as the second amendment is there, there are those who will insist that they have the right and the duty to defend the right to maintain guns for every individual who wants to carry a gun and to minimize the regulation of guns.

Even the very moderate piece of legislation known as the Brady bill, a very conservative, very modest piece of legislation which proposes to do no more than to require that anyone who obtains a gun must wait 7 days, who wants to buy a gun must wait 7 days before they can actually secure the gun, that there must be a period, a waiting period between the time they make the first attempt to purchase a

gun and the time the gun is delivered to them, a simple 7-day waiting period. That has been made an impossibility to pass. That has been impossible in the last few years here in Congress.

So I am aware, as I propose the repeal of the second amendment, that not much is going to happen in that direction for a long time. The repeal of the second amendment, or repeal of any amendment, would take a long process. Congress would have to pass it, of course, with a two-thirds majority, and the States would have to ratify it. It is a long process, but I want to begin the debate now. I want to force those who care about our civilization and the direction our society is taking to look very carefully at this amendment which has led to the proliferation of guns in the American society as in no other industrialized society.

No other industrialized society has such an escalating proliferation of guns. No other industrialized society has the problems related to the proliferation of guns as a result of our allowance of the manufacture and sale of guns as if they were vacuum cleaners or hair dryers, just another piece of hardware. As a result of that, we have an escalating situation with respect to deaths by gunshot, with respect to serious wounds. Violence committed with guns is escalating at a very rapid rate.

Consider for a moment the fact that we have sent detachments of Americans to a nation that has been overrun with citizens who had guns, where guns became the means to settle disputes, the means to govern. Somalia had a complete collapse of civil rule. The society has crumbled. The society has completely been torn apart by men with guns.

You might say that is an extreme example, and how dare you compare that with anything that ever could possibly happen in the United States of America. Well, already in the United States of America, we have some Somalia-syndrome situations. We have some situations that are as bad as Somalia in New York City.

In New York City, there are housing projects, public housing projects, where gunfire is a problem every night, where parents have sawed off the legs of the beds so their kids sleep closer to the floor in case bullets come through the windows, where people are scared to go out in the daylight as well as in the night.

In December, the principal of a local elementary school was murdered in the daytime. He was out looking for a youngster who had left school, and as a result of him being out there, he got caught in the crossfire between some drug racketeers, and he was killed. It is known as the Red Hook Housing Project, and Red Hook Housing Project for the last 10 years has been complaining about the fact that they are terrorized by sporadic gunfire day and night.

And there are other housing developments, and there are some blocks, where there are complaints that there is gunfire frequently.

You might say, well, that is New York City, and there are people in the Congress who would like to depict New York City as something out of this world, a something foreign to the United States. I assure you that the number of people killed by guns, the ratio of the number of victims killed by guns to the total population of New York is not the highest. There are places in the country where the number of victims from gunfire per 1,000 population is far greater than New York City. There are places in rural America where large numbers of incidents are occurring all the time. There are places in suburban America, in our schools.

You know, you have an incident in New York City, and in the schools, and it begins a very dramatic coverage by the press, the TV. It gets national coverage. So, you know, when a youngster is murdered in school, and there was a dramatic incident that took place just outside my district last year at Thomas Jefferson High School. It was just outside my district in terms of geographical boundaries, but the two young people killed were constituents of mine. They lived in my district. That got a lot of publicity, as it should have: Two young men shot down by a third one in a dispute which, if it had taken place 10 years ago, might have been violent but it would have been settled in a way which would not have caused the deaths of two young men as well as ruin the life of a third one, because he is finished after having murdered two of his peers. There is no future for him either.

They might have settled it with fists 20 years ago; 10 years ago they might have settled it with knives. But now you put a gun in the hand of any coward, and that makes him a king. Everybody out there is looking for a gun.

Over the weekend, one of the newspapers, *Newsday*, in New York, ran a story about a youngster who was renting guns. You can rent a gun for \$25 a night, and if you kill somebody, he charges you extra when you bring the gun back. It is \$100, or if you shoot somebody, it is \$100.

You know, we have come to that point, but it is not just New York City. When those two youngsters were killed in New York, and I went to their wake, and just outside the funeral home, I was accosted by a group of young people who asked me, "Congressman OWENS, what are you going to do about it?" You know, I was for a moment not able to answer, because New York State has one of the toughest gun control laws in the country.

□ 1810

New York City has a gun control law which is one of the toughest of any city

in the country. There is not much more in terms of gun control that you can do in New York City or New York State. Yet we have the problem proliferating all the time. So when the young people accosted me and said, "What else are you going to do? Surely there must be something else," the question in my mind is what is it that a Congressman can do at the Federal level?

We are trying to pass this feeble little Brady bill, which would call for people to wait at least 7 days before they can take a gun out of the store. Am I going to tell these young people, "Well, I am fighting for the Brady bill and I am a cosponsor of the Brady bill and I voted for the Brady bill every time it was on the floor, and we cannot get that passed. That is all we are going to do"?

I do not think the Brady bill is the answer. The answer must be far more comprehensive. We must, as a nation, face the threat that guns present to our society. We must determine that the manufacture, sale, distribution of guns must be regulated by the Government from beginning to end. We must determine that the manufacture of guns should not be a profit-making enterprise, the sale of guns should not be like the sale of hardware. We are going to have to come to grips with that and determine now, before our society degenerates any further. Nobody is exempt and no institution is exempt. Let me just give you a concrete example of how the guns go everywhere. In the courts, in a very short period of time we have had a number of incidents where guns have been taken into the courthouse. Recently we had a strike by judges in Dallas, TX. Now, Texas is one of the places where you can freely buy guns. Texas is one of the major sources of guns that flow into New York City and other large east coast cities.

Now, Virginia is a State where most of the guns, the largest percentage of the guns in New York City, come from; that is Virginia. They have been tracked by the U.S. Firearms Bureau. But Texas, a large number come from Texas, too. In Dallas, TX, the judges went on strike because of several incidents that took place in courtrooms and they had not been able to get the kind of protection that they needed, with metal detectors and guards in the court. They went on strike.

Over the past year there have been at least 12 murders in courthouses with guns.

January 1992 a man killed his wife and brother-in-law in a Cleveland family court. This is America.

March 1992 a man fatally stabbed his girlfriend—that was not with a gun.

May 1992 a man shoots his wife to death and wounds lawyers at a divorce hearing in Clayton, MO.

July 1992 a man kills two lawyers and wounds two judges and a prosecutor in a Fort Worth, TX, courtroom.

September 1992 a man fatally shoots former girlfriend in San Bernardino, CA, courthouse.

Friday, January 15—we move from the courthouse and the situation there—we had a situation in New York where an assemblyman recently elected, serving in the New York State Legislature, was accosted while he sat in a barbershop, accosted by a group of young men with guns. He was pistol-whipped, a gun was put to his head and he was robbed. It happened to be his brother's barbershop. That is January 15 of this year, just to give you a run-down on the sampling of the different variety of incidents that do take place. They are everywhere.

Monday, January 20, 1992, and many of you may have seen this on television, a man shot and killed his wife in front of a TV camera; that is, his ex-wife. We have not had an incident like that, I think, since Jack Ruby murdered Lee Harvey Oswald. Now, that was in front of a television camera, man shot and killed his wife on Monday, January 20, 1992.

Tuesday, January 21, at Los Angeles Fairfax High School, a student carrying a gun to school for protection—he felt he had to be protected—accidentally shot two classmates. One of those classmates died.

A 357 magnum was what he was using. It went off accidentally. But he felt he had to have it because he needed protection. One of his classmates died and the other was seriously wounded.

On Wednesday, January 27, in Fort Green, right on the edge of my district, in Brooklyn, NY, a man was shot five times with a machine pistol in full view of the police. It was at a meeting called to discuss the crime situation. Right there in full view of the police outside the meeting, the man was shot five times. Fortunately, he did not die but is in serious condition in the hospital.

On Thursday, January 28, the New York police, as I said before, discovered and revealed the fact that they had closed down a rent-a-gun operation. The rent-a-gun operation was operated by a 16-year-old.

As I said before, you could rent a gun for about \$25 a night, but if you shot somebody before you brought it back, it was extra, \$100, this with a used gun.

On Saturday, January 30, you might have read about this in the paper, in Eustis, FL, two teenagers were charged with murder in a carjacking, rape, and shooting. They abducted the mother, her two daughters age 7 and 3. They drove to an isolated area where they raped the mother. They shot the mother and shot and killed both children. The mother was shot but was, fortunately, able to get help.

Sunday, January 31, in Washington, DC, a 19-year-old boyfriend takes two women and a 3-month-old baby hostage in a 19-hour police standoff. He killed

his girlfriend and he killed her roommate's infant daughter and wounded the other woman before being shot to death by the police.

Monday, February 1, Amityville High School, out in the suburbs on Long Island, not in the big city, an 11th-grader killed another student and wounded a second student as a result of an argument they had.

These are boys in high school, with arguments; one killed, the other shot. The existence of guns transforms the situation that has existed since the beginning of civilization; ever since there have been human beings there have been arguments, there have been conflicts. Young men are very aggressive, they argue, there are conflicts, but the gun introduces a new element. The gun introduces a deadly element from which there is no return. The gun is what I am talking about today.

Our civilization must take steps, we as a legislative body must take steps, to deal with the fact that guns are a very deadly menace to the social order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from New York for bringing this longstanding issue, which has been discussed and deliberated certainly not only by this body but seemingly throughout the country. As the gentleman has distinctly stated, in terms of what happened both in the State of New York and the city of New York, it certainly prompts all of us as Members of this body to devote our full attention concerning the problem of gun control.

As the statement goes, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Perhaps this is one of the areas that we, as a burning issue, as the gentleman well knows, that we have our friends from the National Rifle Association always pressing the issue of a constitutional question of the right to bear arms; there seems to be an ongoing controversy as to why there should be no limitation in allowing the citizens of this great country of ours to bear arms. The gentleman also referred earlier to what is happening in Somalia. I was there recently with our good friend from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and other Members. Even right in the city of Baidoa, where, and the gentleman is absolutely correct, the number of arms that were present throughout the whole country ultimately translates into complete chaos. If it had not been for the recent intervention of military forces of our own country, that we finally brought some sense of order to that country and the problem faced by the people of Somalia.

□ 1820

Mr. OWENS. You know, I have seen many TV presentations and photos of

young people, children, dying in Somalia, older people dying from starvation, and I have certainly been moved as most other people have; but the scene that really hurt me the most and really frightened me the most was a scene on television which depicted the parliament building in Somalia, what is left of the parliament building. It is just one wall with a mural on it and the rest has been bombed and gutted. They have just torn it to pieces.

You talk about the collapse of a civilization, there is nothing more symbolic than to see what has happened to that parliament building, and it is all the result of gun power and the proliferation of weapons in that society.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I really appreciate him bringing this issue again to the forefront. Hopefully in the coming weeks and months with the advent again of the Brady bill that we can provide some stronger measures in terms of how we can best prevent this. It seems to me that prevention seems to be the key word in my mind on how we can best control this very, very serious issue now affecting the lives of the people in our country, and I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this issue for discussion in the Chamber.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. That is what I am here for in memory of all those who have been slain, the mass murders that have taken place.

In a cafeteria, a man killed 20-some people.

In a post office, a man went in to get even with his colleagues for some grievance he had.

Recently another one of those situations where a man took a rifle and came after his colleagues outside the gates of the CIA. They still do not know who it was that murdered two people on a morning when they were on their way to work. This maniac, who under any other circumstances would just have been a maniac on the loose, but with a rifle he became a deadly menace and two people are dead as a result.

On and on it goes, the escalation of it. It is happening more and more.

It might be a surprise to most Americans to know that if you compare the number of people who died in the Vietnam war, about 57,000 people died in the war, compare that to the number of people who were killed by guns in homicide situations, not accidentally, homicides in a 6-year period, 2½ times more people were killed by guns, civilians, 2½ times more Americans than died in the 6-year period in Vietnam.

It is a shocking statistic. Again it is escalating. It gets worse every day. The number of guns in our society is increasing, not arithmetically, but geometrically. There are twice as many guns out there as there were 5 years

ago and the sales are booming. The legal sales are booming and the illegal sales are booming.

As we heard before, there are now people who rent guns.

You cannot solve the problem with one city government taking strong measures or the police in one place taking strong action. You cannot solve the problem with one State of the Union. We do not have boundaries or border police at each State to search cars or trucks as they come in. That is not the solution. It has to be a national solution.

There have been steps taken. The Brady bill is a very conservative moderate step. I am all for the Brady bill. I will vote for the Brady bill. I am a co-sponsor of the Brady bill, but we have to do more.

Senator JOHN CHAFEE of Rhode Island last year introduced a more comprehensive law which would regulate the manufacture and sale of guns. He talked about the Government even offering to buy all the guns out there now that people would sell back. They would buy them to get some of them out of the society in that same law.

A number of people have proposed—I am not alone—a number of people have proposed that the second amendment be repealed so that we can clear the deck philosophically and ideologically and we can get it out of people's minds that there is some kind of right to carry this deadly weapon, that there is some kind of right to have our society move closer and closer to a situation where it may become impossible to retrieve all the guns or to regulate guns because there is going to be such a proliferation that nobody will feel safe without one, that nobody will be safe without one.

We will have to send in the Marines to certain sections of our own country in order to disarm people. It is getting that bad. It is not an exaggeration.

So I am not here because I have some kind of wish to tamper with the Bill of Rights or the second amendment. I am here because I am frightened. I am here because my constituents are frightened. Businessmen are very frightened. They feel that they are totally defenseless against any amateur. There are a lot of amateur crooks, people who would not dare to rob a store if it were not for the gun and they believe that the gun will protect them and that the gun is magic. A lot of amateur crooks, a lot of teen-age crooks, a lot of people normally who would not be out there, store owners and business people, they are out there now.

I am not here because I want to do damage to the Constitution or repeal any amendment for the sake of repeal.

I would very much like to have a dialog with members of the National Rifle Association that is a civilized dialog. I introduced this amendment, this bill to repeal the second amendment last

year. I have a mountain of mail that does not involve civilized dialog at all. There is all kinds of name-calling, all kinds of retreats to bigotry, all kinds of things that happen in the mountain of mail opposed to the amendment. There are, of course, people who are for it, but those who oppose it are particularly violent, particularly profane, particularly racist. I do not want to confront those people. I am not interested in furthering that kind of dialog. I would like to have a dialog with the leaders of the National Rifle Association, with the leaders of sports associations, pistol clubs, hunters. There ought to be a way and there is a way, without question to have people who want guns and will use guns for sport and use guns in a responsible way to maintain guns and to keep guns without having a blanket situation where anybody can get a gun, without having a wide open situation where the criminal, the insane, the children, can all have guns. We ought to be able to come together.

I challenge the National Rifle Association and the leadership there to deal with the fact that more children are dying, more students are dying every day as a result of this proliferation of guns.

What positive stings can we do together or can we do alone, given your vast resources and your influence to deal with the fact that a large number of the victims of gunshot wounds and large numbers of victims dying from gunshot wounds are young people.

Do you have an educational program? Do you have something that you will propose to keep guns out of the hands of students and children?

I appeal to the National Rifle Association, because I assume they are adults, to join me in a dialog. Let us figure out a way to guarantee that those people are going to act responsibly and use guns responsible for support or for protection or whatever always will have them and they will be regulated in a way to keep them out of the hands of the people who are going to use them in irresponsible and deadly ways.

It is no small matter. In the weeks and the months to come, I intend to maintain a body count. We maintained a body count in Vietnam where we would announce periodically the number of people who had been killed. I would like to maintain a body count on the victims of gunplay in this country.

It is impossible, I find, to get running statistics, but we will do the best we can.

I would like to alert the American people to the seriousness of the situation.

I want to show the escalation factor. I want to show how it is increasing. I want to show the danger of the Somalia syndrome, where we have situations that have become so bad as result of

this unchecked proliferation of guns that you have to send in the National Guard. You have to send in the Marines. You have to deal with it in ways which are totally un-American. We do not want to do that, but you are going to have that situation if you do not take action now.

It is the duty of the Congress to exercise the kind of wisdom that is necessary to prevent these kinds of situations. Preventive legislation, preventive action is what we should be all about.

The repeal of the second amendment is not the solution. The repeal of the second amendment, however, is something we should look at in order to begin to arrive at a comprehensive solution.

KHALISTAN'S ADMISSION TO THE UNREPRESENTED NATIONS AND PEOPLE'S ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce Khalistan's admittance into the Unrepresented Nations and People's Organization known as the UNPO, as well-respected organization with strong links to the United Nations and the international community dedicated to advancing the aspirations of its members through non-violent means. On January 24, 1993, the flag of Khalistan was officially hoisted in The Hague during UNPO's annual general assembly.

Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, president of the Council of Khalistan, who led the delegation to the UNPO should be commended for obtaining admittance of Khalistan to UNPO and for his tireless efforts in the struggle for Sikh freedom. Other delegates attending the UNPO general assembly were Dr. Parmjit Singh Ajrawat of Potomac MD, and Mr. Bhupinder Singh of Holland.

Mr. Speaker, Khalistan's admittance into the UNPO is a major milestone in the long struggle of the Sikh people for greater freedom from the Government of India. For years Sikhs have been trying to air their grievances against the Government of India in the international community, only to be thwarted by the central Government of India. Now the Sikh nation has the backing of the UNPO and a new voice in the community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, Khalistan's membership in the UNPO may very well act as a springboard for greater autonomy and eventual independence. There are four former UNPO members: the Republics of Estonia, Armenia, Georgia, and Latvia. They also sought independence and have now ascended to complete independence and sovereignty as

member nations to the world community.

The time for the Sikh people, and Mr. Speaker, I want to say this; it is spelled S-i-k-h people—to declare freedom from India is long overdue. Although India has long claimed to be the world's largest democracy, Mr. Speaker, India's historical and present treatment of the Sikh people clearly needs closer examination, not only by the world community, but certainly by our own community.

Since 1984, over 110,000 Sikhs have been killed by Indian Government forces. It is estimated that between 30 to 40 Sikhs are killed every day in fake encounters, in which police kill their Sikh victims only to claim that they did so during an attempted escape or in self-defense. Throughout India, Amnesty International reports that well over 10,000 Sikhs languish in prisons without charges or trials under laws condemned by the United Nations human rights committee as disturbing and completely unacceptable for falling far short of international standards for the protection of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, in past sessions of Congress I have introduced, or cosponsored, numerous bills supporting the Sikh nation's right of self-determination and seeking to censure India for her disrespect for freedom and violation of human rights against the Sikhs. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to support such legislation during this session. Furthermore, I ask the new administration under President Clinton to take notice of the injustices Sikhs, Kashmiris, and other minorities face under oppressive actions taken by the Government of India.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of India should be sent a message that the United States and the rest of the international community will not accept its brutality against the Sikhs and other minority peoples. The United States should support the Sikh nation's right of self-determination and make the Indian government aware that it cannot get away with its tactics of oppression by the government. The time is long overdue for the freedom of Khalistan, and I ask the United States Congress, the Clinton administration, and the entire international community to support the inalienable right of the Sikh nation to exercise its right of self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD copies of articles that appeared in Newsweek and Time magazine detailing Khalistan's admittance into the UNPO.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From Time, Feb. 1, 1993]

STATES OF MIND

(By Margot Hornblower)

The plaint of the batwa pygmy, translated into Russian, resonated through the earphones of the foreign minister of the Sakha

republic of Siberia. The Iraqi Assyrian compared his forgotten people with American Indians, as a Sioux from South Dakota and a Mohawk from Quebec applauded gravely. Two exiled princes—Tengku Hasan di Tiro of Aceh in Sumatra and Agofe John Bart Agami of Lado in Africa—chatted over cheese sandwiches. "We all have our own dreams," said Erkin Alptekin, an Uighur from East Turkestan. "And if we can share the same pillow, we can achieve our dreams."

A kaleidoscopic cross section of the oppressed, the colonized, the neglected and the rebellious gathered in the Hague last week for the general assembly of the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization. With flag-bearing delegates from five continents, it had all the trappings of a mini-United Nations, despite one key difference: its 39 members, representing 130 million people, are mostly diplomatic outcasts, unwelcome in the international bodies where their fate is discussed. "There are some 5,000 distinct peoples in the world," said UNPO Secretary-General Michael van Walt. "But fewer than 200 states are recognized. Many groups want only basic human rights and their cultural identity. But others, perhaps 50, have the historical and political legitimacy to form new separate states."

The splintering of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia has roused the expectations of restive peoples around the world. Kurds from Iraq. Ogonis from Nigeria. Nagas from India. Frisians from Holland. Shan from Burma. Mapuches from Chile and Argentina. At last week's conference, they agreed on one goal: self-determination. "Indonesia is Yugoslavia a hundred times over," claimed Di Tiro. The Achenese fought a long war against Dutch colonizers, only to be handed over in 1949 to the new Republic of Indonesia. The Javanese-dominated archipelago is battling uprisings in Aceh, East Timor and West Papua. "More than 200,000 of our people have been massacred since Indonesia invaded us in 1975," said an East Timor delegate. "But the world is changing. The Soviet empire has crumbled. We too can be free."

UNPO grew out of the unlikely friendship of a Tibetan, an Estonian and a Dutchman. On a visit to the Soviet Union in 1989, Lodi Gyari, foreign minister of the Tibetan exile government, looked up a fellow Buddhist, Far Eastern history professor Linnart Mall. Their two peoples had something in common: neither could argue their case before the U.N., which deals only through member nations or nongovernmental organizations. "Nobody stood for our interests," said Mall, now vice president of the Estonian National Independence Party. He and Gyari resolved to form an organization "to work for small peoples." They called on Van Walt, the son of Dutch diplomats, who had become a Washington lawyer and general counsel to the Dalai Lama. Representing Tibet's case before the U.N. Human Rights Commission, Van Walt had been besieged with requests for help from members of other nationalities. "The frustration was high," he said. "When people cannot be heard, it leads to violence."

In the two years since it began, four founding UNPO members have gained independence: Estonia, Armenia, Georgia and Latvia. Now several are embroiled in controversy over the treatment of their own minorities. At the conference, Estonia was criticized for refusing citizenship to its Russian inhabitants. Georgia was censured for repressing the Abkhazians, who asked for self-government in 1990. "In an act of genocide," Abkhaz National Theater director Valeri

Kove told the assembly, "the Georgian army is trying to annihilate the people of Abkhazia. We cannot accept losing our motherland."

UNPO has led fact-finding missions to Abkhazia, Kosovo, Kurdistan, Tatarstan and Chechnya in an effort to mediate conflicts, monitor elections and draw attention to human-rights abuses. "The first step is to listen to people's feelings—not just to list statistics," said Van Walt. "But UNPO also aims to provide services." Last week delegates attended workshops on diplomacy skills, conflict resolution and media relations.

"How do you deal with hostile journalists?" wondered a Scanian, whose group, from southern Sweden, seeks more cultural autonomy; a Tibetan counseled him to establish regular contact with a limited number of reporters. Many representatives of the would-be nations complained that their conflicts are rarely covered. "Reports in the media are few and far between," said Mike Foster, a spokesman for the island of Bougainville, which has been under siege by the Papua New Guinea army for three years. "Our cries must be heard."

The most frequent complaint of conference participants focused on the use of population transfers as a weapon against self-determination. Thus a representative of the Mari said Russians are being encouraged to move into their territory. Likewise, Menelaos Tselios, representing Greeks in Albania, claimed: "The Albanian government is intimidating, assimilating and forcing population transfer on the Greek minority." Similar complaints came from Bangladesh's Chittagong Hill Tracts, where indigenous peoples are being forced into "cluster villages" to make room for Bengali settlers. Tatars, forcibly transferred to East Asia from their Black Sea homeland by Stalin, have moved back and built homes and mosques only to have them razed by the resident Russians and Ukrainians. "We do not ask for independence," said Ilknur Baysu, a Crimean Tatar attorney. "Only for basic human rights."

Thirty new peoples have applied for UNPO membership. To join, they must show they are representative. Two separatists from the Jura region of Switzerland did not qualify: their group has only 50 members. Another applicant, the Union Démocratique Bretonne, a minority party that promotes Breton, the Celtic language of Brittany, had high hopes. "UNPO is the only global organization where we can express ourselves," said delegate Kristian Guyonvare'h.

Prospective members must disavow terrorism. Two Sikhs from Punjab complained their application was delayed. "If we do not have a place in an organization like this, where will we go?" said Gurmit Singh Aulakh, president of the Washington-based Council of Khalistan. Three black American groups—Nigritia, the National People's Democratic Uhuru Movement and the Lost-Found Nation of Islam—came as observers. "There's a struggle all over the world for identity," said Jerry Carroll, a onetime Los Angeles blues singer and president of the Nigritian Commission. Also seeking a platform, a group of Bosnian Gypsies showed up to get help in fighting a Dutch deportation order.

UNPO's sudden popularity could lead to growing pains. With a largely volunteer staff, its funds come from U.S. and European foundations, as well as from a \$1,000 annual fee charged each member. Mostly, though, it survives on determination. After giving a harrowing description of the Serbian terror

campaign against his fellow Muslims, Alija Mahmutovic, a physician from the former Yugoslav territory of Sanjak, listened with furrowed brow to the testimony of his fellow delegates. "I realized we are not the only ones to go through hard moments," he said. "I was touched by the Indians from America, by the men from Khalistan. And," he smiled, "I had never before heard of Scania!"

[From Newsweek, Feb. 1, 1993]

BIRTHPLACE OF NATIONS

(By Scott Sullivan)

Absolutely everybody wants a government to call his own. The remnants of ancient civilizations like Assyria want to become self-governing states. So do indigenous tribes like the Masai and the Aborigines of Australia. Micronesian islands, like Bougainville in the far Pacific, yearn for a seat at the United Nations. Once-powerful nations like the Mohawks in North America dream of regaining past glories. The struggles of hundreds of different groups for statehood is becoming one of the permanent—and permanently dangerous—phenomena of our postcolonial, post-cold-war world.

Last week representatives of more than 30 would-be nations met in The Hague to publicize their causes and try to gain strength through numbers. The occasion was the third annual general assembly of the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO). Formed in 1991, the group has seen four of its founding members—Estonia, Latvia, Armenia and Georgia—actually ascend to statehood. Its official membership has swelled from 6 to 32, with 19 candidates hammering at the door. But expansion has brought problems as well as opportunities. UNPO is strapped for cash, and it faces a huge embarrassment: one of its active members, Abkhazia, is waging a full-scale war of independence against former UNPO member Georgia.

The shooting war between Georgians and Abkhazians is simply the most visible case of the complex enmities produced by the wave of decolonization in the 1960s and the fall of communism in 1989. Many of the nations now accused of exploiting and even massacring their subject peoples are themselves ex-colonies, like India, Indonesia and Nigeria. The new Baltic nations have barely had time to adopt democratic constitutions, but they are already facing charges of prejudice and ethnic persecution from their own minorities of Russians and Ukrainians. In Yugoslavia, the secession of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia set off a multifaceted civil war that now threatens the peace of Central Europe.

The high-profile war in ex-Yugoslavia is only one of dozens of armed struggles between the forces of centralization and independence. Rebels in the Indonesian island of East Timor say they have lost 200,000 citizens in a war that's been raging since 1975. Spokesmen for the quaintly named East Turkistan Cultural Association accuse China of slaying "hundreds of thousands" of their Turkic brethren. Indian police and troops are killing "30 or 40 people every day" in Khalistan, better known as the Punjab, according to the independence-minded Council of Khalistan. Kurds and Turkomans from Iraq rehearse Saddam Hussein's atrocities against them.

ALREADY VANISHED

Some independence movements are more rhetorical than real. The Scanians of Sweden and the Jurassic people of Switzerland both sent spokesmen to last week's meeting on behalf of their virtually vanished cultures

and languages. Sister Shaba Shabaka, from Los Angeles, argued that a vast swath of Central Africa, once known as Nigritia, had been stolen from its rightful owners, the Africans carried off to slavery in the Americas. Richard Grass from South Dakota, whose grandfather fought against General Custer at the battle of the Little Big Horn, said his Lakota Nation continued to claim all of the U.S. territory known as the Louisiana Purchase, "plus a fair amount that is now in Canada."

On most issues at last week's meeting, a high degree of solidarity prevailed. All the aspirant nation-builders agreed that self-determination was an inalienable right. They all subscribed to the proposition that large nations are by nature hegemonic. But there were limits to the harmony of the unrepresented. Last week 24 independence movements applied for UNPO membership. Only 10 were immediately accepted, and those rejected were furious. "Why should the people of Khalistan be left at the door?" asked Gurmit Singh Aulakh, an elegant Sikh with a waxed mustache and a splendid saffron-colored turban. Richard C. La France, a representative of the Mohawk Nation, warned: "When we met here two years ago, we were all brothers. Today we are pointing fingers at one another. Tomorrow, when you yourselves become sovereign, you may end up pointing guns at your own minorities."

Michael van Walt, the suave Dutch lawyer who founded UNPO and serves as its secretary general, recognizes the difficulty of separating the nationalist sheep from the goats. The main criteria for membership are that an organization should stand for a recognizable geographical area (which rules out such universalist groups as Black Muslims), that it be representative of its people and that it renounce the use of terrorism. Van Walt admits that most active members carry on activities that "lie in a gray area between armed struggle and terrorism." He tries to guide them from clearly terrorist actions like bombing school buses and "to help them learn other forms of resistance, especially diplomacy and skillful use of the media."

UNPO has largely fulfilled its aim of acting as an alternative United Nations—sometimes to the point of parody. Each member of UNPO sports a national flag, many featuring a green stripe for "hope." The organization has an elaborate set of committees, subcommittees and regional officers. Its delegates sit through hours of droning speech upon speech. As each orator approaches the podium, the chairman announces, for example: "We will now hear from the very distinguished representative of the Udmurt National Movement."

REAL NEED

UNPO's rapidly growing membership suggests that the organization fills a real need. During the cold-war decades, "movements of national liberation" routinely turned to the Soviet Union and its allies for both recognition and practical aid. Those that could not gain Moscow's backing could usually hope for some support from the West. But the new Russia has closed down its revolution-exporting activities, and the West no longer needs to balance Soviet influence. Modest as it is, UNPO is the best available sounding board for, and moderating influence upon, the countless groups striving for independence and statehood.

The movement for national identity is likely to continue growing, and more than a few world leaders view it with alarm. In a recent speech, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the U.N. secretary-general, warned: "The inter-

national community is threatened by micro-nationalism. If we permit it to continue till the end of the century, the U.N. will grow from 180 members perhaps to 300." To ward off the threat, Boutros suggested, "we should encourage states not to separate but to gather together, as the members of the European Community have done."

Boutros may be right in theory. But the fact of the 1990s is that tens of millions of the world's people aspire to statehood, and large numbers of them are ready to fight and die for it. For all its quaintness, its overblown rhetoric and its petty squabbles, the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization is sailing with the wind of history. If it continues to grow at its current pace, UNPO's next general assembly, in 1994, will include more than 100 tribes, movements and governments-in-exile. Some will be harmless dreamers, but a good number will fight their bloody battles along the fault lines of history, and a few may make it to full-scale membership in the comity of nation-states.

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AROUND THE WORLD

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have been talking about human rights violations around the world, in particular pointing out that in the northwestern part of India are two areas where human rights have been violated to a degree that we as Americans can no longer turn a blind eye to.

In Kashmir there are 500,000 Indian troops and police imposing martial law who have been gang-raping women, torturing men, and reports of mysterious disappearances which take place on a regular basis of people who may disagree with the governmental policies.

Right next door is the Punjab, or, as many now recognize it, Kalistan. The Punjab is made up of people who are peace-loving warriors who fight for their rights for their freedoms vigorously, but they love peace. It is an agrarian society, in large part. They just want peace and democratic society just like the rest of the world, as do their neighbors in Kashmir.

I cannot express strongly enough the revulsion that I feel when I see what is going on in those two areas of India, or what used to be India.

There are 500,000 troops in Kashmir. There are also 500,000 police and troops in the Punjab, and the gang rapes that take place in Kashmir also take place in the Punjab, or Khalistan as it is now called.

There are mysterious disappearances. I have seen picture after picture that I have brought to this floor during major debates on foreign policy appropriation bills to point out to my colleagues and to the world the horrible atrocities that are taking place.

We in this country who believe in democracy and freedom and believe that people ought to have those rights, in 1776 fought for our independence and our freedom and for the rights that God gave to every man and woman, every human being.

Because of the repression in the Punjab, those people have decided, many of them, that they ought to have an inde-

pendent state called Khalistan. I have supported them by trying to impose financial restrictions on our foreign aid to the government of India until they allow human rights groups into Punjab and Kashmir so that the world can see what is going on, until they allow the rule of law in Punjab and Kashmir so that the world can make sure there is fairness and equity and that people have the rights that we have and hold so dear as far as jurisprudence is concerned in this country.

We have not been able to get that accomplished with the Government of India. The Indian people I have high regard for. My Indian-American friends I have high regard for. The Government of India, however, has been very repressive in these two areas and they need to be taken to task because of these repressions.

When you see the pictures of young men who have been disemboweled, who have had cigarettes put out all over their bodies and hot irons put on them, when you see their tongues cut out or their eyes gouged out, you realize that this kind of inhumane treatment cannot be tolerated and that people who live under that kind of tyranny have a right to be able to protest and have their freedom and democracy and have the independence that God has granted to those of us in this country.

Recently, Dr. Aulakh, a good friend of mine, went to the unrepresented nations and people's organizations at The Hague in the Netherlands and for the first time received their recognition as an unrepresented people, because they are not getting the proper representation that they deserve by the Government of India. I know that he and his colleagues who want fairness, freedom and independence and democracy in the Punjab were so happy when they saw their flag hoisted above the unrepresented nations and people's organizations at The Hague.

This should send a very strong signal to the Indian Government that not only does the United States and Great Britain and other countries around the world realize what has been going on in the Punjab and in Kashmir, but that other countries who are represented at the unrepresented Nations and People's Organization also understand what is going on and they want change, they want the martial law and the million troops in that part of India removed. They want fairness. They want freedom. They want democracy and human rights for the peoples in that area, just as we in the United States and the people of Great Britain want.

So I would like to say particularly to my friends, and particularly to Dr. Aulakh, congratulations on your efforts. I wish you the best in your efforts in the future, and hopefully one day in the not too distant future not only will the United States and Great Britain and the Unrepresented Nations

and People's Organization recognize that you ought to have freedom, human rights and democracy in Punjab or Khalistan, that then it will become a real fact and we will see the kind of humanity in that part of the world that we are so happy to have in the United States today.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material on this subject:

(From the Council of Khalistan press release, Jan. 24, 1993)

KHALISTAN ADMITTED INTO UNREPRESENTED NATIONS AND PEOPLES ORGANIZATION—MAJOR MILESTONE FOR SIKH INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT

WASHINGTON, DC, Jan. 24.—In a major milestone for the movement for Sikh independence from India, Khalistan was admitted today as a full member of the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization having its flag hoisted at The Hague in the Netherlands during the organization's annual General Assembly. The UNPO, a well-respected organization with strong connections to the international community, is dedicated to advancing the aspirations of its members through nonviolent means.

Attending the General assembly were Lord Ennals, Member of the British House of Lords and former British Minister of Foreign Affairs and Defense; H.S.H. Prince Hans-Adam II of Liechtenstein; Ireland's Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Ms. M. Corrigan Maguire, President of the Peace People, Belfast, and many other renowned dignitaries. UNPO members include Kurdistan, Tibet and Taiwan among many others. Four founding members, Latvia, Estonia, Georgia and Armenia, have already gained their independence and now possess full membership in the United Nations.

Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan who leads the struggle for Sikh independence headed the Khalistan delegation to the UNPO. "I thank the UNPO for admitting Khalistan within its organization," he said. "This is a big boost for the movement for Sikh freedom and increases international pressure on the Indian government to honor the independence of Khalistan and cease its violation of human rights against the Sikh nation."

"We are all very pleased," said delegation member Dr. Paramjit Singh Ajrawat. "India has sought to keep us isolated from the international community for years, but thanks to the work of Dr. Aulakh we are spreading the news of India's oppression of the Sikhs throughout the world community."

"We have long sought an audience with the International community," said Bhupinder Singh of Holland, also a member of the delegation. "Now India cannot hide. Its brutality will be exposed."

Since 1984, over 110,000 Sikhs have been killed by Indian government police, paramilitary forces, death squads and vigilante mobs. Between 30 to 40 Sikhs are killed every day in extrajudicial murders. At least 38,000 Sikhs languish in Indian prisons under draconian laws condemned as "disturbing" and "completely unacceptable" by the U.N. Human Rights Committee for falling far short of international standards for the protection of human rights.

But India's oppression is not isolated to the Sikh nation. The Christians of Nagaland, who were also admitted as full members of the UNPO, have lived under constant oppression at the hands of the Indian government

since 1947. Since then, over 100,000 Nagas have been killed by Indian government forces. Sikhs and Nagas hope that the exposure the UNPO can shed on such atrocities will help cease the long nightmare they have had to endure under Indian government rule.

"India is not one nation but a conglomerate of nations held together against the will of the people," said Dr. Aulakh. "Like the Soviet Union, India too will disintegrate into its natural parts."

"Our admittance into the UNPO is a milestone for the Sikh struggle for independence," Dr. Aulakh continued. "The Council of Khalistan will use this as a springboard toward outright independence. With our admittance we seek, through peaceful means in accordance with methods accepted by the international community to expose India's oppression of the Sikh nation and its mistreatment of the Nagas, Kashmiris, Tamils, Assamese and other nations suffering under Indian rule as well."

"We now have behind us an organization recognized by the international community for its integrity. India can no longer malign the Sikhs in the eyes of the world with its disinformation. It is time for India to face the world and answer to its misdeeds. It is time for India to realize that its tactics of government by oppression will no longer be accepted by the international community. It is time for India to respect the human rights of the Sikh nation. And it is time for the freedom of Khalistan. The Sikh nation will have its freedom. India has no other choice."

BIRTHPLACE OF NATIONS

(By Scott Sullivan)

Absolutely everybody wants a government to call his own. The remnants of ancient civilizations like Assyria want to become self-governing states. So do indigenous tribes like the Masai and the Aborigines of Australia. Microdot islands, like Bougainville in the far Pacific, yearn for a seat at the United Nations. Once-powerful nations like the Mohawks in North America dream of regaining past glories. The struggles of hundreds of different groups for statehood is becoming one of the permanent—and permanently dangerous—phenomena of our postcolonial, post-cold-war world.

Last week representatives of more than 60 would-be nations met in The Hague to publicize their causes and try to gain strength through numbers. The occasion was the third annual general assembly of the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO). Formed in 1991, the group has seen four of its founding members—Estonia, Latvia, Armenia and Georgia—actually ascend to statehood. Its official membership has swelled from 6 to 32, with 19 candidates hammering at the door. But expansion has brought problems as well as opportunities. UNPO is strapped for cash, and it faces a huge embarrassment: one of its active members, Abkhazia, is waging a full-scale war of independence against former UNPO member Georgia.

The shooting war between Georgians and Abkhazians is simply the most visible case of the complex enmities produced by the wave of decolonization in the 1960s and the fall of communism in 1989. Many of the nations now accused of exploiting and even massacring their subject peoples are themselves ex-colonies, like India, Indonesia and Nigeria. The new Baltic nations have barely had time to adopt democratic constitutions, but they are already facing charges of prejudice and ethnic persecution from their own minorities of Russians and Ukrainians. In Yugoslavia, the

secession of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia set off a multifaceted civil war that now threatens the peace of Central Europe.

The high-profile war in ex-Yugoslavia is only one of dozens of armed struggles between the forces of centralization and independence. Rebels in the Indonesian island of East Timor say they have lost 200,000 citizens in a war that's been raging since 1975. Spokesmen for the quaintly named East Turkistan Cultural Association accuse China of slaying "hundreds of thousands" of their Turkic brethren. Indian police and troops are killing "30 or 40 people every day" in Khalistan, better known as the Punjab, according to the independence-minded Council of Khalistan. Kurds and Turkomans from Iraq rehearse Saddam Hussein's atrocities against them.

ALREADY VANISHED

Some independence movements are more rhetorical than real. The Scanians of Sweden and the Jurrassic people of Switzerland both sent spokesmen to last week's meeting on behalf of their virtually vanished cultures and languages. Sister Shaba Shabaka, from Los Angeles, argued that a vast swath of Central Africa, once known as Nigritia, had been stolen from its rightful owners, the Africans carried off to slavery in the Americas. Richard Grass from South Dakota, whose grandfather fought against General Custer at the battle of the Little Big Horn, said his Lakota Nation continued to claim all of the U.S. territory known as the Louisiana Purchase, "plus a fair amount that is now in Canada."

On most issues at last week's meeting, a high degree of solidarity prevailed. All the aspirant nation-builders agreed that self-determination was an inalienable right. They all subscribed to the proposition that large nations are by nature hegemonic. But there were limits to the harmony of the unrepresented. Last week 24 independence movements applied for UNPO membership. Only 10 were immediately accepted, and those rejected were furious. "Why should the people of Khalistan be left at the door?" asked Gurmit Singh Aulakh, an elegant Sikh with a waxed mustache and a splendid saffron-colored turban. Richard C. La France, a representative of the Mohawk Nation, warned: "When we met here two years ago, we were all brothers. Today we are pointing fingers at one another. Tomorrow, when you yourselves become sovereign, you may end up pointing guns at your own minorities."

Michael van Walt, the suave Dutch lawyer who founded UNPO and serves as its secretary general, recognizes the difficulty of separating the nationalist sheep from the goats. The main criteria for membership are that an organization should stand for a recognizable geographical area (which rules out such universalist groups as Black Muslims), that it be representative of its people and that it renounce the use of terrorism. Van Walt admits that most active members carry on activities that "lie in a gray area between armed struggle and terrorism." He tries to guide them from clearly terrorist actions like bombing school buses and "to help them learn other forms of resistance, especially diplomacy and skillful use of the media."

UNPO has largely fulfilled its aim of acting as an alternative United Nations—sometimes to the point of parody. Each member of UNPO sports a national flag, many featuring a green stripe for "hope." The organization has an elaborate set of committees, subcommittees and regional officers. Its delegates sit through hours of droning speech upon speech. As each orator approaches the

podium, the chairman announces, for example: "We will now hear from the very distinguished representative of the Udmurt National Movement."

REAL NEED

UNPO's rapidly growing membership suggests that the organization fills a real need. During the cold-war decades, "movements of national liberation" routinely turned to the Soviet Union and its allies for both recognition and practical aid. Those that could not gain Moscow's backing could usually hope for some support from the West. But the new Russia has closed down its revolution-exporting activities, and the West no longer needs to balance Soviet influence. Modest as it is, UNPO is the best available sounding board for, and moderating influence upon, the countless groups striving for independence and statehood.

The movement for national identity is likely to continue growing, and more than a few world leaders view it with alarm. In a recent speech, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the U.N. secretary-general, warned: "The international community is threatened by micro-nationalism. If we permit it to continue till the end of the century, the U.N. will grow from 180 members perhaps to 300." To ward off the threat, Boutros suggested, "we should encourage states not to separate but to gather together, as the members of the European Community have done."

Boutros may be right in theory. But the fact of the 1990s is that tens of millions of the world's people aspire to statehood, and large numbers of them are ready to fight and die for it. For all its quaintness, its overblown rhetoric and its petty squabbles, the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization is sailing with the wind of history. If it continues to grow at its current pace, UNPO's next general assembly, in 1994, will include more than 100 tribes, movements and governments-in-exile. Some will be harmless dreamers, but a good number will fight their bloody battles along the fault lines of history, and a few may make it to full-scale membership in the community of nation-states.

STATES OF MIND

(By Margot Hornblower)

THE HAGUE.—The plaint of the batwa pygmy, translated into Russian, resonated through the earphones of the foreign minister of the Sakha republic of Siberia. The Iraqi Assyrian compared this forgotten people with American Indians, as a Sioux from South Dakota and a Mohawk from Quebec applauded gravely. Two exiled princes—Tengku Hasan di Tiro of Aceh in Sumatra and Agofe John Bart Agami of Lado in Africa—chatted over cheese sandwiches. "We all have our own dreams," said Erkin Alptekin, an Uighur from East Turkestan. "And if we can share the same pillow, we can achieve our dreams."

A kaleidoscopic cross section of the oppressed, the colonized, the neglected and the rebellious gathered in the Hague last week for the general assembly of the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization. With flag-bearing delegates from five continents it had all the trappings of a mini-United Nations, despite one key difference: its 39 members, representing 130 million people, are mostly diplomatic outcasts, unwelcome in the international bodies where their fate is discussed. "There are some 5,000 distinct peoples in the world," said UNPO Secretary-General Michael van Walt. "But fewer than 200 states are recognized. Many groups

want only basic human rights and their cultural identity. But others, perhaps 50, have the historical and political legitimacy to form new separate states."

The splintering of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia has roused the expectations of restive peoples around the world. Kurds from Iraq, Ogonis from Nigeria, Nagas from India, Frisians from Holland, Shan from Burma, Mapuches from Chile and Argentina. At last week's conference, they agreed on one goal: self-determination. "Indonesia is Yugoslavia a hundred times over," claimed Di Tiro. The Achenese fought a long war against Dutch colonizers, only to be handed over in 1949 to the new Republic of Indonesia. The Javanese-dominated archipelago is battling uprisings in Aceh, East Timor and West Papua. "More than 200,000 of our people have been massacred since Indonesia invaded us in 1975," said an East Timor delegate. "But the world is changing. The Soviet empire has crumbled. We too can be free."

UNPO grew out of the unlikely friendship of a Tibetan, an Estonian and a Dutchman. On a visit to the Soviet Union in 1989, Lodi Gyari, foreign minister of the Tibetan exile government, looked up a fellow Buddhist, Far Eastern history professor Linnart Mall. Their two peoples had something in common: neither could argue their case before the U.N., which deals only through member nations or nongovernmental organizations. "Nobody stood for our interests," said Mall, now vice president of the Estonian National Independence Party. He and Gyari resolved to form an organization "to work for small peoples." They called on Van Walt, the son of Dutch diplomats, who had become a Washington lawyer and general counsel to the Dalai Lama. Representing Tibet's case before the U.N. Human Rights Commission, Van Walt had been besieged with requests for help from members of other nationalities. "The frustration was high," he said. "When people cannot be heard, it leads to violence."

In the two years since it began, four founding UNPO members have gained independence: Estonia, Armenia, Georgia and Latvia. Now several are embroiled in controversy over the treatment of their own minorities. At the conference, Estonia was criticized for refusing citizenship to its Russian inhabitants. Georgia was censured for repressing the Abkhazians, who asked for self-government in 1990. "In an act of genocide," Abkhaz National Theater director Valeri Kove told the assembly, "the Georgian army is trying to annihilate the people of Abkhazia. We cannot accept losing our motherland."

UNPO has led fact-finding missions to Abkhazia, Kosovo, Kurdistan, Tatarstan and Chechnya in an effort to mediate conflicts, monitor elections and draw attention to human-rights abuses. "The first step is to listen to people's feelings—not just to list statistics," said Van Walt. "But UNPO also aims to provide services." Last week delegates attended workshops on diplomacy skills, conflict resolution and media relations.

"How do you deal with hostile journalists?" wondered a Scanian, whose group, from southern Sweden, seeks more cultural autonomy; a Tibetan counseled him to establish regular contact with a limited number of reporters. Many representatives of the would-be nations complained that their conflicts are rarely covered. "Reports in the media are few and far between," said Mike Foster, a spokesman for the island of Bougainville, which has been under siege by the Paoua New Guinea army for three years. "Our cries must be heard."

The most frequent complaint of conference participants focused on the use of population transfers as a weapon against self-determination. Thus a representative of the Mari said Russians are being encouraged to move into their territory. Likewise, Menelaos Tselios, representing Greeks in Albania, claimed: "The Albanian government is intimidating, assimilating and forcing population transfer on the Greek minority." Similar complaints came from Bangladesh's Chittagong Hill Tracts, where indigenous peoples are being forced into "cluster villages" to make room for Bengali settlers. Tatars, forcibly transferred to East Asia from their Black Sea homeland by Stalin, have moved back and built homes and mosques only to have them razed by the resident Russians and Ukrainians. "We do not ask for independence," said Ilknur Baysu, a Crimean Tatar attorney. "Only for basic human rights."

Thirty new peoples have applied for UNPO membership. To join, they must show they are representative. Two separatists from the Jura region of Switzerland did not qualify: their group has only 50 members. Another applicant, the Union Démocratique Bretonne, a minority party that promotes Breton, the Celtic language of Brittany, had high hopes. "UNPO is the only global organization where we can express ourselves," said delegate Kristian Guyonvare'h.

Prospective members must disavow terrorism. Two Sikhs from Punjab complained their application was delayed. "If we do not have a place in an organization like this, where will we go?" said Gurmit Singh Aulakh, president of the Washington-based Council of Khalistan. Three black American groups—Nigritia, the National People's Democratic Uhuru Movement and the Lost-Found Nation of Islam—came as observers. "There's a struggle all over the world for identity," said Jerry Carroll, a onetime Los Angeles blues singer and president of the Nigritian Commission. Also seeking a platform, a group of Bosnian Gypsies showed up to get help in fighting a Dutch deportation order.

UNPO's sudden popularity could lead to growing pains. With a largely volunteer staff, its funds come from U.S. and European foundations, as well as from a \$1,000 annual fee charged each member. Mostly, though, it survives on determination. After giving a harrowing description of the Serbian terror campaign against his fellow Muslims, Alija Mahmutovic, a physician from the former Yugoslav territory of Sanjak, listened with furrowed brow to the testimony of his fellow delegates. "I realized we are not the only ones to go through hard moments," he said. "I was touched by the Indians from America, by the men from Khalistan. And," he smiled, "I had never before heard of Scania!"

THE ISSUE OF GAYS IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I probably will not take the full 60 minutes, but, as I address this distinguished Chamber today and about a million people on C-SPAN, and that would include those who are watching the other distinguished body at the north end of the world's greatest legislative building; as I speak, they do not have to

worry about touching the dial and flipping over to the other C-SPAN channel because Mr. DOLE is just concluding his remarks on the Dole amendment which is being debated concurrently with the Senator Mitchell amendment. Both are debates on motions to table both the Mitchell and Dole amendments on whether or not to do something about the ban on homosexuals in the military.

Mr. Speaker, we have not yet addressed this issue, except by a few short 1-minute speeches over the few days that we have been in legislative session in the 103d Congress, but there probably will be a strong, vigorous debate in this Chamber soon, sooner, probably, rather than later, and I want to weigh in now with some observations that I think are germane to what I believe is a firestorm growing across this country with veterans groups.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the Republican House Research Committee, an instrument of our leadership, held hearings in the Rayburn Building with three panels of distinguished heads of veterans organizations, and the testimony was nothing short of stunning on homosexuality in what is certainly not the gay nineties, not with a black plague type disease, as one of the veteran leaders described it, that has already killed 100,000 homosexuals, 100,000 American homosexuals. That is far more than they killed in action, a total of 33,629 in Korea and the killed in action out of the 58,000-plus on the wall, the Vietnam wall. The killed in action is 47,832. We put those two figures together, and we still do not come anywhere near 100,000.

Let me correct the Vietnam killed in action. It is 382—47,382, a precious figure that includes 8 American women who died as Army nurses in the line of combat duty, and some missing in action, and some who died of torture and captivity in North Vietnam dungeons and other Communist cells.

□ 1840

Mr. Speaker, 100,000 are a lot of human beings. I said on this floor that in the early years of the AIDS crisis, the pollution of our blood supply was being incubated by promiscuity. Some people on this floor said incubated by sodomy. Well, sodomy by its nature involves promiscuity. And the majority of deaths, over 73 percent, if you throw in joint drug user and practicing homosexual, way over 73 percent.

If you discuss the Ryan White's of the world, the young man who was a hemophiliac who died because of the polluted blood supply before our otherwise fine Red Cross got with the program and started discriminating in every sense of that verb and telling people that if you are homosexual, whether you are practicing or not, we will not take blood from you. That is a discrimination of from whom they will

take blood. And once they started that, on September 9, 1985, we began to clean up the blood supply in America, which is still not perfect. I think the odds are 1 in 4,000 that if someone gets a nonpre-arranged blood transfusion, you can worry a tad, but the worry is less than being struck by lightning. So I would suggest that people trust the blood supply up to this point. It is not like France, where everybody is suing because the authorities there knew it was a polluted blood supply, probably for the same reasons in the United States, and still kept dispensing blood. It is tearing that country's health system apart.

During the hearings this morning, Mr. Speaker, several references were made to blood, as Senator DOLE made in his concluding speech, right before these two votes that are going on right now.

He stated that the blood supply in the military, particularly in his branch of the service, the Army, is a living he called it walking, blood supply. The largest mobile blood supply in our combat forces is carried in the veins of your rifleman next to you, your mate in a foxhole, your shipmate in a gun turret on board the ship with you. Everybody has their blood type on their dog tags, along with their name and their religious affiliation, if they want to state it.

When you are wounded, and the blood supply is quickly exhausted, particularly with ships at sea. When a big aircraft carrier was hit in World War II, the blood supply was gone within hours, if not minutes. Then the whole ship becomes a mobile blood supply.

If people can't trust in the military that the blood supply is pure, then you have certainly an obvious morale problem.

You can incubate within yourself the immunodeficiency virus for 4 months, some people say, and others say much, much longer, before it would even register in a test.

So if you engaged in wild partying because you are going off into the service and contracted the HI virus, you could be on active duty for 4 months or longer before it would show up in a test.

Oh, yes. Oh, yes. It does not show up within hours or days, my friends.

Now, this mobile blood supply is just one reason of dozens and dozens of reasons that came up from our veterans this morning. I had the opportunity to read the opening paragraph of the current Time magazine under a section called Armed Forces, entitled, "Sex, Lies, and the Military." The subtitle, "For Gays," and later on in the article they always have to add the word male, gay males and lesbians. Lesbians, thanks to the Isle of Lesbos and sisters of Sapphos in ancient Greek mythology, probably, not history, lesbians have their own name.

It says, "For gays and lesbians, life in the Armed Forces means unflagging vigilance and tactical deception."

Now, this particular article is bylined by one reporter, a lady, Jill Smolowe. I will spell that name, S-m-o-l-o-w-e. It is unfamiliar to me.

It is a sympathetic article to the homosexual viewpoint, which makes these opening paragraphs all the more revealing.

Listen to this. Keep in mind the Latin expression *sotto voce*. It comes from the opera. It means soft voice, but you can hear it.

The article begins, "It is done *sotto voce*, but somehow word gets passed. The Air Force is the most hospitable armed branch. The Marines and the Army are the pits. Entertainment jobs, medical jobs, are the safest." This means for homosexuals. "Artillery and infantry units the roughest. If possible, head for bases around San Francisco or Washington, DC. Steer clear of South Korea and Hawaii. Join groups like Alcoholics Anonymous." This is if you have never had a drink in your life. Just join the group. "Why? Because they are safe enclaves, especially for those in the Navy. Buy 'Bob Damron's Address Book'." That is in italics because that is a title. "Bob D-a-m-r-o-n's Address Book". "It lists gay bars near military installations, both at home and abroad. But be careful—such clubs are off limits and often scouted by bands of military police known as courtesy patrols."

Notice the pejorative use of the word bands. I never thought of shore patrol or military patrol, although we did call the air police AIF's, but that was just a term of affection for AP's. I never heard them called bands. You know, bands are what you say for roving bands of looters or roving bands of Vikings scouring throughout Europe. I never heard this term applied to MP's.

"But the bands of military police known as courtesy patrols. Be alert for changing code words. If someone says don't go straight, go forward, or asks are you a friend of Dorothy's, you will know you have found the Emerald City."

Some of the Members know, the freshman class does not, that my uncle was Jack Haley, the tin man in the "Wizard of Oz". I went on that set as a 6-year-old and have fond feelings, since it is my children's, all grown now in their thirties, five of them, favorite film, the world's greatest babysitter. I have a ninth grandchild on the way. No movie has captivated my grandchildren like the "Wizard of Oz". I am sorry to see it become code words for homosexuals in the military, that you are in Emerald City, party time. Party on, Garth, party on, Wayne, if you answer yes, you are a friend of Dorothy's.

"For gay men," notice they have to add the word men there, "for gay men and lesbians, military service means a

life of unflagging vigilance and tactical deception," starting off with recruiting, because you have to lie to get in.

The adversary they fear most does not speak a foreign tongue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to slow down here. Let me read this with real emphasis. "The adversary they," homosexuals, "fear most does not speak a foreign tongue. Rather, the enemy lies as close as the next bunk."

Your bunk mate. Your shipmate. For a homosexual in the military, that is your enemy. What an amazing statement.

"At military bases across the country, homosexuals describe the existence that at best is tentative, guarded, and supported by discrete networks. At worse, it can mean snickering colleagues, which hurts, and dangerous blanket parties, during which the victims are held beneath covers and beaten senseless," which is a cowardly act. And I have seen people that have been thrown out of the military, deservedly so, for these blanket parties.

The one I remember vividly that I thoroughly approved of was not over homosexuality, it was someone who just would not take a bath. He stunk to high heavens. Some people teased him that he had terminal BO. Finally they gave him a blanket party, scrubbed him with scrub brushes without soap or water, and some men received an article XV, and as I recall, 12 hours each marching in a rectangle on the tour paths for giving this guy what they called a GI bath.

These blanket parties are cowardly, and it is described in the media as gay bashing. Of course, whatever you call it, at its root it is not only violent and brutal, it is cowardly and it is condemned by every man of character and courage, whether in uniform or not.

Of course, women, it goes without saying, are not into violent little stunts like that.

"Until now, the military's homosexuals have had to live with the uneasy knowledge that exposure of their secret could mean expulsion. Over the past decade, homosexuals have been discharged from the Armed Services at the rate of about 1,500 a year." I might say that since the 1991 figures I looked at a few days ago, this is not evenly spread over the services.

□ 1850

I asked Admiral Moore, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs for 4 years under the Kennedy years, why the Navy had a far disproportionate number in the number of figures. I gave him the 1991 figures. It went something, I will be off one or two figures here, the Marine Corps was 45. Remember that because of the Colt .45, 45. The Air Force was 146. The Army was 199, and I do not remember precisely the Navy, but it was in the high 580's.

I said, Why would there be so many more in the Navy? He said because of

the living conditions. The Marine Corps, of course, is low because they have less than a third of the men that are in the Air Force and the Army and the Navy.

He said, because of long isolation, sea duty, long deployments overseas, he said the temptation is greater to succumb in a situation where you might be caught, which is interesting that the Navy will have the biggest problem, if the privacy factor is ended. And he said that it has always been thus. And in the Army and the Air Force, it is handled on the base level, more quickly, and the people have more access to going far away from the base of assignment to work out their sexual proclivities.

By the way, an important footnote here that I have come to believe, talking to Europeans on how their militaries handle this, there is a lot of lies and misinformation and disinformation going around. Israel and France are the two most distorted in how they handle it.

They do not ask people coming in, Mr. Speaker, but in France sex is considered so private that they do not ask but they make it clear, when you are recruited, that whether you are heterosexual or homosexual, if your sexual conduct becomes any kind of a problem, you are out, if you are a heterosexual. And if it becomes known at all, conduct notwithstanding, that you are a homosexual, you are not. The burden is upon you to keep it private. And this pejorative, ugly little term "in the closet" or "coming out of the closet" or "outing somebody from the closet" is a loaded term, created about 25 years ago by a homosexual activist/propagandist because what does that really mean, if you are looking for a synonym?

Out of the closet or in the closet conjures up an evil stepmother after a beating putting you in a small dark place when what it really means is privacy. That is all, privacy. And anyone in the military wants promotions and wants the respect of his colleagues who, to quote Gen. Colin Powell, do not understand the mores of the homosexual community in any country in the world, if you want that respect, maintain your privacy.

A perfect example, perfectly analogous, is someone who has a problem. There are all sorts of sick expressions about zipper problems or lack of respect for women, but suppose someone has the problem which psychiatrists call a Don Juan complex, a man incapable of loving women, incapable of feeling worthy of being loved back, so he is in the conquest mode to sleep with as many women as he possibly can.

If this person, and I am thinking of vaguely a true story here, not so vaguely, if this person is the CEO of a division of one of America's largest

corporations, say, he is tall, very tall, over 6 feet 3 inches, handsome, prematurely gray hair, has redesigned a semi-sports model for one of the divisions of General Motors, is not only a designer and a good manager but is the star of five divisions of General Motors and is hand-picked to become the CEO of the entire corporation and suddenly the word starts circulating among the board of directors that he is a womanizer, that he is cheating on his wife and his mistress and cheating on his mistress more than once, that he has got this Don Juan problem, guess what happens in the closed boardroom? This division chairman of General Motors never becomes CEO. As a matter of fact, he is soon separated from the corporation.

Suppose this were in the military and this person were a man or a woman, generally a man, of course, up to make colonel, become a wing commander, come back to the Pentagon, become a brigadier and maybe go back and be a division commander of an Army division, and it is found out that he is either totally deceiving his wife or breaking her heart or she does not know, so he thinks he is the world's greatest con artist.

When it gets around his fellow officer corps, particularly above them, that is the end of his promotions. If he kept this private and was so discreet and so hidden that it was taken that he engaged in this illicit adultery and/or fornication miles and miles from the base, miles from his family and nobody ever knew, then everybody ever knows, right. That is called privacy. You could call it heterosexual in-the-closet illicit conduct, offending Mosaic law, adultery, but if it becomes known, his peers, without ever having to put anything down in writing, when it comes down to a promotion board in private, thumbs down. No promotion.

And most homosexuals in the military know that that is exactly what would happen to them. You know what? The Europeans that I have spoken with, officers and NCO's, have told me that it is their experience that no matter what is on the record on how you handle homosexuality and uninformed people, 90 to 95 percent will never come out of privacy. They just will not, for all the aforesaid reasons.

So who will come out? Activists or people who think that enemy in the bunk next to them is about to disclose something to superior officers, out them, or, as happens in many cases, as these cliques develop on bases of one homosexual group against another, he will be outed either anonymously or openly by some other homosexual group who himself is in private for revenge, for some imagined or real offense against the one clique or an individual of the clique.

Talk to the military people. You get stories of all these tensions and con-

flicts that sometimes if you get two or three groups together can actually tear about an entire unit up to sizes of units that would stagger your imagination in analysis.

Newsweek magazine in an article, Mr. Speaker, I hope my staff is watching and brings the article over here so I can put it in the RECORD at this point. Newsweek had an article in January, three or four issues ago, four issues ago. The title of the article was a play off the title of one of the ABC daytime soaps, "The Young and Reckless."

The title was "The Young and the Reckless." It talked about not San Francisco or New York or one of our so-called sophisticated big cities, talked about Milwaukee. And it said in front of some of the homosexual bars there, they even gave the title of one. I think it was called the Club, the Club. It was the saloon. That was the name of the saloon, was the saloon in caps. It said older homosexuals in their thirties would come and shop, troll in front while young men with baseball caps on backwards and baggy Levis would lean against the wall. They called them teenagers, 18, 19, and 20, some probably lying about their age, below age. And they would lean against the wall and they would be selected by these older homosexuals for partying and no safe sex here.

That is why the title of "The Young and the Reckless." It said that the carnal, that is Newsweek, a Newsweek reporter used that word "carnal." Again, it was basically a sympathetic article, but the time you are through reading it, that the carnal activity was incredible.

And the article goes on to say, this is not just happening in big cities. It is happening and they mentioned medium- to small-size cities all over America where this is happening.

It is happening, I understand, in my town of record in my Orange County district, Garden Grove, CA, pretty much your average little small, lower- to middle-class American town with a great future. This "Young and the Reckless" problem is, according to Newsweek, going to cause a whole new surge of HI virus infections in young homosexuals and start this cycle all over again in the one group that we thought had exercised some discipline on activity and was using more than any other group in America safe sex.

We are still getting the warnings about the growth in the heterosexual community, which is where it is most prevalent in Africa, where it may literally kill tens of thousands of people in the next 10 years. And in high school kids across this country, where it is considered nonromantic, nonspontaneous to engage in any kind of contraceptive preparation for the sex act.

Here is a Marine Corps major, I hope he will not mind my using his name, but it is on the front page of one of our

Nation's newspapers from the middle North of our country. He is suggesting disbanding the Marine Corps. That is how much this marine loves the corps, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1900

Listen to this. Listen to this. U.S. Marine Corps officer to Congress—that is to me, that is to all of us here, Mr. Speaker: "Abolish the Corps rather than admit homosexuals," Washington, DC. "No sooner was Bill Clinton sworn in as President than his top aides announced that the military's ban on homosexuals would be lifted. Under a plan worked out by President Clinton and his senior national security advisors"—and I can hardly absorb that, senior national security advisors; we are discharging good men and women, some of them decorated heroes from Desert Storm who want a career, who are halfway through a 20-year career, who want to stay, some approaching the 16th, 17th year, and we are discharging them saying, "We like your action and you got extra, exceptionally qualified officer efficiency reports, NCO reports, but we are going to have to let you go," meanwhile let's talk about bringing in people that cannot perform their approach to sex in 26, 27, 28 of our States because it is illegal; it is in the Universal Code of Military Justice, as sodomy, illegal, and it is also illegal up to this moment, at least, in the District of Columbia; but, "Come on in while we push out these other highly qualified and decorated men and women."

So anyway, "Clinton's senior national security advisors three days before the inauguration, Clinton will ask his Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, to issue a code of conduct for both heterosexual and homosexual military personnel and an executive order which removes the ban. The order is expected to be issued as early as May, after Clinton concludes his consultations with top military officers."

He never asked for those, it was more or less forced upon him, Mr. Speaker.

Those were "consultations on how to implement the new order." In other words, all done, no matter what the Senate has voted on within the last few minutes, it is going to be done.

"How the order will be accepted among the armed services is not clear." It is after I heard all these people this morning. "Though certainly a measure of the discontent with Clinton's plan is indicated in the January issue of Marine Corps Gazette." That is a fine, fine service magazine.

Maj. Arthur J. Corbett, a student at the National War College, said it would be better to disband the Corps than see it dishonored and its virtues and values destroyed. In a brutally frank column titled "Disband the Corps" Major Corbett says, "The proposal to open the ranks of the services to homosexuals is

a sign of a declining culture, a culmination of banal evils from a progression of noxious ideologies.'

"If the U.S. Marine Corps is opened to homosexuals," said Major Corbett, 'the marines should ask Congress to abolish them. Perhaps now is the time to recognize that, although America, more than ever before, might actually need a Marine Corps, it no longer wants one. It is true that the future portends many littoral conflicts'—that means the littoral or coastline of the countries, l-i-t-t-o-r-a-l, the corniche—"littoral conflicts to which a Marine Corps should respond, but the other services will adapt. They will certainly adapt better, the other services, to amphibious work there than the Marine Corps will adapt to recruiting sexual deviants."

"Marines are an incredulous lot by nature, and brutally honest in their observations and decisions. The young officers who attempt to explain how homosexuality is an alternate instead of a deviant lifestyle will quickly lose the respect of their marines and a bit of their own honor in the process."

Continuing to quote, "Sanitized terms like 'sexual orientation' may serve to obfuscate the gross realities of a perverse life style to a jaded public, but marines living in barracks will rightfully question leadership that discredits by association the sacrifices they are willing to make. The party line will be that homosexuals are Marines, just like you and me."

I have heard a decorated marine from Vietnam who serves in the Senate make that very point on the floor tonight. He is going to vote with the homosexual ban removal.

Major Corbett continues: "The cognitive dissonance"—and don't we educate our Marine officers well, Mr. Speaker?—"cognitive dissonance that this simple yet official lie must engender will tug at the credibility and ultimately rend the integrity of our corps. Critics claim that homosexuals already lurk in our ranks. The salient difference between the current reality and the proposed policy is that now homosexuals lie to the Marine Corps. Soon we will find that, to accommodate homosexuals, the Marine Corps must lie to marines, and they in turn lie to one another. Institutions like the corps are not built upon deceit. It is time to ask Congress to disband our Marine Corps. We should transfer our personnel to other services and don their uniforms. It is better to wear proudly the uniform of another service than to see the globe and anchor progressively defamed."

Mr. Speaker, we are in a break, waiting for the Senate votes to come over here, and I am hoping that enough Members, a great majority of the party, went over to Mr. DOLE and we will have some language to truly study this for six months and keep the stand-

ing policy in place and get a full debate in both houses and a vote.

Here is the article I mentioned just a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, I want to read it verbatim, the opening paragraph.

Listen to this, "The Young and the Reckless." It is under the "Lifestyle" section. I don't know why it has above the title the word "Mind." Is this all taking place in people's minds? I thought it was hypothalamus, underdeveloped, except for lesbians, only the male hypothalamus, by a doctor who was a self-admitted homosexual dealing with 40 cadavers of homosexuals who died of AIDS, and he finds the hypothalamus is not developed, unbelievable, and that is being stated now as scientific fact by people over at the White House.

The subtitle is, "Safe-sex campaigns are running into a generation gap in the gay community." Here it goes.

"It was an average, rollicking 'Boy's Night Out' at the Saloon in downtown Minneapolis." As I said, that is the name of the place. "Conspicuous among the crowd of thirtysomething regulars was a generous sprinkling of dewy-faced 'boys'—18 to 21-year-olds, allowed in Thursday and Sunday nights to dance and make sexual contacts but not to drink liquor. With their backward baseball caps and baggy flannel shirts, some of the younger contingent might have been just off a touring school bus. But that impression was emphatically dispelled later at the carnal 'Sidewalk Sale' that is one of the attractions of 'Boy's Nite'—boy's night, sickening to this grandfather of soon to be nine grandchildren, sickening corruption of youth.

What did William B. Yates write about the coming of World War II right before he died, that "the blood-dimmed tide is loose and everywhere the ceremony of innocence is drowned. The center cannot hold, things fall apart, and the best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity."

The Members had better believe the center is not holding, and the ceremony of innocence is being drowned all around us. Boy's night out on the sidewalk sale of teenagers. If these young boys were shot up by a terrorist on a school bus, they would call them children. I will never forget when a high school bus was attacked in Israel and a dozen or so high school seniors were all gunned down by some of George Habash's terrorists, all the papers of the world called it a slaughter of children, when they were killed on a bus accident or a young football team goes down, they are children. But when they are in the streets of Minneapolis—did I say Milwaukee before? I will emphasize Minneapolis, and it probably is happening in Milwaukee, too, then they are not children any more. These are adults, supposedly; all 18, capable of

sowing seeds for their own destruction and a painful death, curled up in a prenatal position, covered with Kaposi's sarcoma, cancer sores, and coughing from every pulmonary disease that comes down the pike, all infecting their bodies, slow, miserable deaths, sometimes living 14 years in this slow death agony, sometimes mercifully a third of them are dead within 6 months of being told that AIDS has manifested itself, and this is a sidewalk sale of boys.

"As one jaded curbside cruiser"—that is an older homosexual—"curbside cruiser observed after checking out the youthful wares," and I am going to respect the decorum of this floor by changing a word that means anal sexual intercourse, it is not the worst of words, it is the one that sounds like "carpentry," what you use without nails, use your imagination, Mr. Speaker, he says, "after checking out the youthful wares," like this is a hardware store, he says, "They are just old enough to bleep without getting yourself arrested for it." Disgusting.

Minneapolis is hardly the only place such daring games are being played. While the annual rate of new HIV-positive cases among homosexuals is decreasing, surveys in urban areas from Seattle to Mobile, Alabama are finding signs of a relapse to pre-AIDS recklessness marked by a resurgence of free-wheeling gay night life.

□ 1910

"Even more worrisome, the evidence points to a growing generation gap in AIDS awareness: The importunate youth of the gay community apparently are practicing high-risk sex in significantly greater numbers than their elders. Studies say young gays are more likely to have had multiple partners and unprotected anal intercourse, the two leading risk factors for HIV infection, in the past 12 years. In the San Francisco area, where this year the HIV-positive rolls grew by 1,000, a department of health survey indicates that a second wave of AIDS infections is taking shape, with the highest incidence among gay men between 17," that is a minor in my State, "and 25. Nationally, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, diagnosed cases of AIDS among homosexual men from 13," that is not a man, "13 to 29 crept upward last year, in defiance of the overall trend downward.

"It seems clear that the safe-sex message is not getting through effectively to younger [homosexuals]."

Did you notice the use of the word by the Newsweek magazine right before "sidewalk sale" of "carnal"? Is that not a judgmental word, the carnal sidewalk sale, one of the attractions of "boys' nite."

So there it is in Newsweek. Here is the current article on the military in

Time, and I repeat, these are generally, as you read on, sympathetic articles.

Mr. Speaker, the fight is on.

Mr. DAN BURTON of Indiana just came to the floor, and I thought of a trip that he and I took to Granada. He was a sitting Congressman. I had just been gerrymandered out of my seat. It was the first days of November 1983, so that is 10 years ago this month. We went down to Grenada. The combat was not completely over, snipers were still operating in the hills, and the island was not totally secure. We were seeing for the first time women, not in combat units, but in support units on an island when, I repeat, the combat was not completely over. And we went out to I think it was the airport where the Rangers were hit in broad daylight, in the morning by mistake because the Cuban advisers had 23 millimeter anti-aircraft fire set up, and were actually hitting all of the C-130's that were bringing in the 17th Ranger unit. And we were briefed with the colonel there, and then as we traveled around the Army units, about to be passed off to the Marine Corps, we noticed an Army captain that was, to be very frank, very effeminate. He had a small radio on one hip, and in the manner of some very eminent people in show business, what they call a limp wrist, or a broken wrist, he would put his wrist on his radio, cock his hip, stand with his toe pointed. It was like someone who was imagining he was a ballet dancer. So not to be unkind, giving him the benefit of the doubt that this buy was probably a highly-decorated Army captain, and it turned out later he was assigned to the general staff, and I think Mr. BURTON was standing right there, we turned to some of the sergeants and we said, "About this captain over here, is he a pretty good officer?"

Now I have traveled enough in the armed services for the Foreign Affairs Committee to tell you that our military enlisted people truly respect their Congressmen. When a Congressman or Congresswoman comes to a military base, it is not only officers that roll out the red carpet. A lot of these young men and women want to talk with you, they want you to eat in their chow hall, they want to spill out their good, positive suggestions, and they want to gripe. It is not just like World War II where the joking gripe was if you do not like it here, write your Congressman. That was generally under heavy fire, "Write your Congressman." But when a Congressman was there they were respectful of that.

So here is a young E-4 or E-5, who is not a senior sergeant, but like a buck sergeant, maybe a corporal, and I said to him, "How about this officer over here, is he a pretty good officer?" And he says, "Oh, sir, you mean that flaming," and he used the roughest word for a homosexual in America. In Britain it may be queer or something else, and I

feel free to say that since they have renamed themselves in some groups as the Queer Nation. But this is a word that hurts, and I understand that, and that is why I will not use it. It is a British synonym for kindling wood, or cigarettes, and it is an alliteration, and it starts with a "f." "You mean, sir, that flaming (blank) over there? He's ridiculous."

Now as a Congressman I want to say wait a minute, sergeant, or corporal, why are you so open about this? Your career could be destroyed if he overheard you. "Are you kidding, Congressman? Everybody in this unit knows this guy is a flaming blankety-blank. He sickens us."

Now I ask you a question, is that the way you remember it? I will ask you a question. When that happens, the respect factor is gone. This is what the military means by order, good order, discipline and morale. That officer obviously was not commanding respect among the men under him, no matter how a younger man should be disciplined for speaking that roughly about an officer. And that was not just an officer he was addressing, he was a superior officer that he was telling that to, but the way he did it so openly, we had the feeling that they talked like that, all of the men in the unit talked like that about this general's aide. And I thought boy, good thing we have the policy we have. And for 10 years that policy has served us well, and anybody who has been in the military, and I have been an enlisted man for 2 years, and a cadet, and an active-duty officer, the California Guard Pilots Air Corps, Reserve Pilots combat-ready, standby reserve, and out-of-reserve after 28½ years, and I can tell you, maybe Time magazine is right, the Air Force is the most hospitable branch of the service to homosexuals. And then my dad's, the artillery, the infantry, I repeat, are the roughest.

I was on 10 bases on my active duty service, and on 8 of those 10 bases we heard right after we arrived or right before we arrived that there was a major homosexual scandal with lots of people discharged. And this was 1953 to 1958.

I remember Lackland Air Force Base where everyone was awakened one night with lights, and sirens, and the Air Police making a bust, and as I recall 13 homosexual activists are near the dugout at the first base on the baseball field, where they were all having a little orgy, and were all together caught with searchlights in some kind of a preplanned operation, all of them having anal sex on first base, and there went 13 people out of the Air Force, and that stuck in our minds. I had just turned 20, and I was an aviation cadet wing colonel at 20 years of age. So I had to be briefed on this, and I had to pass the word to all of the troops.

I found one sadist, an underclassman below me, who was making aviation ca-

dets do pushups on top of one another, naked in the closet. I stood them up, and one of them was crying. Eventually he washed out for lack of emotional stability. And one guy said what kind of a man are you that you would subject yourself to that, and I am sure that the sadist who was doing this, he thought that he was some macho somebody who was going to be a jet fighter pilot, but he went back to being in the enlisted ranks, and I heard that later he was out of the service. Even in the ranks of training to be a pilot you can get bad apples like that, and the military's job is to weed them out.

So now we stand on the possible status of this debate in the Senate, and for those, Mr. Speaker, who have C-SPAN, they can click over to C-SPAN II if they have it, and they can find out what has happened. It will be back here soon. We are doing special orders now, not at the end of the full legislative business, but in lieu of recessing or adjourning so that we can go back into session to vote on this family leave act, which will have either the Mitchell or the Dole language on homosexuality in the military attached to it.

I would like to close by discussing a prologue that I always use when this issue comes up at home, or with the news media people, and it is simply why are we discussing this? It was not the Senate's choice, as Senator DOLE made very clear tonight. It is not the House's choice, and I would not have been making this speech on this maybe the whole 2 years of this Congress if Mr. Clinton had not moved on the only campaign promise he seems determined to keep if he had not brought it up.

Now, to defend the President, it was Veterans Day, November 11, in the Rotunda of the State Capitol in Arkansas when a media person, the powerful fourth estate up there behind me, brought up his campaign promise, and pushed it in his face, and he came out and he said in front of all of these veterans, and there were at least 30 veterans' divisional unit flags behind him, and he said yes, he thought it was a discrimination issue and a civil rights issue, and he was going to pursue this.

□ 1920

Now, the problem was he should not have been that soon, as someone who at one point in his career said he had loathing for the military; he should not have maybe gone to a Veterans' Day thing just 8 days after the election and put himself in a position to be asked that. He should have waited until he was inaugurated, eased in with some visits to military bases, and then started to make statements, and then the press would have hit him on this.

But from that day to this, there has been a building firestorm, since November 11 through the inauguration, right down to today, and to tell you

the truth, Mr. Speaker, I think, what BOB DOLE is trying to do, our great Senator from Kansas, is stop the President from hemorrhaging. He has a bleeding wound, a massive bleeding wound. It is going to get worse over these 6 months if these veterans' groups that appeared at our Research Committee hearing this morning have their way.

The best that can be done for the President, and I talked to the Senate chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the majority party, is to close this wound, stitch it up, cauterize it, let him admit defeat, go to this constituency of homosexual activists that raised almost \$4 million for him and say, "What do you want me to do? Look how much capital, political capital, I have expended. You have almost bankrupted me. It has ruined the first 2 weeks of my Presidency. Wait until next year, will you, or the year after? I have done what I can do for you. Let me move on to the laser-beam focus on the economy," balancing the budget, trying to bring down our massive debt, to quote the Governor of Colorado, which I completely concur with, is a nation-killer.

Our debt and our deficits are nation-killers. That is a darn good quote, and I will use it for the rest of the time that I am here in this Congress. Let him get back to the nation-killer issues and not try to fix something that is not broken, the morale of our military and the finest fighting units we have ever developed in all the history of military science and the art of arms.

Mr. Speaker, I think the best thing that the leadership in this Chamber and the other great body could do is to end this, give us a straight up-or-down vote, and let us in this Chamber speak with all of those phone calls that were coming in so highly respected and touted, to Larry King, to Rush Limbaugh, to the lowest, tiny little Christian Bible station that calls up in the hills of the Ozarks or the Olympia Mountains, all these radio programs with the voice of America, the vox populi who were speaking.

Now there is a lie going around that it is organized calling. I can tell organized calling whether it is from the right or the left. We can all tell organized postcard campaigns. We know what white mail is, mail handwritten on personal stationery, every style of writing, different, some long, some writing in the margins, some terse and simple, written on small monarch-sized stationery; the calls and the letters we are getting are from Middle America.

I want to close by quoting something my colleague from southern California, DUNCAN HUNTER, said in the hearings. He said, "Our volunteer military is working," the young men and women who volunteer to join. Because of it, I like this word picture: The coffee tables of the kitchens, small homes

around America and small apartments, from an Archie Bunker-type apartment in the Bronx to the smallest little house in any little housing project anywhere in America, it is not the upper classes and the elite that send their kids into the military. Every now and then somebody from a wealthy family who has a fourth or a fifth child, that through reading, gets an interest in the military and maybe goes through an ROTC program or rarely asks for an appointment to one of the service academies. The kids that are asking for service academy appointments from this Member of Congress are from the lower middle class and some from the upper middle class of our country, and certainly all middle class.

Unfortunately, from the lower classes, unless you get an outstanding mom or dad, or a team of mother and father, a kid from the lower classes generally does not have the education, and that is a tragedy, to even pass the entrance exams to be a soldier, sailor, or marine, let alone an officer. So it is middle America.

Around that coffee table, talking about the options for an only son, an only daughter, or the oldest or the youngest of a large family, and at that coffee table, that kitchen table, we are going to interject a new element, and that is that that youngster, particularly if he or she is so gung-ho to go in and finish high school at 17 the way I did, just barely turned 17, that they need their parents' permission to sign them in, or a judge, and 99.9 percent of it is a parent, and that parent says, "Send my 17-year-old into military services that have been turned into some sociological experiment like some beaker in a chemistry lab; we are going to pour in this ingredient that religiously active people in this country call sodomy?"

You do not have to go any further than Leviticus or Romans to realize that you have to rewrite the Old Testament that begins, "And the Lord said to Moses," you know, from the top right to the main man, "The Lord said to Moses, abomination," or in Romans, St. Paul, who spread the Christian faith after the son of God's crucifixion, and telling people and listing in there plenty of heterosexual sins and all sorts of lying and cheating and thieving, abusing your neighbors, and puts in there clearly, "Men with men, women with women, abomination"; Romans in the New Testament, Leviticus in the Old, telling people who really go to church and practice religion in the middle of this County, "Give us your children. The Marine Corps wants, you know the bold, the proud, and the sensitive." Is that what the posters are going to say? Pink berets? No.

I do not mean to trivialize this thing. It is a very serious sociological discussion going on in our country. As I said at the hearings, our focus is on combat

cohesiveness, readiness, an explosion of construction nightmare, either homosexuals or heterosexuals demanding new, expensive, separate housing when they are not in the field. That is the major problem.

Or, for example, assignment of lower E grades, enlisted grades, NCO's, petty officers, sergeants or officers to foreign countries as advisers; no Islamic nation is going to accept a professed, out-of-privacy officer or NCO adviser into a Moslem country.

You can be assured that if a man is in his local paper as being the first outed, professed homosexual in his unit, just like in our diplomatic corps and with our Foreign Service officers, unless kept private he or she will never be assigned to a country that respects and practices the Islamic faith.

There are not groups in Moslem countries that demean their holy writ, the Koran. It is respected, and in extreme cases up to the point of issuing death threats on Salman Rushdie, the writer. In our country we do have people who regularly demean and attack the bible as an anachronistic old-fashioned, meaningless, and certainly not God's word, and there are organized groups in this country that do that, but do not think you are going to send one of the professed homosexuals in uniform as an adviser to many countries in the world, and that includes all the Moslem countries in what they call the scimitar of Islam, and that goes to Mindanao in the Philippines, Indonesia, all the countries in the southern area of Asia. No; no. No military advisers are to be accepted there.

And then, in addition to the separate quarters, there is the domestic partnership thing that we see General Dinkins, the mayor of New York, fighting right now on all fronts trying to destroy the St. Patrick's Day parade, and we see it in San Francisco written into law, written into law again recently here in DC, and it comes back to our DC committee to be redebated, because we, in aggregate, are the mayor, governor general of the District of Columbia, and that is domestic partnership.

Once this thing in Mr. Clinton's vision is a fait accompli, then you have the problem next year of some litigious, and that is a problem for our whole society, some sue-oriented homosexual activist saying, "My domestic partner here is not feeling well. I want him in the base hospital. I want to get on the housing list on the base."

Remember, a family, a husband and a wife without children, opted not to adopt, one of them is not fertile, they do not have child, God loves them, and I have seen some of the greatest marriages going with people that could not have children, and they get on the housing list along with military couples with children. That's proper. A husband and wife is a family. I had to wait and watch husband and wife fami-

lies without children get into housing ahead of me, never gave it a thought that they did not have kids. When I hit my final jet fighter base on active duty my wife was actually 8 months and 20 days pregnant with our No. 2. We could not secure on-base housing and had to live off the base for two months with a brand-new baby. It did not bother us a bit, we waited our turn.

What do you think is going to happen to morale, discipline, and good order if two male homosexuals approach base housing NCO's and they say, "We are domestic partners, and we want on the base housing list?" Mutiny time, Mr. Speaker.

And let me tell you what I said from this well on domestic partnership a year and a half ago, please, put on your thinking cap and use commonsense logic. It goes like this: What constitutes a domestic partnership? Suppose one guy is in Vietnam with his friend in a foxhole, and he saves his life, and the next day he saves his life, and you have that incredible bonding of deep friendship. Women understand how deep this can be between two men that does not involve sex. It involves saving one another's life. And they come home. Neither of them has found "Miss Right," so they get an apartment together, and one of them says, "You know, I think I will put you on my insurance policy until I find the girl of my dreams and we get married," and the other guy says, "I will do the same for you." And they develop a friendship, and they go to work for the city of San Francisco, and they come in and say, "Listen, I am working for the city, and this guy is my best friend through life until I get married. Can I get him on this domestic partnership thing to get hospital benefits or retirement if something happens to me on the job? I am a cop, I am a fireman, a civil engineer, and I get killed out on the freeway or something." And they say, "Well, we have got one question. Are you intimate with one another?" "Pardon me?" You know, just for sake of color, let us just say the guy is an Italian-American. "Excuse me?" "Are you intimate? Are you having sex with this guy, oral or anal sex? Because if you are not, you do not qualify for the program."

Do you get that logic? I discussed that on this floor that to qualify as a domestic partnership you must assert and state you are sexually intimate, and that goes for lesbians also. What a nutty thing.

Now, imagine a bar off base, whether it is off limits or not. Of course, they would try to not have them off limits, because the heteros have their bars where the MP's sometimes have to come in and arrest people for acting in an ungentlemanly way and getting drunk in the local bistro. And so let us say that a guy goes in a bar and gets a crush on this guy and says, "Listen, I

have got an idea. If you like me as much as I like you, I will declare you my domestic partner, and you do not have a job, so you can come live on the base. I will put our name on base housing. You know, if we break up a year from now, you know, big deal, it is a done deal. Do you want to be my domestic partner? You get housing out of this. You can shop at the commissary. You can get milk at half price."

□ 1930

You could go to the PX, post exchange, the base exchange, what about it?

Now, I have a document from my Christian denomination, the Roman Catholic faith, and it says that if we pass legislation in this body or the other one or anywhere in the world which encourages people who may think that this is offensive to God and they are struggling with that orientation, to use their words, that may come from the absence of a father, a brutal father, a womanizing father, and they want to try and live a godly life, with a focus on Jesus or some other religion, and then suddenly they see the Congress of the United States saying, "Hey, this is equivalent to heterosexuality, this is open, it is just different, an open life style." So that they are tempted to come out. What would they do if they see a whole series of privileges passed, the temptation is there to get into a domestic partner relationship and they start to demand those privileges.

This document that I asked for last week that is a compilation of what came out of the Committee for the Propagation of the Faith, the Catholic Church, ordered by Cardinal Ratzinger, a cardinal with his base in Germany, it says two things. It says that homosexuality is intrinsically disordered and it says that although the particular inclination of the homosexual person is not a sin, it deserves dignity and to be respected and given all the constitutional privileges which—certainly in the military is not a right, it is a privilege—it says that the inclination "is not a sin but it is more or less a strong tendency toward an intrinsic moral evil, and thus the inclination itself must be seen as an objective disorder."

If you act it out, it is intrinsically evil.

I submit to Maria Shriver, who was raised as a Catholic and who did a ghastly 1-hour pure hardcore propaganda, pro-homosexual piece on NBC last week, I suggest to Maria and her great family and anybody in this Chamber of any Christian denomination that the debate in American is taking a course that is making people hate any religion or denomination that says that homosexuality is intrinsically evil, the acting out of it is intrinsically evil.

When the networks and the pundits, hardly 2 percent of whom go to church anymore, set themselves up to breed hatred against my religious faith, I am taking that personally.

St. Patrick's Cathedral, where my parents were married in New York in 1929, I was baptized there 4 years later, my older brother was baptized 2 years before me and my younger brother 2 years after me, all in the 1930's, I consider that one of the most beautiful houses of worship in this country. And to see that cathedral trashed on December 10, 1989, by this group called Act Up, which is getting more and more and more respectability by the networks, to see that happen, to see the communion host, which practicing Catholics believe is truly, through transubstantiation, is the body and blood of Jesus Christ, to see that thrown on the ground and trampled, to see that on television, believe me, there are New York police officers of Polish, Irish, or Italian heritage, who see red and they put on their gloves to arrest these people and make those arrests with their hearts in it. I am not going to watch the three networks in my service in this Chamber—and CNN, of late—create hatred for loyal Catholics and a church that is never ever going to change its doctrine on innocent life in the womb or that homosexuals individually must be respected with dignity and love, but the acting out of that inclination is an intrinsic evil and a disorder.

I am watching them create this hatred for fundamentalists, evangelicals, or Jews, for the Islamic faith, traditional Buddhism and Hinduism, all throughout history people have had codes and mores and taboos on sexual conduct.

I would recommend Samuel Francis' column of the day before yesterday, who said, with all of the debate, Colin Powell, the four-star general, chairman of the Joint Chiefs, excellent statement, one of them comes to mind. He says what the President is asking us to do is to allow something, to enforce something about mores that we do not even understand. In other words, Colin Powell says, "I don't even understand why people want to engage in that." He did not mean the bizarre stuff like fisting and renting and all of that bizarre yellow stuff that we see in the testimony this morning. He is just talking about gender on gender. He is talking about same sex. He said, "We don't understand the mores. We are being told we have to enforce this and allow it?" Well, I think, what Francis' column says at the heart of the matter here is that this Nation is going to have to decide whether this is aberrant or abnormal conduct or not. All the arguments that General Powell has used and all the military people have used and I have put in "Dear Colleagues" and we have all discussed up to this

point, if we avoid the core, what Francis says is the heart of the issue and it becomes the national debate on the New York school system under Fernandez, where they teach that Heather has two mommies, in the school system and we start trying to force these lying statistics that the country is 15 percent homosexual, as the new figure is being thrown around. We barely were able to refute 10.

You go up to the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, out there it is 1.5 to 2 percent.

We have got one big national debate in front of us, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to finding out in a few seconds what the Senate vote was. I hope the Dole amendment prevailed. I include here in closing the excellent commentary of Mr. Samuel Francis.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 2, 1993]

SEX * * * AND CONSEQUENCES—SOCIETY'S STATE

(By Samuel Francis)

In what turned out to be the mother of all arguments, the brass hats of the Pentagon cloistered themselves with President Clinton for two hours last week to try to explain to the new chief why lifting the ban on alternative lifestyles in the military is not a terribly swift idea. Since the closest Mr. Clinton has ever come to people in uniform is when he quips with the burger jockeys at McDonald's, the brass took on no enviable mission.

Nevertheless, with help from Senate Armed Services Chairman Sam Nunn, the Joint Chiefs seem at last to have penetrated the bunker of presidential consciousness. Now there has been a "compromise," but no outright reversal of the ban—at least not for a while.

Yet most of the arguments the generals offered the president boil down to pragmatic and administrative reasons. The New York Times reports that Joint Chiefs Chairman Colin Powell brought up several: Accepting homosexuals in the military would create serious problems for "morale and discipline, recruiting, cohesiveness among combat troops, personal privacy and even the spread of AIDS."

These are good reasons, but none touches the heart of the issue, which is whether the social normalization of homosexuality is a good idea. Unless that issue is resolved in the negative, unless Americans and their leaders decide it's not a good idea, most of the reasons Gen. Powell mentioned become irrelevant.

If homosexuality is "normal," if it is no different from heterosexuality, then problems of "morale and discipline," recruiting and "cohesiveness" wither away as the result of outdated stereotypes of homosexuals as "abnormal." The spread of AIDS would be no more serious than that of other venereal diseases, and personal privacy has never been much of a consideration in an army that doesn't even have toilet stalls. Gen. Powell and his colleagues in khaki did their best, but by all accounts they missed the bull's eye.

Nor are many of the reasons the religious right offers much more compelling. It's true the Bible condemns sodomy, the Old Testament inflicts the death penalty for it and both church and rabbinical traditions condemn it. But America no longer even pretends to be a Christian society, and unless

we make that pretense, there's no reason to write Jewish or Christian Scriptures into our secular law.

Moreover, God may not like sodomy, but reportedly He also doesn't much care for lying, gluttony or any of a wide range of vices that abuse the flesh He created. As abhorrent as such sins are in the eyes of the Almighty, it doesn't follow that our public laws should punish them. To reach that position, you have to engage on other ground.

The main argument homosexuals use to justify repealing laws against consenting sodomy among adults and voiding the ban on their kind in the military is that homosexuality does no harm. They claim (I'm not convinced they're right) that homosexuals are no more inclined to commit sex crimes than heterosexuals and that the homosexual act itself hurts no one. Hence, under a commonly accepted standard, the state has no business using legal force to prevent or punish such acts. It is on the validity of that argument that the case for normalizing homosexuality must stand or fall.

It is not a valid argument. One of its flaws is its very narrow conception of what constitutes "harm" and "hurting." The lesson of 4,000 years of social history is that sexual behavior, consensual or not, has consequences for others, that it often affects (and hurts) others in ways society needs to control, and that unregulated sex renders social bonds, especially in the family but also beyond it, impossible. We can regulate it through law or through socially enforced moral custom or both, but we have to do it somehow.

History knows of no human society that has not regulated sexual behavior and forbidden some kinds of it, nor is there any reason known to social science to suppose that a society that fails to do so is possible. A "society" that makes no distinction between sex within marriage and sex outside it, that does not distinguish morally and socially between continence and debauchery, normality and perversion, love and lust, is not really a society but merely the chaos of a perpetual orgy.

It is an invitation to just such an orgy that the proponents of normalized and unrestricted homosexuality invite America. Maybe most Americans have reached the point at which they are ready to immerse themselves in the illusion that a perpetual orgy pretending to be a society really doesn't hurt anybody.

Or maybe most Americans haven't thought it through. It's clear their leaders haven't and don't know how to make the case against normalization. That's one more reason why Mr. Clinton ought to hold off on his executive order until Americans and their leaders have a chance to think about it some more.

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COPPERSMITH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana. [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE ANDREW JACOBS, SR.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, recently Andrew Jacobs, Sr., a fine former Member of this body, and a great American, passed away. People in Indianapolis knew him to be a fine legislator, a tough and yet fair-minded

judge, and a devoted family man. He shall be missed by all those who knew him of whatever political persuasion.

You know a lot about people by their children. In addition to the fine reputation Andrew Jacobs, Sr., had, I know of him through his son and our colleague, Congressman ANDREW JACOBS, Jr. Although I'm a Republican and ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., is a Democrat, I consider him to be one of the finest Members of this body as well as a good friend, and I attribute his honesty, integrity, and love of his fellowman, to his parents who taught him well during his formative years.

Even though I primarily only knew Andrew Jacobs, Sr., by reputation, I know he was a unique individual because he couldn't have been otherwise and had a son like our colleague ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.

In addition to my brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am adding for the RECORD some comments made in Indianapolis newspapers and at a recent memorial service held for Judge Jacobs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,
Washington, DC, January 28, 1993.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR DAN: Here are the two things Joe Gelarden wrote, one published in the Star and the other, you will recall, spoken at the memorial service.

It was kind of you to be willing to place them in the Record.

Dad was elected to the U.S. House in 1948 and served during the 81st Congress.

Sincerely,

ANDY JACOBS, Jr.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Dec. 22, 1992]

CHERISHING MEMORIES AND LEGENDS OF ANDY SR.

(By Joe Gelarden)

His name was James Andrew Jacobs, but no one knew him by that name. He was simply Andy Senior.

But James Andrew Jacobs, reluctant member of the 81st Congress, Criminal Court judge like no one had ever seen before—or since—was not "simply" anything at all.

If this guy had lived in New York City or Los Angeles, they would have written books about him. Maybe they still will. But he was born a Hoosier, first class, so the big-shot writers in the big-time towns never knew him.

But I did.

Like other Hoosiers of legend, he was born in southern Indiana on a farm and educated in a one-room schoolhouse. He worked his way through law school, elbowed his way into the Downtown real estate game and made a ton of dough.

He was brilliant, hard-working to a fault, had a grasp of people and a sense of history. He loved his family, especially his wife, whom he always called "the widow Jacobs" and his kids. His son, known always as Andy Junior, the congressman, was the kid of whom he was most proud.

I know how much he loved his son. Once, at a big political dinner, a big-time politician made a bad joke about Andy Jr. Later that night, as I accompanied Andy Sr. to his car, the man who was so tough that he made mad

dog killers and their lawyers quake in their boots was in tears.

"How could he say that about Andy? I thought he (the big-time politician) was a better man than that," said he.

JUDGE OF TALL TALES

I covered the courthouse while he was a judge. We talked most every day about life and politics and Indiana and America. He always had a story or a tall tale—like the one about the young lawyer, when ordered to give his best advice to the criminal client, suggested that he try to escape.

Despite our daily contact, he always called me Mr. Gelarden. I tried to explain that Mr. Gelarden was my father, that I answered to the name Joe.

"I'll try to remember that, Mr. Gelarden," he replied.

Andy Sr. went to Congress in 1948 from the old 11th District after being handed the nomination by a bunch of pols because they really didn't want him to run for Marion County prosecutor. One man who was in the meeting where they decided to offer him the nomination said the big shots believed Andy Sr. would have put them all in jail within six months.

Andy Sr. liked newspaper reporters, but he sued one for libel and collected. For that, my boss' dad banned his name from the pages of your favorite newspaper for years.

I first saw Andy Sr. about 1968 when I was a young police reporter with a fresh Marine Corps discharge in my pocket. It seems that the police were going to surround Military park because they believed a bunch of commie radicals were going to hold a rally there for a nefarious purpose.

DEMOCRAT REGISTRARS

Actually, they were Democrats and were there to register young voters, but you had to be there to understand the times.

On hand to bring in the kids were (shhhh) folk singers John Denver and Phil Ochs.

Anyway, one of the police brass was racing around snapping pictures of the alleged radicals with a tiny spy camera, and he spent a lot of time focused on this old guy in a string tie.

This alleged old commie guy was spouting reason, not treason. He talked about Lincoln and Washington, about motherhood and the flag, about Indiana and the U.S. Constitution. It was Andy Sr.

Some radical. So much for believing the police brass.

Later, when he was on the bench, he presided over some 150 jury trials in 159 days, a feat which must be a world record. I don't think he ever put anyone on probation. In Criminal Court 3, if you did the crime, you would do the time.

Often, he had so many trials that the city ran out of potential jurors. When the lawyers suggested that this was a good reason to continue the case, he just smiled.

"Sheriff," he'd tell the courtroom deputies, "go out on the highways and byways and bring me some jurors."

So the deputies, armed with a handful of blank subpoenas, walked out on Market Street and began stopping citizens.

One time, they stopped me and slapped a subpoena in my pocket. "Come with us," they ordered. I did. I fumed in his jury room for about an hour until I was seated in the jury box. A very stern Andy Sr. looked over his glasses and said: "Mr. Gelarden, do you know anyone involved with this case?"

"Yes, your honor," I replied. "I know everyone in this room, except the guy in the orange jumpsuit with the words Marion County Jail on it."

NO SHORTCUTS

The judge chuckled and said, "Excused." While he knew I would be eventually excused, he wouldn't pull a string to cut my service short. Like the rest of the public, he believed it when the law said he couldn't shortcut the process. In his mind, it just wasn't right to do a favor for me because I covered his court. I was to be treated like the rest of the citizenry.

Another time, another lawyer sought a continuance, saying he just couldn't go to trial today, but any other time would be fine. OK, said Andy Sr. "Be here at 6 a.m. tomorrow. And Mr. - - -, don't be late."

Ken Roberts, a young lawyer, was one of Jacobs' public defenders. He later said the old man scared him to death. Fear turned to love.

"After practicing in front of Andy Sr., I believe I can be effective in any court in the land. I have learned my trade before the toughest, most exacting judge in the world."

One of the things Andy Sr. held dear in the world (besides his long-suffering bride) was the fact that his son Andy Jr. was elected to his 11th district congressional seat.

He never let anyone know his feelings.

"If my son wants to go to Congress, I want him to go to Congress," said Andy Sr.

"He'll learn."

REMARKS BY JOE GELARDEN AT THE FUNERAL OF ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

Today is my late father's birthday, Dec. 29. Like Andy Senior, he was from Southern Indiana. His roots were in Belgium. Both were raised on a farm, clawed their way to Indianapolis, hustled their way into law school.

Along the way, both men seem to have earned a kind of wisdom that surely must spring from the rich Hoosier soil, the strong hardwood trees, the sweet flowing springs from under the rocks in the cricks where the critters dwell, from the secret spots under the grove of beech tree where flowers bloom in the spring, and from the hearts of the sensible people who scratch out a living in the hollers and hills of counties with names like Daviess and Martin and Crawford and Perry.

Both he and my dad came from a long tradition of Hoosier idealists. Those whose ancestors came to Indiana because they wanted to practice what they preached. Men like George Rapp and Robert Dale Owen and the Shakers and even yes, even Abraham Lincoln and Eugene Victor Debs.

Indiana and America has been blessed with these men and women.

James Andrew Jacobs claimed to be a simple man. But he was not. He professed to be happy only when holed up in his workshop, or puffing on the pipe that wouldn't stay lit. Or eating lunch with his cronies, spinning yarns that were often closer to outright lies than the sacred truth.

But Andy Senior was only truly happy when he was working. Working to solve a problem that troubled his soul and that of his friends and humanity.

At an age where most men are ready to go fishing, Andy Senior nearly worked himself to death on one of America's great problems. Crime.

He believed that insane maze that we call the criminal justice system works only if those involved in the system worked—hard.

And he relished the chance to go into battle with those he considered "artists" not lawyers. He believed that a trial was a search for the truth.

Unlike a lot of judges, he always said he would listen to any lawyers argument with a

willingness to be convinced. And I believe he meant every word.

(aside) That did not mean that he would swallow a load of horsefeathers.

Or listen very long to the plea of a lawyer who insisted that the sky was green, the earth was flat or that his client was just an innocent bystander caught up in inappropriate conduct situation because the Moon was in the seventh house and Jupiter was aligned with Mars.

In this situation it was a wonder to watch Old Andy smoke the lawyer's tail feathers using the very same speech delivered to me by Sgt. Noakes, my sainted Marine Drill Instructor but this time it was recited in simple, descriptive but un-profaned English.

When other judges and politicians urged Old Andy to take the easy way out, to ride with the tide and roll with the flow, to cut back and plea bargain cases to get rid of them, he said no. He believed that is wrong.

And he put his pipe down and started to work. He presided over 150 jury trials in 159 days. If that is not the absolute world record, one does not exist.

In the end the system got to him and he resigned.

But to Andy Senior, it didn't matter. He did not fail. He had fought his fight on his own terms in his own way.

And to his way of thinking, a man could do no more.

Today, I have only two regrets about my relationship with Andy Senior. Confess that I was lax and failed to keep in contact with him after he left City Hall.

And I regret that I never got to read the book he never got around to writing entitled: "S.O.B.s I Have Known, with its central character Judge Mordecai J. Loophole."

One wing of a well known political party recently tried to convince us that had the corner on the market for something called "Traditional values."

Hogwash, Old Andy would say.

For his life was a celebration of traditional values. Values like truth and hard work of devotion to ideals and traditions of love of fellow man and woman of honesty and integrity and the quest for justice of appreciation and celebration of the sense of place embodied in the perjorative term—Hoosier—that he—and we—wear the pride of the knowledge of where he belonged in the history of this nation, this state and this city.

His life was a celebration of simple traditional values like a love of wife, son, daughters and what my late Daviess County grandmother called her grandbabies.

It was the love of and for a group we call family. It is a passion which consumes and drives any sane man.

But my friends, I am not here to recite his obit, praise his accomplishments and tell you of his faults. Others here can do that with more accuracy or eloquence.

I am a scribbler and do not possess the eloquent tongue of the lawyer, the politician or the Congressman.

But I can swear and affirm to all who will listen to my voice that my life is better for having known James Andrew Jacobs.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2111

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS) at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF A CERTAIN RESOLUTION

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 61 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 61

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is hereby waived with respect to a resolution providing for consideration of a bill relating to family and temporary medical leave for certain employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 61 waives clause 4(b) of rule XI, which requires a two-thirds vote to bring a rule to the floor the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules. The resolution only applies to legislation relating to family and medical leave.

This resolution is simple and straightforward. President Clinton has requested that Congress get the family and medical leave legislation on his desk at the earliest possible time. House Resolution 61 facilitates this request.

I encourage my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is taking another week of media criticism, this time for reneging on his campaign promise not to raise taxes on the middle class. He needs to create the appearance that he has a domestic agenda, and our friends on the other side have decided that the family leave bill will be his political prop.

So that the Democrats can have their photo opportunity tomorrow, the leadership wants to impose marital law on the House of Representatives.

I can understand, Mr. Speaker, if this were an emergency measure to create jobs and stimulate economic growth, or if we were approaching sine die adjournment. It is neither.

In fact, we are being asked to ignore House rules and expedite the passage of a bill that will actually destroy jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting for 2 years to pass a jobs creation bill, but the Democratic leadership cannot wait 3 days, as required by House rules, to enact a jobs destruction bill.

Mr. Speaker, today our Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress took testimony from nearly 50 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle on proposals to improve this institution.

One of the biggest frustrations commonly expressed is how we increasingly rush through legislation without adequate deliberation or opportunity for Members to review the measures they are being asked to vote on.

We have a 3-day layover rule just for this reason. Our problem is not that our rules don't work. Our problem is a Democratic leadership that increasingly ignores them.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no justification for taking such extreme action only 4 weeks into the new Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote down this martial law rule for the people's House.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that the basis of this rule is to waive the requirements that say that, if we are bringing up a bill on this same day that it comes before us, we have to have a two-thirds vote on it, and we are just kind of getting rid of that provision? Is that right?

Mr. DREIER. My friend is exactly correct. That is exactly what is happening here. We are waiving the standard provisions that we are supposed to work under here in the people's House.

Mr. WALKER. And the reason for that particular provision is to ensure that it would take a supermajority to pass any bill that the Members have not had a chance to read and to understand; is that correct?

Mr. DREIER. My friend is absolutely correct. We are really preventing most any Member from having the opportunity to read this measure before we vote upon it.

Mr. WALKER. And there have been changes in the bill that is coming over from the Senate that we are passing this rule to expedite; is that right?

Mr. DREIER. I say to my friend, "We just had a hearing upstairs in the Rules Committee, and there was a great deal of confusion over the changes which took place in the other body."

Mr. WALKER. Wait a minute. The people who are bringing this measure are confused about it themselves?

Mr. DREIER. Well, a number of us on the Committee on Rules were confused at the explanation that was given to us of the actions that took place in the other body.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just did a quick count of the House, and we have approximately 30 to 50 Members on the floor right now. These are the only people that have any chance whatsoever to get ahold of copies of the bill. That is about one-tenth of the House of Representatives. One wonders when the other Members are going to have an opportunity to see some of these things, and yet we are going to waive the two-thirds rule that allows people an opportunity to really understand the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Well, I do not want my friend to be too much of a pessimist. We have an opportunity to address that because we are going to have a vote on that question in just a few minutes, so where there is life there is hope, and I hope that we are able to prevent this waiver of this two-thirds provision and we will allow every Member to have an opportunity to read the legislation.

Mr. WALKER. Let us also understand that what they are doing is they passed this rules package themselves in the beginning. We did not vote for it. The Democrats passed the rules package, and all of them voted for it, or there were a significant number of them that did not vote for it this time, but they passed it by an overwhelming majority, and now with a majority vote they are waiving a two-thirds rule.

Is that correct?

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely right.

Mr. WALKER. So, what we have is a situation where they are overthrowing their own rules in a way that cuts down on the supermajority rule that they have in place.

Does it strike the gentleman that that also is a rather obvious procedure, and is the gentleman telling me that the whole reason for doing all of this is because at 9:30 tomorrow morning the Democrats have scheduled at the White House a photo op?

Mr. DREIER. Well, that is what I have heard, but I did not get an invitation.

Mr. WALKER. So, in other words the Members are not going to be able to read the bill. We are going to pass a bill that the people who are proponents of it are confused about the Senate language, and we are doing this all because at 9:30 tomorrow morning we have to have a photo op at the White House.

□ 2120

Mr. DREIER. Did my friend get an invitation to be at that photo op?

Mr. WALKER. I must admit I am not on the invitation list these days.

Mr. DREIER. I felt I was left out myself.

Mr. WALKER. I have to tell the gentleman, I am not real disappointed by that. I am going to be able to be back in my district. But I am very concerned that the procedures of the House, meant to assure a logical and

reasonable process, are being violated so that more Members can get on the television.

We were told by the chairman of the committee that handles this bill the other day that the whole debate on the floor was structured so as many Members as possible could get on television. Now we are having the whole House proceedings undermined so the Members can go to the White House tomorrow and get on television there. I am sure pleased the Democrats think television is more important than the democratic process.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I knew my friend from California [Mr. DREIER] represented an area near Hollywood and would have some expertise in that area. But let me congratulate my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for his introduction—

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is out of order. The gentleman has not yielded himself any time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] still controls the time.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat that my friend from California [Mr. DREIER], although he does not directly represent Hollywood, apparently represents an area close enough there that he has been able to develop some of the talent, which has rubbed off on our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. I will have to congratulate them on their show of gasp, their show of awe and concern. I do not know how long it took them to be able to develop this. But let us look at the facts. Let us look at the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that we had a recess planned for this body that has been of notice since the first of the year. People have plans. So it is an attempt to try to move the family and medical leave bill forward so that people can keep those plans to go back to their district with their open meetings.

Now, to say that this is something suddenly put on us is amazing. The family and medical leave bill has been before us for 8 years. It has passed this House six times. It has been in committee hearings for hours, and hours, and hours.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on just one point?

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, how many of the 110 new Members who have joined this House, the largest number of new Members in decades, had a chance during those other considerations to closely scrutinize this measure the way my friend from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] and I have?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is a very good question. The answer to that is that we had over 3½ hours of debate just this week on this subject.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, including the Senate provisions which have been included in this measure, which we are going to ram through if martial law is imposed?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, as I said, all of the new Members had over 3½ hours, which is an unusually long time for debate. They had the opportunity to attend a variety of hearings. We have yet to have heard a complaint about that. So clearly, we have had an abundant amount of time to be able to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the majority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Not only have the new Members of this body had the opportunity during the debate over this issue in the last week, ample opportunity to express themselves, they are the very people who have come fresh from the electorate and who have brought the horror stories that make possible this legislation reaching the President's desk tomorrow at 9 o'clock. So they know firsthand the pain and suffering.

I venture to say when the rollcall is taken on this vote, at least on this side of the aisle, we will have over 95 percent of our new Members not only in support of this legislation, but in enthusiastic support to take care of the needs of sick parents and unborn children.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend that he has made over the past several years a very compelling case for this legislation. We are standing here at 9:20 this evening debating whether or not we are going to impose martial law rule on the people's House. That is the question we are considering here.

I have heard the arguments made by my very good friend, the distinguished majority whip, for many years on this issue, and I have listened to it. Frankly, I sympathize with many of the things that my friend has said.

But the fact of the matter is, we do not need to do it with this kind of procedure. We do not need to waive the rules of the House of Representatives. There are 47 new Republican Members too. There are 63 Democrat and 47 Republican Members that are new. Many of them are virulently opposed to this legislation, and they should have the right to look at the changes that were made in the U.S. Senate before we bring this up for a vote here.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Glens Falls, New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished Republican leader of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I am going to try to keep a cooler head than I sometimes do on this floor, although this issue is becoming so frustrating.

Mr. Speaker, I am just reminded of last year when I almost decided not to run. But as I look at what is happening here, and I am not here trying to defeat this piece of legislation, because Members on that side of the aisle know that last year I was a part of the negotiations that tried to make this a workable piece of legislation, one that would work, that would not create a hardship for small business and industry in this country, and I voted for the legislation. I did it again yesterday, almost against my own better judgment.

But having been a part of that, getting that 50-employee figure in there, meant so much to the people that I represent. So I am not here to try to defeat it.

But I am just totally disgusted with what is happening in this Congress. I have a young Member here, I believe from Idaho, who came up to me this morning and said, "What is an open rule?" You know, I looked up at him and I said, "Well, I understand why you don't know what an open rule is. We haven't had one this year yet." Here we are, 3, 4, 5 weeks into the session.

I looked back at what has happened in this Congress over recent years. Back in the 95th Congress, 1977-78, about the time I came here and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], and a lot of these other people on that side of the aisle, at that time only 15 percent of the rules were restrictive rules. Two years later it jumped to 25 percent restrictive rules, waiving all the rules that we live by here. Two years later it jumped to 32 percent, then 43 percent, 46 percent, and 55 percent. Finally last year, in the 102d Congress, 66 percent of all the rules we brought to this floor were blanket waivers, waived the Budget Act, and drove the deficits through the ceiling.

That is what we are doing here today. We are waiving this two-thirds rule. We are going to vote on a piece of legislation that you and I have not seen.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you something. I read these changes that were just handed to me. But there are not five Members on this floor that have read them. Members do not know what is in this bill. Members do not have the slightest idea what they are voting on here.

That is not the way democracy should work. That is not fairness in this House.

Getting on a little further, what the Senate has done, just so Members will

know, they have defeated BOB DOLE's amendment which would have kept the regulations in effect in the military dealing with homosexuals. They defeated that.

They enacted Mr. MITCHELL's sense-of-Congress amendment, which does absolutely nothing. They have ducked this issue.

I offered the emotion upstairs a few minutes ago to make this in order. Mr. Speaker, listen to this: "All Executive orders, Department of Defense directives, and regulations of the military departments concerning the appointment, the enlistment, the induction, and the retention of homosexuals in the Armed Forces of the United States as in effect on January 1, 1993, shall remain in effect with respect to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps," which I served in, "unless changed by law." And that was voted down on a party line vote.

We tried to reinstate the Goodling amendment, which passed this House with Democratic support. It was just absolutely ignored by the other body.

They made some other changes, which I will let the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] talk about with his amendment and mine dealing with the definition of spouses. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why we in this body have to cave in to the other body.

□ 2130

We are an equal branch of Government. Every one of us are as good as any Senator over there, and that is why we ought to defeat this rule. And we ought to go back upstairs and make the amendments in order and come down here and have a legitimate, honest-to-goodness debate of the issues so that Members like me, who want to vote for this bill, can do it. But do not try to jam this down our throats just because the Senate has already disappeared from Capitol Hill.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

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

I rise just to, I believe, correct the RECORD and the impression that my colleague from New York may have left with respect to two of the amendments that he talked about.

The argument on the floor has been that there has been changes made in the Senate and we need time to digest them, to understand them, to look them over, to reread them.

We have had 8 years to understand this bill. And if I might be so bold as to suggest, this body is capable of digesting the four changes that were made in the Senate.

The first change, they changed the definition of spouse from the language

that we had that we, by the way, accepted from the Republicans, to a language that I think perhaps they would even be more enthused with, that which is listed in the U.S. Military Code definition.

The second point I want to make is with respect to the so-called Goodling amendment. The Goodling amendment was taken by the Senate and a compromise was reached. The compromise basically adds items to be studied by the Commission as well as by adding certain other members to the Commission who represent certain areas of expertise such as family issues, temporary disability and labor-management.

In addition to that, the Senate has taken language that reflected the Goodling amendment and they have added requirements that a doctor must certify that such leave is medically necessary and the expected duration of such leave, a reasonable compromise from what we passed and what they did not have, a reasonable compromise, a reasonable compromise on spousal language.

And the third point I want to make to my colleagues, so everybody understands what the four points were that they changed, is the question that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] alluded to. And that is the question of the issue of service of homosexuals in the armed forces.

By a vote of 62 to 37, with the vast majority of Democrats, including Senator NUNN, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and many, and some Republicans, they adopted the Nunn-Mitchell language which basically says this:

It is the sense of the Congress that: (a) the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a comprehensive review of current departmental policy with respect to the service of homosexuals in the armed forces; (b) such review shall include the basis for the current policy of mandatory separation; the rights of all service men and women, and the effect of any change in such policy on morale, discipline, and military effectiveness; (c) the Secretary shall report the results of such a review and consultation and his recommendations to the President and to the Congress no later than July 15.

Of this year, July 15.

We can wait 6 months to get the review of the Secretary of Defense and have the impact of the hearings that the Senator of the Committee on Armed Service over there, Senator NUNN, will conduct. That is the fourth part.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall conduct comprehensive hearings on the current military policy with respect to the service of homosexuals in the military services; and shall conduct oversight hearings on the Secretary's recommendations as such are reported.

By an overwhelming vote, 2 to 1 in the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, they adopted that language tonight. It would be a tragedy if we did

not accept that same language and the review process which it implies, a thorough review process, not only by the Secretary of Defense but by the appropriate committees in the House and the Senate.

I ask my colleagues to understand that those were the four changes that were made there, changes we can live with, changes that make sense, changes that meet a common ground between the right and the left in this House, and that we pass to the President tonight this important piece of legislation which he is waiting for.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am the one who authored the language that the House passed on spousal definition, and I am not certain what the language means that the Senate has passed.

The language reads, the term spouse means "a husband or wife, as the case may be."

Can the gentleman tell me what that means?

Mr. BONIOR. The term "spouse" in the Senate language means husband and wife or, as the case may be, or as defined in the Military Code definition.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, no, it does not say that. All it says is, the term spouse means "husband or wife, as the case may be," period.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. To help me define this for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would think that at least the hawks over there would be relieved that the Senate adopted the language of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the definition of spouse in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. That is what the language is.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, because once again, while that language may be, no one has yet provided me with an explanation.

Mr. BONIOR. Does the gentleman mean that he went for 12 years under President Reagan, under President Bush, under Colin Powell accepting that definition and all of a sudden tonight on the eve of this bill it has become a mystery as to what it means?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the point is that the language adopted by the House established the basis by law. Now this comes along and is not a legal definition.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is a legal definition. The Uniform Code of Military Conduct is a legal definition.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to find out whether or not anybody disagrees with this: Does anybody disagree that this language in the bill

that has come out of the Senate, that "husband" means a married man? Does anybody disagree with that?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I agree with this language, and I agree with the support that it was given by Senator NUNN, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WALKER. I think it is important to try to find out where we stand. Does this mean a married man and a married woman?

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], author of that very famous Goodling amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to ask the distinguished whip, when he indicated what the modification was to my amendment, I thought I heard him say that the word "doctor," is that what he meant, that it is a doctor who must certify that such leave is medically necessary? I thought that is what the gentleman said.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, that is correct, and if I am wrong, I stand corrected.

My information is that the amendment added requirements that in order to be eligible for reduced or intermittent leave, a doctor must certify that such leave is medically necessary and the expected duration of such leave.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman say "a doctor"?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I did.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

I will certify that this is an irregular practice at best and a darn mean one at worst.

Mr. Speaker, as near as I can tell, what we are doing tonight is exercising martial law in the U.S. House of Representatives so that we can entertain a self-executing rule or gag rule that will allow us to pass the Democrats' latest version of their bill without any discussion of that bill or without any vote on that bill, but a vote only on the rule itself.

□ 2140

I also understand the Democratic whip promises us that as whip, he can assure us that 95 percent of the Democrat freshmen will be whipped into line and vote for this gag rule. I find myself not at all curious about that proclamation from the Democrat whip. I expect they will be whipped into line, as they are told this is a procedural vote.

The question that I am most concerned about is, after 8 years of discussions in the committee over the reduced leave schedule in the bill, much work being done by many, we found the day before the bill was marked up last week that that reduced leave provision was substituted unilaterally by one member of the committee in consultation with certain people from outside the Congress of the United States.

We had put in here a provision that says that we can have a reduced leave schedule, 1 hour a week, 2 hours a week, 1 hour on Thursday, 3 hours on Friday, whatever the employee wants for 480 hours a year without any consultation with the employer; that is to say, to dictate the terms of the reduced leave to the employer. This was a totally new innovation taken out by this House in a vote on the Goodling amendment. Now we are asked to put gags on and vote to affirm this provision.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1. An act to grant family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to designate February 7, 1993, through February 13, 1993, and February 6, 1994, through February 12, 1994, as "National Burn Awareness Week," and

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate from Thursday, February 4, 1993, or Friday, February 5, 1993, until Tuesday, February 16, 1993, and a conditional adjournment of the House from Thursday, February 4, 1993, or Friday, February 5, 1993, until Tuesday, February 16, 1993.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF A CERTAIN RESOLUTION

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Sugar Land, TX [Mr. DELAY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I think Members really better listen up as Members walk onto the floor about what is happening here. We are going to have two votes. The first vote will be on the martial law that has been amply debated here and described here, where with a majority vote we are going to waive the two-thirds vote by which we can bring up a bill.

The second vote, the second vote, Members, endorses Clinton's position on homosexuals in the military. If you vote for the rule that passes the Senate bill, it is a self-enacting rule, you are voting to endorse the position of the President on homosexuals in the military. What you will be endorsing is the removal of the question of whether you are a homosexual or not on personnel recruitment forms, and you are suspending any more charges or legal moves against homosexuals that presently are in the military, and you are waiting for hearings and however they want to do their political manipulations for July 15 to come.

You are also giving up your right as the House of Representatives in speaking to this issue. Do not, and I repeat, do not go home and say that you have taken care of the homosexual problem in the military, because what you have done is endorsed the President's position and, second, what you have done is given your right to enforce the ban on homosexuals in the military just carte blanche by passing a rule that is self-executing, this bill, H.R. 1.

So be very wary when you go home over the recess of the questions that will be asked to you about how you feel about gays serving in the military and the ban on gays serving in the military, because if you vote for this rule you are voting to support the President's position.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

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

I think it is very clear that there is confusion over the meaning of at least some of the terminology here. That is one of the reasons why we should not be adopting this truncated procedure. Under the terms of the Senate amendment, as I understand them, the term "spouse" means a husband or wife, as the case may be. That is all the language says, contrary to what the distinguished whip said a moment ago. It does not add the words as defined in the Military Code of Justice, so the only words we have before us are these very words: "The term 'spouse' means a husband or wife, as the case may be." That is not further defined, as it is in the House version.

I think it is very important before we vote on this that we have confirmation from the chairman or other Members who have been involved in the rule, in the developing of the rule, to confirm the fact that this refers to the two people involved in a heterosexual marriage; that it means a married man and a married woman, and that is precisely and all that it means.

If that is not the understanding of everyone in the body, then we have a significant difference of opinion, and we had better be very careful before we adopt this rule, that we understand the

differences between the House version, which referred to other law, and the Senate version, which does not.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SKAGGS). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 11½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. And I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, are there going to be further requests for time?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from East Petersburg, PA [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to get some clarification on what language, we are told that everybody understands, is in this bill. It was apparent, a minute ago, the whip did not understand what was in the bill in terms of the language on "spouse". He specifically stated it wrong as to what is in the bill. I am trying to get a clarification, and I would like to have someone, who can make legislative history on this, give us the clarification that is necessary.

When we passed the House version, the House version talked about husband and wife under the law of any State. That means there was a body of law to refer to. The UCMJ was specifically dropped as a reference in the Senate. They went with this language that they put in there, but specifically dropped the reference to UCMJ, and in fact, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, when he went before the committee, did not want to include any definition whatsoever with regard to "spouse" in this bill.

What we are trying to do is, since the House has adopted a position and since the Senate has adopted a position, we are trying to make certain that we mean the same thing.

I would ask again what I asked a couple of minutes ago, do the terms under this bill as it comes over from the Senate, does the term "husband" mean a married man and does the term "wife" mean a married woman?

I would ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], if he would answer.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, it does to me. I do not have any trouble knowing the difference.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman would state it for the record.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, it does

to me, for the record, because I have no trouble understanding the difference. If the gentleman does, that is his problem, not mine.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman, the problem is, if we look in the dictionary, and it says, "as the case may be," we will find the term "husband" means, among other things, "a frugal housekeeper." Now, that could be a whole variety of things.

I am simply trying to establish, and I think the gentleman has said it for the record, that it is his understanding that this means a married man and a married woman. That does help clarify. I appreciate it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, the Members are looking at someone who has never been in politics before. There are 10 of us that are in this Congress, the first time we have even been here, and I have walked off the street corners of America and walked into this body, and I am shocked. Not only am I shocked, but I am appalled at the martial law on this side. You ought to be ashamed.

What bothers me here, and what America needs to understand, is that there is a requirement of two-thirds, and all of a sudden they say, "We can shift and change," because you have flights that you have to make for tomorrow, and do not want to take the time to read a bill.

I think that is pretty shocking. I would like to read and see what the changes are. I think that is extremely important, not to put our personal time and our personal lives ahead of the job and the responsibilities. I think we owe it to the American people to stay here until the job is done.

□ 1250

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have been a little too frivolous with the debate. This is really not something we can laugh about.

I just want Members to know that I am not going to take up time trying to defeat the previous question on this particular rule, because we are talking about simply waiving the two-thirds vote. So there is not really justifiable reason to try to defeat the previous question. We will have a recorded vote on the rule itself.

However, I just want Members to know that when we do debate the second rule, that there will be an attempt to defeat the previous question for two reasons. One, so we can offer the Good-

ling amendment and two, so that I can offer the Dole amendment which would keep the present policy in effect as far as military homosexuals are concerned. I just wanted Members to know that.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong, enthusiastic "no" vote on this martial law rule.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the Family and Medical Leave Act have presented a number of smoke screens today. But the bottom line goes back to the same issue that we have been discussing for the last 8 years, which has passed this House six times before, which we debated for over 3½ hours earlier this week, and that is, simply, should working men and women in this country that have a medical emergency in their family, whether it is a child or a parent in need, should they have the right to be able to spend time, unpaid leave time with that parent, or child, or spouse without fear of losing their job. That is the issue today.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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 (Mr. SKAGGS). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. GORDON. 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. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Does the gentlemen from Tennessee insist on his point of order with regard to a quorum?

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 155, not voting 36, as follows:

(Roll No. 27)

AYES—239

Abercrombie	Boucher	Condit
Ackerman	Brewster	Conyers
Andrews (ME)	Brooks	Cooper
Andrews (NJ)	Browder	Coppersmith
Andrews (TX)	Brown (FL)	Costello
Applegate	Brown (OH)	Coyne
Bacchus (FL)	Bryant	Cramer
Baessler	Byrne	Danner
Barcia	Cantwell	Darden
Barlow	Cardin	de la Garza
Barrett (WI)	Carr	Deal
Becerra	Chapman	DeFazio
Bellenson	Clay	DeLauro
Berman	Clayton	Dellums
Bevill	Clement	Derrick
Bilbray	Clyburn	Deutsch
Bishop	Coleman	Dicks
Bonior	Collins (IL)	Dingell
Borski	Collins (MI)	Dixon

Dooley	Lambert	Rangel
Durbin	Lancaster	Reed
Edwards (CA)	Lantos	Reynolds
Edwards (TX)	LaRocco	Richardson
Engel	Lehman	Roemer
English (AZ)	Levin	Rostenkowski
English (OK)	Lewis (GA)	Roukema
Eshoo	Lloyd	Rowlan
Evans	Long	Roybal-Allard
Fazio	Lowey	Rush
Fields (LA)	Maloney	Sabo
Flner	Mann	Sanders
Fingerhut	Margolies-	Sangmeister
Flake	Mervinsky	Sarpalius
Foglietta	Markey	Sawyer
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Schenk
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Schroeder
Frost	Mazzoli	Schumer
Furse	McCloskey	Scott
Gedensson	McCurdy	Serrano
Gephardt	McDermott	Sharp
Geren	McHale	Shepherd
Gibbons	McKinney	Skaggs
Glickman	McNulty	Skelton
Gonzalez	Meehan	Slaughter
Gordon	Meek	Smith (IA)
Green	Menendez	Spratt
Gutierrez	Mfume	Stark
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Stenholm
Hall (TX)	Mineta	Stokes
Hamburg	Minge	Strickland
Hamilton	Mink	Stupak
Harman	Moakley	Swett
Hastings	Mollohan	Swift
Hayes	Montgomery	Synar
Hefner	Moran	Tanner
Hilliard	Morella	Tauzin
Hinchee	Murphy	Taylor (MS)
Hoagland	Murtha	Tejeda
Hochbrueckner	Nadler	Thornton
Holden	Natcher	Thurman
Hoyer	Neal (MA)	Torres
Hughes	Neal (NC)	Torricelli
Hutto	Oberstar	Towns
Inslee	Obey	Trafoant
Jacobs	Oliver	Tucker
Jefferson	Ortiz	Unsoeld
Johnson (GA)	Orton	Valentine
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Velazquez
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Vento
Johnston	Parker	Visclosky
Kanjorski	Pastor	Volkmer
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)	Waters
Kennedy	Payne (VA)	Watt
Kennelly	Pelosi	Watt
Kildee	Peterson (FL)	Williams
Klecza	Peterson (MN)	Wilson
Klein	Pomeroy	Wise
Klink	Poshard	Woolsey
Kreidler	Price (NC)	Wyden
LaFalce	Rahall	Wynn

NOES—155

Allard	DeLay	Herger
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Bachus (AL)	Dickey	Hoekstra
Baker (CA)	Doillittle	Hoke
Baker (LA)	Dornan	Horn
Ballenger	Dreier	Houghton
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Huffington
Bartlett	Dunn	Hunter
Bateman	Emerson	Hyde
Bentley	Everett	Inglis
Bereuter	Ewing	Inhofe
Bilirakis	Fawell	Istook
Bliley	Fish	Johnson, Sam
Blute	Fowler	Kasich
Boehlert	Franks (CT)	Kim
Boehner	Franks (NJ)	King
Bonilla	Gallely	Kingston
Bunning	Gallo	Knollenberg
Burton	Gekas	Kolbe
Buyer	Gilchrest	Kyl
Callahan	Gillmor	Lazio
Calvert	Gilman	Leach
Camp	Goodlatte	Levy
Canady	Goodling	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Goss	Lewis (FL)
Clinger	Grams	Lightfoot
Coble	Grandy	Linder
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	Livingston
Combest	Gunderson	Machtley
Cox	Hansen	Manzullo
Crapo	Hastert	McCandless
Cunningham	Hefley	McCollum

McCrery	Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)
McDade	Quinn	Snowe
McHugh	Ramstad	Solomon
McInnis	Ravenel	Spence
McKeon	Regula	Stearns
McMillan	Ridge	Stump
Meyers	Roberts	Sundquist
Mica	Rogers	Talent
Michel	Rohrabacher	Thomas (CA)
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Torkildsen
Molinar	Roth	Upton
Moorhead	Royce	Vucanovich
Myers	Saxton	Walker
Nussle	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Oxley	Shaw	Weldon
Packard	Shays	Wolf
Paxon	Skeen	Young (AK)
Petri	Smith (MI)	Zeliff
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Zimmer
Porter	Smith (OR)	

NOT VOTING—36

Archer	Klug	Schiff
Barton	Kopetski	Shuster
Blackwell	Laughlin	Sisk
Brown (CA)	Lipinski	Slatery
Crane	Manton	Studds
Fields (TX)	Penny	Taylor (NC)
Ford (TN)	Pickett	Thomas (WY)
Gingrich	Pickle	Washington
Hancock	Quillen	Waxman
Henry	Rose	Whitten
Hutchinson	Santorum	Yates
Johnson (CT)	Schaefer	Young (FL)

□ 2212

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 70) and ask for its immediate consideration.
The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 70

Resolved, That the following named Member be elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives: Standards of Official Conduct: Nancy Pelosi, California to rank after Representative Cardin of Maryland.

The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1

Mr. GORDON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-13) on the resolution (H. Res. 71) relating to the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1) to grant family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1, FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1993

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 71 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 71

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 1) to grant family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment thereto be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 1 hour.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House rule XX, I make the point of order that House Resolution 71, the rule that we are taking up, should be considered in the Committee of the Whole, and I ask to be heard on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, House rule XX provides that, and I quote:

Any amendment of the Senate to any House bill—

And I repeat:

An amendment of the Senate * * * shall be subject to a point of order that it shall first be considered in the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, if, originating in the House, it would be subject to that point.

And the rule goes on to provide just one exception to this requirement is possible, and that is if a motion to disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference is made.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 71 contains the Senate amendment by virtue of being a self-executing rule. As such, my point of order must be sustained and the resolution must be considered in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] desire recognition on the point of order?

Mr. GORDON. Not on this point of order, not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SKAGGS). The Chair is prepared to rule on the gentleman's point of order.

Before the House at this time is not the Senate amendment itself, but a rule properly reported from the Rules Committee to the House of Representatives, against which a rule XX point of order is not well taken. If we were considering the Senate amendment itself, the gentleman's point of order would be well-grounded, but the Chair will rule the point of order out of order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that this resolution when adopted will in fact agree to the Senate amendment? So if the Senate amendment is not in this rule, where is it? Is it floating out there somewhere?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has not called up for House consideration the Senate amendment, but a rule offered by the Rules Committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee has called up this resolution which contains the Senate amendment, because as soon as this resolution is adopted, it will, in fact have the Senate amendment. Now, the Chair cannot have it both ways.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business before the House is the resolution offered by the Rules Committee, which if adopted will be the order of the House. The Senate amendment is not now before us.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the Senate amendment be taken up separately when we have completed this legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not under this resolution.

Mr. WALKER. Well, if the House is not going to take up the Senate amendment separately and it is not contained in this resolution, I repeat again, where is it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, rule XX which the gentleman has cited applies only if the Senate amendment itself is before the House, which is not the parliamentary status that we are now in.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, where is the Senate amendment if it is not in this language? It has to be before the House as a part of this language because once this language is adopted, and the Chair has ruled that the Senate amendment will not come up separately, and so therefore, it has to be contained in this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. What will be adopted will be the rule.

Mr. WALKER. But the rule enacts the bill, so the bill is a part of the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, the bill is not before the House. The Senate amendment is not before the House. The resolution of the Rules Committee is before the House. The Chair has ruled on the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all

time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

At this time I yield the customary 30 minutes, for purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER]. Pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 71 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. The rule provides that the House concurs in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1, and, in effect, upon adoption of the rule, H.R. 1 is cleared for the President's signature.

Mr. Speaker, this will be the seventh time the House has passed family and medical leave legislation, each time with strong bipartisan support. Last evening the House passed H.R. 1 by an overwhelming vote of 265 to 163. Just a short time ago the Senate passed their version. By passing this rule we can put family and medical leave legislation on the President's desk tonight.

I encourage my colleagues to pass this resolution.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, for yielding me this time very generously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, when we were debating the last resolution, my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, mentioned Hollywood. He referred to the fact that I represent an area that is near Hollywood.

I would add that the gentleman has just taken a page out of the same book with what he has proposed. We just voted a few minutes ago on Martial Rule No. 1. Now we are being asked again to vote on Martial Rule No. 2. Unfortunately, it is with the same tragic cast of villains.

Once again the other side is trying to stifle debate and deliberation by making a vote on this rule the vote on the Senate changes as well.

If I were permitted to say so under House rules, I would observe that the other body has sometimes been referred to as the "Cave of Winds." If we accept this procedure and the other body's amendment tonight, we will be called "The House of the Cave-Ins." We are being asked to cave in and accept sight unseen a Senate amendment which substantially alters what this House agreed to just yesterday.

□ 2230

Members may or may not be interested in knowing this, but, before the House and Senate have reached the stage of disagreement on a bill, the most privileged motion is to disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference. That is because the position and prerogatives of the House are tantamount and must be protected at this stage. This rule turns that very important protection on its head and

caves to the Senate position without separate debate or a vote.

Mr. Speaker, to protect the House prerogatives I urge defeat of the previous question so that we can make the amendments that we have discussed in the last resolution in order.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Del Mar, CA [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues why this Member and many of the other Members have a real concern about the term "spouse."

My wife, like all the other Members', was issued a spouse pin. The gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER]; her husband, as many other husbands, was issued a spouse pin. The reason that we have concern is the Sergeant at Arms as an official body of this House has issued two spouse pins to the two homosexual Members of this body. So, the term "spouse" does have significance.

And I heard the chairman say that it is defined in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. I can assure the chairman, as a 20-year retiree from the U.S. Navy, it never has referred, or codified, or redefined the term "spouse" in that manner.

So, H.R. 1, if my colleagues support it, that is what they believe in, and they should do it. But I believe, and I believe many of the other Members feel, that H.R. 1, right now, with the term as it is, sets and keeps in the President's homosexual issues until July 15. Second, it is the start of the redefinition of the term "spouse." That is why this Member, and I am sure many of the other Members, have concern in the House.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Newport News, VA [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, it concerns me more than I can say that so early in this session we are on a track that is going to bring this House into enormous disrepute. It is not because I oppose the legislation pending before us. No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter that I am opposed to the legislation which is before us, shortly, presumably, to be enacted. If my colleagues have the votes to implement the public policy of that legislation, then I say to them, "Utilize it. Don't play games with our rules. If you do not have the courage to submit an issue straight to this body and cannot prevail by getting a majority without the permeations of the rules and self-executing rules that deny to me and to others the opportunity simply to say no, we think this is unwise public policy, and you cannot tell me, leadership on that side of the

aisle, that you do these things other than to avoid the risk that people on your side of the aisle would not vote for this misconceived public policy in the way we are distorting and abusing the rules and the process of this House."

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "Call a halt to it. Do not do this further. If you cannot prevail by a clearcut majority on a proposition fairly presented, you are not entitled to prevail, and how dare you contort and twist the rules to avoid the opportunity of this body to work its will? Are you so afraid you do not have a majority if you use the rules of this House as they were intended to be used?"

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Garden Grove, CA [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have this peculiar feeling that I should be doing my Christmas shopping this weekend. This feels that much like the end of a session. I cannot believe it is the beginning of February, the beginning of a brandnew Congress.

I went over to the Senate side this afternoon and this evening, and they had a fulsome debate on this issue of homosexuals in the military that has the Clinton administration hemorrhaging, and the President would have been well served by a Republican leader, Senator DOLE, to have allowed a fulsome debate on only the DOLE amendment and a similar amendment over here to give the President a defeat that I think he could have overcome with the passage of just a few months rather than have him hemorrhaging for the next 6 months where we will have full committee hearings in both Houses in several committees on this issue, and it will turn into a national debate that is going to affect a heinous policy of trying to teach grade school children that there is no such thing as sodomy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put an article out of the Navy Times in the RECORD on seven countries and how they handle homosexuals in their services, in varied ways, and none of these people have fought a war lately, and none of them have major navies at sea. But there is a lot of lying going around about what happens in other countries. I would also like to put in AIDS statistics because an Army is an entire walking, living, mobile blood bank, and it is important to people in combat that they trust the purity of their blood supply. I would like to put in a draft that will probably be refined a little bit of our leadership's research committee statement on what we think about this, and I would like to put in a Newsweek article called, on a play on words on a soap opera, "The Young and the Reckless," about how teenaged boys line up on the sidewalk in Minneapolis and are selected by homosexuals in their thirties, and one of them says,

"It's nice to get them this young and not have to be arrested and go to jail."

Mr. Speaker, this is going to be a heck of a debate over the next 6 months. The President will continue to be hemorrhaging, and I am sorry we are not in for a full debate on this issue this early in the session.

The articles referred to are as follows:

GAYS IN FOREIGN MILITARIES

AMERICA: CLINTON'S TEAM BEGINS TO STUDY THE ISSUE

(By Patrick Pexton)

WASHINGTON.—The hottest issue of 1992 grew warmer in December when President-elect Clinton's personal emissary visited the Atlantic Fleet to assess the mood and plan strategy for lifting the current ban on homosexuals in the United States military.

The aide, Washington attorney John C. Holum, visited crews on three ships and a submarine and met with Navy Secretary Sean O'Keefe and the chief of naval operations, Adm. Frank Kelso.

In a brief interview with Navy Times, Holum said he has been "consulting widely" with people in all of the services and will continue to do so, although he would not outline precisely whom he has talked with or where he has visited.

Clinton has promised publicly to get advice from an array of military people about the issue before making the move; which many say would more closely align U.S. policy with that of such allies as France, Germany, Israel and Canada.

Holum echoed statements by Defense Secretary-designate Rep. Les Aspin, D-Wis., saying his mission is not to decide whether, but rather how, to make the change.

A senior adviser for national security to the transition team and a member of Secretary of State-designate Warren Christopher's law firm, Holum said he was assigned "to look into ways to implement Governor Clinton's commitment on this issue." He said his consultations are "very broad" and that he may visit other bases.

Holum spent between 90 minutes and two hours on each of four ships during his Dec. 22 visit to Norfolk, visiting berthing areas, heads and mess facilities. He met with groups of enlisted people aboard the aircraft carrier Teddy Roosevelt, the destroyer tender Yellowstone, the attack submarine Boise and the amphibious transport dock Trenton.

The sailors he met there, he said, were "certainly being candid." Officials said sailors expressed concern about privacy, berthing, personal health, potential violence against gays and fraternization regarding homosexuals.

In each case, Holum said he would convey the crew members' concerns to Clinton.

CANADA: LAWSUIT BROUGHT DOWN HOMOSEXUAL BAN

(By Grant Willis)

WASHINGTON.—All Michelle Douglas wanted was to get her security clearance, do her job and be left alone. Instead, the Canadian Air Force lieutenant found herself a place in history as the woman who brought down the Canadian military's ban on homosexuals in uniform.

"I never, in the military, made an issue of my sexuality. It was only the military that made an issue of it," said Douglas, 29, an Ontario lesbian who sued the government over restrictions on her career and triggered an

abrupt change in government policy last fall. "I challenged it because of a personal injustice."

The government agreed October 27, 1992 on the eve of trial, to settle Douglas' \$500,000 wrongful discrimination lawsuit and consented to an order by the Federal Court of Canada stating that the military's policy on sexual orientation violated the 1985 Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

"The Canadian Forces will comply fully with the court's decision," said an announcement the same day by Chief of Defense Staff Gen. John de Chastelain. "Canadians, regardless of their sexual orientation, will now be able to serve their country in the Canadian Forces without restriction." Now some Americans may be looking north of the border for indications of what may happen here if President-elect Clinton delivers on his promise to end the U.S. military's ban on homosexuals.

But the Canadian court decision ending the military's gay ban is barely two months old, so its real effects are still hard to judge. Plans to implement it are still in the works.

In addition, constitutional and cultural differences between Canada and the United States make comparisons unreliable.

REVOLUTION UNDERWAY

While gay-rights laws exist in only a handful of U.S. jurisdictions, Canada has been undergoing a nationwide gay-rights revolution for seven years under its human rights charter and associated court rulings.

The charter gives Canadians civil rights guarantees similar to those found in the U.S. Constitution, but it also contains the types of explicit bans on sex discrimination that were considered and rejected in the United States during debates over the Equal Rights Amendment in the 1970s and 1980s.

While an end to the homosexual ban in the U.S. military would put the Pentagon at or near the forefront of social change here, the Canadian military is one of the last institutions in that country to drop discriminatory practices.

Also, unlike the United States, Canada repealed its criminal sodomy laws in 1969, and Canadian service members are not required to certify they are heterosexual when they enlist or reenlist.

The Canadian defense official managing the change in sexual orientation is retired Brig. Gen. Daniel Munro, director general of personnel policy for the Canadian Forces. Munro declined to be interviewed.

However, it is clear that Munro's staff has more work to do to translate a broad anti-discrimination policy into a day-to-day change in military life.

ECHOES OF U.S. CONCERNS

A Canadian government background paper, issued at the time of the policy change, echoed many of the arguments made in the United States by those who oppose lifting the ban. It said strong leadership within the military will be required "to ensure that cohesion and morale, which are essential to operational effectiveness, are not impaired." * * * Some of the strongest concerns center on the perceived loss of privacy and the inability to control personal relationships under conditions where physical and social privacy is impossible to provide.

Canada's sudden move to throw open the doors to homosexuals in the military is a sign of progress, Douglas said. Nevertheless, she said, the official silence on the policy since October is cause for concern.

"To a large extent, they are trying to make this issue go away by not discussing it

publicly," she said. "We need to see some real leadership on this issue. . . I worry that, unless there's some external pressure, the military probably won't respond as well."

Some glimpse of the Canadian military's intentions emerged from a Dec. 10 meeting in Ottawa between Munro and Svend Robinson, an openly gay member of Parliament and a member of the New Democratic Party.

A Robinson aide who attended the meeting said Munro has asked interested organizations to suggest training or personnel policy changes to help the integration process.

Some immediate issues on Munro's agenda, the aide said, are the settlement of four pending lawsuits against the government by former service members who claim to have been damaged by the military's old policy.

Homosexuals in the military whose careers have continued under promotion and transfer restrictions since 1988 are having their personnel files reviewed for possible retroactive action to bring them back into parity with their heterosexual colleagues the aide said.

Finally, the aide said, the government plans to review the cases of all members who were released for homosexuality since Canada's human rights charter took effect in 1985. It is still unclear whether these veterans will be offered compensation or reinstatement to active duty.

MATRIMONIAL QUESTION

Meanwhile, the Canadian gay-rights juggernaut rolls on: The Supreme Court of Canada is reviewing whether to allow two gay men to marry, and the Ministry of Justice has introduced legislation to put homosexual rights explicitly into federal law.

"I wouldn't be surprised if it happens," said Ian Inrig, dominion secretary-treasurer of the Army, Navy and Air Force veterans in Canada—Dominion Headquarters. "We, here in Canada, are undergoing a great metamorphosis."

"There is some opposition in the armed forces, but the members have been told to live with it," he said. "I wouldn't think of it as very much of an issue at all, as far as our membership is concerned."

Sources say privately that Canadians are accustomed to a greater level of government intervention in social affairs than U.S. citizens and that the prevailing social climate is one of tolerance.

"We Canadians are not like you Americans," said one source, who asked not to be named. "Canadians are a very laid-back people. We have to be pushed and pushed until somebody really reacts."

Douglas agreed.

"We generally are a very accepting people," she said. "There is no Pat Buchanan and there's no Jerry Falwell here, and I say, 'Thank God.' Douglas added, referring to the conservative Republican political commentator and the fundamentalist clergyman whose views have carried electoral clout in the United States."

Douglas said one of her lesbian friends who is still on active duty and keeps her sexual orientation a secret noticed little reaction among her military colleagues to the new tolerance policy in October.

"They talked for about a week, and that was it," Douglas said. "There never were any hurtful statements, just a few jokes."

Douglas predicted few homosexuals in the Canadian forces will choose to announce their sexual orientation. And since many homosexuals will still appear on the surface to be just like anyone else, she said, there will be little for heterosexual members to react to or resign over.

ENGLAND: ONE SIMPLE POLICY: OUT OF THE CLOSET AND YOU'RE OUT OF THE ARMY

(By William Matthews)

WASHINGTON.—Britain's policy on homosexuals in the military is simple. "when you come out of the closet, you also come out of the army," said Chris Pengelly, a spokesman at the British Embassy in Washington.

And although policies restrict homosexuals from military service, Britons say there is little if any sentiment for change in Great Britain.

The question of permitting homosexuals to serve in the British military is simply not a matter of debate, according to Britons interviewed here and in London. And the fact that Canada and Australia recently lifted bans on letting homosexuals serve, and the possibility that the United States might follow suit, has not prompted the British to question their own policy, they said. "We think we've got it right," Pengelly said.

The only recent military action on the homosexual front in Britain came last June when the British military adopted the policy that homosexual acts that are not against civil law will no longer be against military law. The change means this:

"They used to be kicked out and prosecuted. Now they are just kicked out." Pengelly said.

Actually, the practice of prosecuting homosexuals simply for being gay was abandoned unofficially years ago, said Andre Silverman, a spokesman for the British Defense Ministry. Most homosexual activity among consenting adults was decriminalized in Britain in 1967, he said.

But beyond making current practice into official policy, there has been no move by the British military to welcome homosexuals.

Britain's military leadership contends, much like its American counterpart, that allowing homosexuals to serve would be detrimental to the military.

"Homosexuality is not compatible with the efficient operation of the armed forces" Silverman said. The British military is built on "a system of trust and confidence" among its members, and permitting known homosexuals to serve would disrupt that trust and undermine military effectiveness.

A spokesman at the Defense Ministry called the exclusion of homosexuals "a practical decision, not a moral judgement." She said the ban is necessary to maintain high morale and cohesiveness.

Both Defense Ministry spokesmen said they do not know how many troops are expelled each year for being homosexual, but Silverman said such expulsions among Britain's 300,000 military personnel are "not common."

Gays in the military "is certainly not an issue," said embassy spokesman Pengelly. And, gay rights have not become a political cause as in the United States.

"Most Britons think the controversy in the United States about whether to permit homosexuals in the military is all rather odd," said Jamie Dettmer, a correspondent for the Times of London.

ISRAEL: THE GAY CLOSET IS STILL FULL

(By Tom Philpott)

HAIFA, ISRAEL.—Yaron, a 30-year-old reserve lieutenant in the Israeli navy, stares thoughtfully at his coffee cup, considering the question.

English is his second language, so he must choose his words carefully. But the greater challenge is sorting out his feelings on the

topic now raised: his experience as a homosexual in the Israeli Navy.

Thirty to 60 days each year, Yaron commands a Dvora-class fast attack boat, patrolling Israel's coastline with a crew of five active-duty sailors and four to five reservists. "Ten beautiful men" Yaron calls them.

The crew trains to keep skills sharp and to guard against terrorism from the sea. But how does a homosexual like Yaron handle his duties? How does the crew react? How does the Israeli military accommodate homosexuals in operational assignments?

Widely viewed as one of the best militaries in the world, the battle-tested Israeli army is often cited as proof that military units can function successfully without excluding homosexuals. But in taking a first-hand look at the Israeli military, Navy Times discovered vast differences between the written law and day-to-day practices.

DISCRIMINATION PERSISTS

In theory, homosexuals in the Israeli military are promoted, serve in combat and are in every way the equals of their peers. But in practice, people like Yaron face many of the same pressures as their counterparts in the U.S. military. Indeed, Yaron has never revealed his sexual preference to his military leaders, for fear that it might cost him his coveted at-sea billet.

Those found to be gay, or who proclaim their homosexuality, must undergo psychological testing to remain in service. Their files are flagged. They usually are barred from positions requiring top-security clearances. And they are rarely assigned to combat units. Regardless of the position they hold, they do not serve without stigma.

Homosexuality, while no longer legally banned in Israel, is viewed as abnormal both within the military and in Israeli society.

THE MASQUERADE

Yaron's experience in a close-knit operational unit provides ammunition to both sides in the gay debate. He remains in the closet, even after six years of active duty and six more in the reserves. The masquerade, he said, is painful, but necessary. If he reveals his homosexuality, not only would it bother some crewmen, particularly the younger ones who don't know him, but it might upset his squadron commander. The navy has too many reserve officers for too few seagoing billets, so Yaron likely would get a quick transfer to a desk job.

Hiding his homosexuality, Yaron said, he receives excellent fitness reports and considers himself an effective boat captain. Still, he's concerned about the "sexual tension" and how his homosexuality plays off the crew.

"[Navy officials] think if I'm gay that, in an emergency, some of my subordinates won't take my orders . . . that they will be insubordinate," he said. "I feel you must trust everyone. It doesn't depend on sexual orientation. I'm very efficient."

But, "You live with the crew 24 hours a day, sometimes away from the beach for a long time. And sailors, they talk all the time about sex."

But as a homosexual, he said, "it's very difficult to separate the sexual stress from the special relationship with the crew. There are close quarters and sometimes even touching. Lots of times sailors go naked, and that is a problem for me. They laugh a lot about opportunities for sex among the crew and, sometimes, for a gay, it's very hard."

He's uncomfortable with some of the horseplay between crew members and bothered that the crew curse one another with derogatory

tory slang words for homosexuals. He wonders if some sailors who joke about homosexual relations actually are interested in them. And he fears showing favoritism toward crewmen whom he finds physically attractive.

"I can't ignore if I like someone very much. If I'm very attracted or [have] a special relationship, I'll act different . . . Sometimes they can be confused and don't know the meaning of this connection."

But Yaron emphatically said he would "never" have sexual relations with a crewman.

"I separate [my] civilian life when I come into the Navy. I act like I'm straight. But sometimes that may cause some trouble because I'm only a human being. I can do my job very good although I feel sexual attraction, too."

Listening to this conversation is Tal Weisberg, a gay reservist in the Israel army and Yaron's friend.

"I switch off my sexuality" when on active duty, Weisberg said. "Not because I want to, but because I am afraid."

Staying in the field for long periods is not much different than being at sea, said Weisberg, who serves in a frontline maintenance unit. When he feels attracted to another soldier, in a group shower for example, he has learned to check his feelings.

"It depends on the character of the person," Yaron said. "If he has a weak character, it's a problem."

WE DON'T WANT A PROBLEM

Israel has fought five major wars in its 45-year history. Today it faces real or potential enemies on every border and is dealing with the sixth year of civil unrest in its occupied Arab territories. Against that backdrop, the issue of homosexuals in the military is seen as relatively insignificant. And as far as the government is concerned, the less attention paid to it the better.

"We don't have a problem," said one government official "and we don't want one."

"It's true that the Israeli army does not discriminate against gays. But it has to be put into a proper context," said Lt. Col. Moshe Fogel, spokesman for the Israeli Defense Force. That context begins with Israeli society, where the emphasis is on "family values" and where the government is a democratic theocracy, with Judaism and religious leaders playing a prominent role in setting the nation's agenda. There's no concept here, as in the United States, of absolute separation of church and state.

"We struggle to strike a balance between a modern, pluralistic, secular society and, at the same time, a Jewish state," said Uri Dromi, director of the government press office. Judaism considers homosexuality as "an aberration something that should not be done and should not be endorsed or acknowledged or credited with the same status as straight people."

This approach to homosexuality fits in well with Israel's concept of universal service. At age 18, all Israeli men and women are drafted. Some exemptions are granted for ultraorthodox Jews and the physically handicapped. But many youths found physically unfit, including the severely handicapped, routinely appeal to a voluntary service board and win spots somewhere in the Israeli Defense Force. Throughout the process, the issue of sexual orientation is never raised.

"If you don't let someone in the Army here, it is a very cruel thing to do," said David Kreizelman, Israel's deputy director of the government press office. "Not only do

people assume something's wrong" with that person, but he or she is sure to face "all kinds of problems."

Military service is a springboard to a successful civilian career here. Job applicants are quizzed on their military experience. Those who have progressed steadily or have served in critical positions have an advantage over their peers, particularly for jobs in government or in Israel's bustling defense industry. Conversely, young people with no military experience face limited prospects.

Male draftees must serve three years on active duty. At age 21 a relatively small number enter the small Israeli career force, while most transfer to the reserves, where they drill one to two months annually until age 51. Women must serve two years on active duty and remain in the reserves until age 24.

Draftees can say where they would like to be assigned, but the military makes final decisions based upon qualifications and service needs. Only top-quality recruits are sent to combat units. Quality is determined based on intelligence, motivation, psychological fitness, education and physical fitness.

While no conscript is asked about sexual preference, anyone who said he is a homosexual—or is suspected of being one—is referred for psychological testing.

Dan Yakir, a lawyer with the Association for Civil Rights in Israel, said the official policy on homosexuals in service is set down in a 1983 military order, which concludes that while homosexuality is not a mental disorder, it might pose a security risk.

The psychological exam given to those who acknowledge or are suspected of being homosexuals is aimed at determining whether the individual's sexual orientation is an isolated phenomenon or whether it is associated with other behavior that could jeopardize a military operation. The test also attempts to measure the "mental strength of the soldier and the ability to cope with stress," Yakir said.

Most homosexuals are permitted to remain in service, said Reuven Gal, former chief psychologist for the Israeli Defense Force. "However, there will be an indicator in his file that limits him from serving with specific units, such as intelligence . . . or in small units where the closeness of living accommodations are so tight and limited it may create problems. They won't send him to a submarine, for example. Other than that, they won't discriminate."

Yakir said homosexuals are not allowed to serve in positions requiring top-secret clearances, including any work with encoded messages. The 1983 order states that those suspected of being gay should be considered a security risk for the duration of their service career.

Charles Moskos, an American sociologist who opposes lifting the ban on gays in the U.S. military, recently spent time in Israel researching the gay issue. His conclusion: "Technically the Israelis draft gays. De facto, they treat gays like second-class soldiers. . . They are sent to open bases where they can go home at night." In other words, he said, "Open gays in the military are treated like women."

An Israeli defense official disagrees.

"Each case has to be treated on an individual basis," he said. But if a homosexual "is in a combat unit and his fellow soldiers know that he's homosexual and it becomes a social problem, he has to be taken out of that unit."

Gal, now director of the Israeli Institute of Military Studies, suggests that, structurally,

the Israeli military might be better suited to accommodate homosexuals than is the U.S. military. The Israel military is smaller and far more stable.

"The very same group [of recruits] who came in together in August 1989 walks out together three years later," said Gal. "The same four guys in a tank crew will serve together through several wars. They know each other to the guts." For such a group to discover a close buddy is gay may not be so hard, he said. But for an American unit, in which members move in and out all the time, "I can see a lot of trouble with that."

The big stumbling block for acknowledged homosexuals is not the right to wear a military uniform, Israelis point out. It's the right to earn advancement and win good jobs. "Once you become an officer, or once the Army has a lot invested in you, it's more unlikely they will kick you out on this issue alone," said Liora Moriel, who chairs the Society for the Protection of Personal Rights, Israel's only gay rights organization. Her advice to gay military people: "Keep quiet as long as you can. Once you've proven yourself, you can say I'm gay or I'm lesbian, and it will matter less."

"I know an officer who visited with American units," said one Israeli defense official. "And what did he see? In Marine combat units he saw women getting the same training as men. He saw every type of ethnic background you could ever imagine."

"We see that and we say, 'What problem could you have with homosexuals?'"

THE LAW SAYS IT'S OK TO BE GAY, BUT LIFE ISN'T SO SIMPLE

(By Tom Philpott)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—Tal Weisberg hid his homosexuality from family and friends for years. He still does from fellow reservists in the Israel army.

"The difficulties are not in the field or with military authority, but dealing with the [military] environment," he says.

"In your personal life you can go where you want and be with whom you want * * * In the army you are stuck with fellow soldiers. And if they are not open about gay issues, and they find out you are gay, it can be a very difficult problem."

Weisberg says he "came out" only after leaving active duty. He did discuss his feelings with army psychologists and trusted them not to "transfer this information to military authorities." As far as he knows, they did not.

Weisberg doesn't talk about his personal life with other soldiers during stints on active duty as a reserve maintenance specialist. If someone asks why a nice-looking, 34-year-old is not married, he says, "I have a good cover story." He actually was married once and has two children.

The "common attitude" among other soldiers, Weisberg says, is that homosexuals "are faggots and drag queens." As a result, he knows only one openly gay soldier.

"Most people in the Army are much more accepting of the gay community now" than they were even a few years ago, he says.

But in the military, homosexuals, like heterosexuals, have to control their sex drives.

"Obviously, there are situations where [a homosexual] sees a sexy soldier and he desires him. But it's the same thing if a straight soldier sees a sexy women soldier and desires her."

"We do have more opportunity to be closer to men, [sharing] the same tents and the same showers. But gay people are very care-

ful with those things. They won't try to hit on somebody unless they are positive they are gay too," Weisberg says.

"If permitted, I would prefer to be in a place where I wouldn't have to stay in camp all the time. I would do my duties and come home. But I'm sure there are some who would like to be combat officers or serve on ships."

"If people learn to appreciate the person, and to know they can count on him in time of need, his sexual orientation is totally irrelevant. If you are a [jerk] it doesn't matter if you are straight or gay."

GAYS CAN SERVE "IN AN OFFICE BUT NOT AT SEA!"

(By Tom Philpott)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—Israeli authorities refused to let active-duty service members be interviewed about homosexuals in the ranks. But almost every Israeli adult has been in the military or serves in the reserves, so opinions are not hard to find.

And most agree that homosexuals are virtually invisible in the Israeli military.

Allon Klebanoff, a reserve Army captain who commands a tank company, says homosexuals stay hidden and no one goes looking for them.

His own experience with homosexuals over 12 years of service involves a single incident during a training exercise. As executive officer of a company, Klebanoff said, he walked by a tent and saw two soldiers in the same sleeping bag.

"I just looked the other way. They are good soldiers. Never any problems about them," he said. But "had they been bad soldiers, had I needed an excuse to get rid of one or both of them, I may have used it."

Klebanoff, a history teacher who was wounded in action in Lebanon's Bekaa Valley, in 1982, says he may not be typical. "Maybe somebody else would have said, 'There's no room for gays in my unit.' * * * In Israel you'll find policy in many cases comes down to how the commanders decide."

A retired Israeli naval officer, who asked not to be named, said he never had to deal with the issue during 31 years of service.

"If the gay restricts himself, and nobody in the boat knows about it and he doesn't show any sexual advances, I don't see any problem. [But] if this guy starts with another fellow, there probably is a problem."

But no one openly homosexual ever served in a seagoing billet, he said.

"I don't want to see a gay in our uniform. He can serve in an office someplace or on a base. Not at sea!"

A young woman who recently completed her two-year army obligation said she saw nothing that led her to believe lesbians serve openly in the Israeli army. "It's not open and people don't talk about it," she said. "If there were some I didn't know about them."

Adds Erez Weiss, 23, who spent his three-year tour as a helicopter crewman. "I don't think it would have been accepted. It is a very close system and they probably would throw him out. If there is someone who's gay, he hides it. It's a kind of curse."

A 41-year-old reserve army sergeant, named Israel, who refused to give his full name, said he was assigned to an artillery battalion for most of his 18 years in service and never met an avowed homosexual.

"A gay would have had lots of problems. [They] do not fit in with the image of a fighter. . . . He has no place in a combat unit, he would be automatically rejected."

That feeling surfaced during the Gulf war, he said, when he was assigned to a unit in

Tel Aviv that rescued citizens from the rubble of Iraqi missile attacks. Because his temporary commander, a major, had very effete mannerisms, he and other soldiers refused to follow his commands. They did their jobs despite the officer, rather than by following his orders.

"Everybody called him homosexual. . . . He had no support. No one respected him. . . ." "At the same time," he said, "it is stupid not to have gays serving as [military] computer programmers and in the medical corps."

GERMANY: FLAUNTING HOMOSEXUALITY CAN KILL CAREERS (By Steve Vogel)

BONN.—Homosexuality is no excuse for not serving in the Bundeswehr, the German armed forces. All young men, gay or straight, face the draft and compulsory service.

But the degree of acceptance of homosexuals here does not come close to the full equality that gay activists in the United States are demanding.

Gay officers find paths to promotion blocked, and in some cases they are barred from jobs requiring access to classified material, officials say. And gay conscripts often find life in the Bundeswehr unpleasant.

Still, neither anti-gay violence, lowered readiness nor other discipline problems have resulted from Germany's decriminalization of homosexuality 24 years ago. "We haven't noticed any problems like that," said Friedrichs, who has been in the service 30 years. "There were no problems that caused the military leadership any headaches."

From a practical standpoint, the Bundeswehr's prohibition on gays ended in 1969, when West Germany removed homosexuality from its list of criminal offenses—civilian and otherwise.

"Homosexuality is not an offense in Germany any longer, and it's the same way with the armed forces," and Lt. Col. Burkhard Friedrichs, spokesman for the German Army's 10th Armored Division in Simmeringen.

"Heterosexuals and homosexuals are treated the same way," said Navy Commander Walker Reichenmiller, a spokesman for the Defense Ministry in Bonn.

How accurate that assessment is—and how applicable the German experience may be to the United States—are both open to debate. As one senior American officer said: "The Germans, the Dutch, the Belgians—they ain't been in a fight lately."

But the German military has managed to avoid any major public debate on the issue. Other than a single case in 1984, the issue of homosexuals in the German military has not created waves.

"There are always cases of known homosexual soldiers," said Friedrichs. "In principle, it's not treated any differently than heterosexuality." Typically, unless some sort of disturbance within the unit is reported, the situation is ignored. "It's a private matter," he said.

SOME ARE KNOWN

An officer in the Luftwaffe, Germany's Air Force, added: "I know one commander who's gay. His commander knows it, his unit knows it, but does it influence how he does his job? No. It's a known fact. He doesn't live on base. He doesn't behave against military law, and that's it. If he's behaving like everybody else, then where's the problem?"

Cases in which a homosexual makes an advance on a subordinate would not be treated differently than if a male superior made ad-

vances on a female subordinate, officials said. "In cases of sexual harassment, sexuality plays absolutely no role," said Friedrichs.

However, because women are prohibited from the German military except in the fields of medicine and music, there are few reports of heterosexual harassment.

Still, homosexuals face strict discrimination. The Bundeswehr withholds promotions from gay officers on the grounds that they cannot command adequate respect from soldiers, according to Volker Beck, a spokesperson for the German Gay League, who added that court challenges to the practice have not been successful to date. "What happens practically is that when someone is open about their homosexuality, they won't be promoted."

Military officials acknowledge that an officer's career can be damaged by open homosexuality. "It might be affected where they are behaving in a way it becomes obvious," said Reichenmiller. "The respect a military superior needs to lead soldiers might keep him from further promotion, but he wouldn't be" stripped of his rank.

But he might lose a prestigious job. In 1984, for example, a senior German army commander, Lt. Gen. Guenther Kiessling, was dismissed as deputy supreme commander of NATO because of allegations—later dismissed—that he frequented homosexual bars.

Manfred Woerner, then the German defense minister and now NATO secretary general, maintained that the general was a security risk because of alleged visits to two gay bars in Cologne, where Woerner said he was known as "Guenther of the Bundeswehr."

The case, known as the "Kiessling Affair," became a political hot potato, with Woerner coming under heavy criticism. When the allegations could not be substantiated, Kiessling was reinstated. But he then retired voluntarily.

German has compulsory military service for men, and a simple declaration of homosexuality does not exempt someone from military service. "The fact that somebody says 'I'm homosexual' is not reason to dismiss the man," said Reichenmiller.

URGES MUST BE CONTROLLED

However, if a potential draftee testifies that he is unable to control his sexual urges, he will generally be exempted.

"He will undergo a medical survey, including psychoanalysis, to establish clear evidence that he can't refrain from advancing on men," said Reichenmiller.

Exemptions also are granted for conscientious objectors, who are then required to work in civilian service.

Beck says that gay conscripts often find life in the Bundeswehr difficult.

"The conscripts are young, and manly behavior is expected," he said. "Someone who is homosexual is considered unmanly and therefore has a big psychological burden to bear if it's known."

"In a time when the entire society has become much more liberal, it's not a black mark to say you're homosexual," said Reichenmiller.

FRANCE: SOME CLAIM "I'M GAY" TO DODGE MILITARY SERVICE

(By Tom Philpott)

WASHINGTON—While homosexuals in the United States fight for the right to serve in the all-volunteer military, homosexuals in France may use sexual preference to avoid mandatory service, according to government officials there.

"There is no official discrimination against gay men and women as long as they obey the rules of the French armed forces," said Capt. Philippe Hunter, a spokesman for the minister of defense. "For example, it is not possible to punish somebody because of his sexual life. But if this person makes some sexual harassment upon other members of his unit, he will be in trouble."

Other government sources said the more common practice for French homosexuals is to avoid the 10-month mandatory service required of draft-age youths by claiming their lifestyle is incompatible with service.

"Of people eligible for duty under the conscription law, only about three-quarters spend their 10 months in the army. Of the remaining 25 percent, three-quarters of those are medically exempted. And a well-known way of being exempted is declaring you are a homosexual," said one official. "[But] it will not appear on paper that you were exempted for that reason . . . Everybody is happy."

Yet it's not always a magic way to dodge the service. "If a young man claims to be a gay in hope of not being drafted, it won't work," said Hunter. "But if his sexual life causes him psychological troubles, he won't be drafted."

The gay movement in France "has always been anti-military," the official said. "Therefore many homosexuals will do everything possible to avoid being drafted."

Interestingly, while homosexuals in the French military "is a nontopic," in the words of one official, "It always comes as a surprise to discover there is such a thing as a gay in the military."

In French culture, he explained, "The way you behave sexually is a matter of private concern. So if you are a homosexual and you don't try to win [other service members] over to your ways, there will be no problem."

"The fact that they are screened out under the law is unofficial. It's just a well-known way of homosexuals to not be processed for service. If you were an avowed homosexual and wanted to volunteer, there would be nothing to prevent you from serving."

Hunter agreed that Americans speak more openly about "their sexual choices. It's not the same in France. They are more discreet."

It's uncommon to meet an avowed gay in French society, except perhaps among artists, are much more difficult to find than in the military, Hunter said.

"I have been serving on ship for about 10 years and I never met anybody who claimed to be gay," he said.

MARRIAGE AND BENEFITS: DRAWING THE LINE (By Soraya S. Nelson)

WASHINGTON.—Ask Norwegians what problems result from gays and lesbians serving in the military and the response is either a puzzled look or surprise at being asked the question.

In a country where women and men serve side by side aboard submarines and roll around naked in the snow to get clean during military exercises, Norwegians are very matter-of-fact about their integrated defense force. And homosexuals have served openly for the past 14 years.

There are approximately 40,000 people on active duty in the Norwegian military, including 26,000 male draftees. It is not known how many are homosexual because inductees are not asked their sexual preference.

Despite the absence of debate on homosexuals serving in the military, the status of homosexual partnerships is currently in flux.

The Labor Party government's proposal that Norway, like Denmark, allow gay and

lesbian marriages is expected to pass before spring, officials said.

Homosexuals on active duty could then receive monthly housing allowances of about \$550, plus other benefits, which could fuel resentment if it is seen as unfairly favoring homosexuals.

By contrast, there was little debate in 1979 over ending the ban on homosexual service in the military, said Gro Lindstad, who chairs the National Organization of Lesbian and Gay Liberation.

"It's never been an issue or a problem," agreed 27-year veteran Navy Capt. Thor Hallin, who commanded the first Norwegian war vessel on which men and women served together.

Politicians agree society should be tolerant of homosexuals, said Anders Sjaastad, a member of Norway's parliament. Sjaastad likened the current debate to the one about putting women on an equal footing with men in the military.

"When we introduced equal rights for women serving in the military we had all kinds of arguments that it would introduce problems," recalled the former defense minister, who signed the order giving women equal opportunities in the Military. "None of those problems have actually occurred."

Hallin agreed, saying that in Norway today, women and men train together, serve together and even share quarters, sometimes in the least private of settings.

For example, a five-kilometer cross-country skiing exercise conducted five years ago required participants to work up a good sweat, undress and then roll in the snow to get clean while they were still hot. They did so without problems, said their former commanding officer.

But despite the tolerance of Norwegian society, Lindstad said most gays and lesbians in the military do not reveal their sexual orientation out of an unfounded fear of discrimination.

THE YOUNG AND THE RECKLESS

It was an average, rollicking "Boy's Nite Out" at The Saloon, in downtown Minneapolis. Conspicuous among the crowd of thirty something regulars was a generous sprinkling of dewy-faced "boys"—18- to 21-year-olds, allowed in Thursday and Sunday nights to dance and make sexual contacts but not to drink liquor. With their backward baseball caps and baggy flannel shirts, some of the younger contingent might have been just off a touring school bus. But that impression was emphatically dispelled later at the carnal "Sidewalk Sale" that is one of the attractions of Boy's Nite. As one jaded curbside cruiser observed, after checking out the youthful wares: "They're just old enough to screw without getting yourself arrested for it."

Minneapolis is hardly the only place such daring games are being played. While the annual rate of new HIV-positive cases among homosexuals is decreasing, surveys in urban areas from Seattle to Mobile are finding signs of a relapse to pre-AIDS recklessness, marked by a resurgence of free-wheeling gay night life. Even more worrisome, the evidence points to a growing generation gap in AIDS awareness: the importunate youth of the gay community apparently are practicing high-risk sex in significantly greater numbers than their elders. Studies say young gays are more likely to have had multiple partners and unprotected anal intercourse, the two leading risk factors for HIV infection, in the past 12 months. In the San Francisco area, where this year the HIV-

positive rolls grew by a thousand, a Department of Health survey indicates that a second wave of AIDS infections is taking shape, with the highest incidence among gay men between 17 and 25. Nationally, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, diagnosed cases of AIDS among homosexual men from 13 to 29 crept upward last year, in defiance of the overall trend downward.

It seems clear that the safe-sex message is not getting through effectively to younger gays. Somehow, they manage to deflect the warnings. "I know a lot of guys my age just coming out, and [they] are having too much fun to worry about AIDS," wrote one respondent in a study of 18- to 25-year-old gay males in three West Coast communities. Many young gays carry a conviction of indestructibility along with the belief, held at their peril, that AIDS is no threat to them. The "stereotypical view" is that it happens mainly to "older men with mustaches who go to leather bars," said the study, conducted by the Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS) of the University of California, San Francisco.

Shock treatment: Young gays are sheltered, in a sense. Few have met anyone with AIDS, or seen a friend of their own age sickened and die. "They haven't had the shock treatment my generation has had, says 42-year-old journalist Charles Kaiser, who is writing a history of gay life in New York and has lost many friends to AIDS. As a gay teenager growing up in the San Francisco area, Richard Ehara felt immune, despite the city's high HIV-positive rates. He didn't know anyone with AIDS and, anyway, he didn't worry about it. "When you're young, you really don't feel like you're vulnerable to death," he says. "You say, 'Well, I'm having sex with this guy who's 19 and he says he's never had sex with anyone who's older.'" At 24, Ehara realizes that was a delusion: "I know now that I've probably had sex with someone who could have had HIV."

By their mid-20s, gays may have developed a fatalistic attitude about the disease. Often, says Dan Wohlfeller, education director for San Francisco's Stop AIDS Project, they will tell project workers something like "I'm convinced that by the time this thing is over I'm going to be infected." The CAPS researchers say that closeted young gays sometimes feel so isolated they see little reason to protect themselves. "It seems like nobody cares if I die anyway," wrote a respondent in the CAPS survey.

Thousands of homosexuals come to meccas like San Francisco uninformed or misinformed about gay sex, and no one is waiting at the bus stop to greet them with information kits. There's a common belief, for instance, that anal sex is safe as long as the penis is withdrawn before ejaculation, although it has been shown that pre-ejaculatory secretion has enough HIV elements to cause infection. But school programs offering explicit information and free condoms meet fierce, often unyielding, opposition. "Schools don't want to talk about sex, and they certainly don't want to talk about homosexuality," says Frances Kunreuther, director of the Hetrick-Martin Institute in New York's Greenwich Village. Among other services, the institute operates a one-of-a-kind high school for gay youth, under city auspices. But the school is under constant fire from church and parent groups, among others.

It's not only information that the young lack, but so-called communication skills. Health workers point out that while it is be-

coming more hip for young people to carry condoms in their wallets, it takes a certain social adroitness to negotiate using them. Young gays may miss out on the education in such niceties provided by heterosexual dating rituals. Russ Nordmeyer, 23, an outreach worker for the University of Minnesota's Youth and AIDS project, recalls that what he and his friends feared most when they came out was not infection but rejection. "What you're thinking is: Is the guy going to freak out if I mention condoms? Will he think I have AIDS?"

Some AIDS educators have begun refurbishing their safe-sex pitches to make them more relevant for the young. In one three-year study funded by the National Institutes of Health, researchers reported they were able to sharply reduce high-risk behavior among gays in three small cities by working through "popular leaders" pointed out to them in gay bars. The leaders were asked to attend a series of training sessions where they were taught informal ways to communicate to their peers about safe-sex practices. Then each was encouraged to contact at least 14 other people and work the topic into conversations. According to study director Jeffrey A. Kelly, a professor of psychiatry at the Medical College of Wisconsin, before the program was in place 31 to 49 percent of the men surveyed reported having had unprotected anal intercourse. Afterward those figures dropped by as much as 30 percent.

Social norm: One conclusion, demonstrated in other studies as well, is that facts alone are not enough to change behavior. What brings about change more surely, Kelly and other researchers believe, is perception of what seems to be the accepted way of doing things. "By reshaping the norm, you can shift the behavior of the whole group," Kelly says. For example, he notes, people were told for years that smoking could kill them, but

many resisted giving up the habit until abstinence started becoming the rule among their peers. He thinks the approach might work even better with adolescents, who are much more peer-oriented than adults and tend to respond eagerly to the latest "in" behavior.

Something along those lines is being tested in workshops run in several cities by U.C. San Francisco's CAPS. The focus is on behavior associated with AIDS: coming-out issues, dating relationships, communication skills. "How often do you remind a friend to use condoms? That's not a thing you commonly talk about," says CAPS psychologist Susan Kegeles. Workshops emphasize the need to make sure friends stay healthy, in order to keep their community intact. Participants are then sent back out to their localities and asked to bring in their friends. Say Kegeles: "This is a project run for and by young men. We're trying to empower them around these issues, so the issues become their own. We're coming to the realization that young people are never going to listen to older people about AIDS."

Insights like that are hard won in the AIDS battle. Psychologists believe that, in any case, there have been not enough new ideas forthcoming, and too much blaming of the victims. They argue that adults must bear much of the blame for the failure to get the message across imaginatively and convincingly. If AIDS educators really hope to convert the young to safe sex before their penchant for risky business becomes entrenched, they must look to improving their own communication skills. But that will avail them nothing if schools continue to bar the messengers from the classroom.

REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE RESOLUTION

The national security of the United States is not negotiable. That is why Republicans in

the House of Representatives have always stood for a strong military. It is why we have opposed drastic cuts that would cripple preparedness.

It is why we now emphatically oppose the attempt, by a Commander-in-Chief unfamiliar with military life, to unilaterally intrude professed homosexuals into the ranks of the Armed Services.

This is not a matter of civil rights, but of military wrongs. It is wrong for any White House to pay off political debts at the expense of the men and women on the front lines of freedom. It is wrong for any President to scorn the collective wisdom of our military leaders, the overwhelming sentiment of those who serve in the ranks, and the outrage of the American people.

Our common bond of citizenship calls for understanding and compassion toward those who, for whatever reason, cannot reach their goal of a military career. Their individual aims must, however, be subordinated to a greater good: maintaining the order, morale, and discipline essential to fulfilling the mission of the Armed Forces.

That mission of our Armed Forces necessitates living together in enforced intimacy. It exposes personnel to hazardous situations, where exposure to blood-borne disease is dramatically increased. An army is a mobile living, walking blood bank. Our military system of authority is distorted by the intrusion of any sexual factor. Our military responsibility, financial and otherwise, for health care, for treatment of dependents, and for post-service benefits argues against RASH decision by an inexperienced President.

Republican Members of the House therefore affirm that the personnel procedures of the Department of Defense, and of related agencies, concerning homosexuals shall not be altered except by act of Congress.

TABLE 8.—AIDS CASES, CASE-FATALITY RATES, AND DEATHS BY HALF-YEAR AND AGE GROUP, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 1992, UNITED STATES

Half-year	Adults/adolescents			Children less than 13 years old		
	Cases diagnosed during interval	Case-fatality rate	Deaths occurring during interval	Cases diagnosed during interval	Case-fatality rate	Deaths occurring during interval
Before 1981	81	86.4	30	6	66.7	1
1981:						
January to June	92	91.3	39	10	80.0	2
July to December	205	91.7	87	5	100.0	7
1982:						
January to June	399	92.5	153	14	78.6	8
July to December	696	91.2	289	15	80.0	5
1983:						
January to June	1,288	93.6	524	33	100.0	13
July to December	1,645	93.0	931	42	88.1	16
1984:						
January to June	2,569	92.0	1,401	49	85.7	26
July to December	3,386	92.6	1,963	62	85.5	23
1985:						
January to June	4,891	92.1	2,821	97	76.3	44
July to December	6,319	91.0	3,868	130	80.0	70
1986:						
January to June	8,315	89.8	5,086	135	80.0	64
July to December	9,940	87.4	6,542	187	70.1	92
1987:						
January to June	12,928	87.8	7,571	223	70.4	118
July to December	14,358	84.1	7,947	260	64.2	167
1988:						
January to June	16,480	81.2	9,327	250	60.4	134
July to December	16,961	79.8	10,667	336	56.8	169
1989:						
January to June	19,181	74.4	12,381	339	56.3	167
July to December	19,190	71.4	14,150	326	49.7	182
1990:						
January to June	20,375	63.5	13,687	341	44.3	188
July to December	19,494	56.4	14,467	351	36.2	186
1991:						
January to June	20,924	46.0	14,757	317	32.2	152
July to December	19,600	34.7	15,326	257	24.5	157
1992:						
January to June	16,197	20.4	11,788	241	17.4	113
July to December	2,581	9.9	2,231	25	12.0	21
Total ¹	238,095	66.5	158,243	4,051	52.6	2,129

¹ Death totals include 210 adults/adolescents and 4 children known to have died, but whose dates of death are unknown.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING], another one of our dynamic freshman Members.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the issue of homosexuality in the military demands a full and open debate. It is not something that should be decided in the dark of night on something that is sent over to us at the last moment from the Senate.

The job of the military is to protect our national interests. Our job as a Congress is to protect the brave men and women who put their lives on the line to protect that national interest. By caving in to a politically correct pressure group, the Clinton administration is jeopardizing the lives of those brave men and women, and by acquiescing in the legislation passed in the Senate and by acquiescing in the so-called compromise being proposed by the Clinton administration, we are joining with the administration. There will be blood on our hands because we are also jeopardizing the lives of our brave men and women.

□ 2240

The Armed Forces are there to defend our country, not to be a vehicle for social change, not to bring about changes in the military that others are trying to bring about in society.

The job of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force, is dangerous enough, it is tough enough, without the Congress and the administration attempting to impose what they believe to be a politically correct social standard upon them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to give this issue the seriousness it deserves, the debate it deserves, and not acquiesce in the martial law that was imposed on us before. I ask that the previous question be defeated.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Sugarland, TX [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to this side of the aisle. We know you have got the votes, and I know some of you can show some of your arrogance in having the votes and trying to turn this place into what it now looks like, the English Parliament. And we have expressed outrage over the way you are twisting the rules.

Mr. Speaker, let me just talk plain politics a minute. If you have not looked at this bill and this rule, especially those that have told their constituents that they support the ban on homosexuals in the military, they had better look at what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of the sense of Congress. It is a reiteration of the President's position. If you vote for this bill, you are voting for the President's position. That is what your people back home are going to see in the papers in the morning. So do not

switch on your position that you established over the last few days, because believe me, it will be portrayed. A vote for this bill is a vote for the President's position that says he is going to lift the ban on July 15, and we are going to go through these machinations and political posturing between now and then to cover his position. But his position is lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military. By voting for this bill, you are supporting that position.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

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

Mr. Speaker, the hour is very late. Members worked until midnight last night, and it looks like we are going to come close to that this evening.

I just want our colleagues to refocus on what this bill is all about. We have worked for 8 years to get to this point, where we could deliver to the President of the United States a bill that will put into policy what every other major industrial nation has, and that is giving families a choice, giving them a choice so they do not have to choose to neglect their child and save their job, or a sick parent and save their job. That is what this is all about this evening. That is what this bill is about.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail this evening, we will have codified gridlock once again. The Senate of the United States, the other body, this evening passed this legislation with a very strong majority, 71 to 27. They had before them an amendment similar to that which the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] wants to offer, and I hope we do not allow him to offer, an amendment offered by Senator DOLE that would have done the things that the gentleman has suggested with respect to the issue of gays in the military.

Mr. Speaker, that amendment was defeated on a vote of 62 to 37, with Republicans and Democrats supporting the position of the senior Senator from Georgia.

We have in this place of legislation before us that we will pass shortly, language supported by the majority leader from Maine and the Senator from Georgia [Senator NUNN], language that will allow us to continue to study this controversial issue and report back on the 15th of July, to study in the Department of Defense and study in the Committee on Armed Services in the other body.

That is a rational approach. That is one which looks at all the issues that this very difficult decision that faces the country needs to have looked at.

But please, I beg Members, please do not forget what this issue is all about. This issue is about whether or not people have to make the choice between a sick child and their job, or a dying parent and their job. They should not have

to make that choice. That is not the values this country was founded upon. That is not the values Members came here to serve for.

Mr. Speaker, let us get rid of this black mark that we have had as we stand alone among Western democracies and free people on this very important social issue. Let us join other nations who have the decency to tell workers who are caught in those very, very difficult situations in their family, that, yes, your family comes first, your parents come first, your child comes first. That is what this bill is all about tonight. And do not be sidetracked by attempts from the other side to cloud this issue, to emotionalize this issue to the point where people are taking serious the other very human issue that we seek to remedy in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote against the position of the gentleman from New York, vote for the previous question, and then finally let us send this bill to the President of the United States for a signature on a bill that we can all be proud of.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again my very dear friend from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has made a very eloquent and passionate plea. Many of us on this side of the aisle are very sympathetic. But we have to realize that we are here debating the rule on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for our colleagues to know that over the past 12 years we have constantly heard from the other side of the aisle that we have a problem called gridlock. I was elected the same day that Ronald Reagan was in 1980. Since I have been here we have had a Democratic House of Representatives and a Republican in the White House.

Now we have a Democrat in the White House and both House of Congress also controlled by the Democrats. Mr. Speaker, what has happened here is we have found that the solution to the problem of gridlock is to throw the rules of this House right out the window. I believe that is reprehensible, and I believe it is a travesty to the process that we have of representative government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, we do hear a great deal of discussion on both sides of the aisle tonight about fairness and unfairness. This is a body where we should take seriously and debate the issue openly and honestly, as fairly and equitably as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I rise here tonight is to codify and reinforce the fact that all Americans should be able to take care of their children, their sick spouses, their grandparents, and so on. But I do not think that whether

we have debated this for 8 years or 20 years is the issue tonight.

□ 2250

The issue is, have we debated it enough to come up with a law that will do what we want to do about family unity, about people in harm's way?

I heard earlier this evening one of the Members of this body said that should we not have a policy, and this is about one of the controversies, intermittent policy, should that be allowed?

The point I would like to make, one of the Members said earlier that should not a mother that has a child with leukemia be allowed to take 2 hours off on Tuesday and 2 hours off on Thursday to take that child to have treatment.

My point is, I agree with that 100 percent. If that mother works in a business where there are 55 employees, she can to that. But if that mother works in a firm where there are 45 employees, the bill that we will pass, maybe, will not help her.

I know this is maybe a day late and a dollar short, but should we not wait just a couple more weeks to redefine a bill so that all Americans, regardless of the number of employees in a business, have the opportunity to take the time off when they need it? And if we can craft a bill where some of those people can be paid, would it not be worth the time to wait a couple more weeks?

My position is that it would be.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that anything that is going to be said here on the floor tonight is going to change much, but it occurs to me that above here it says, "In God We Trust."

The longer I serve in the Congress of the United States, the more I become convinced that we really do not mean that a great deal.

The Bible and every religion talks about moral foundation and moral concept, and nations have to live by those morals. And when governments start violating the rules and the laws of God over a long period of time, that civilization cannot long exist.

I am not just talking about the Bible. I am talking about every major religion. I think this country is heading down a path now that is going to ultimately cause us real severe problems.

And we, as a Congress who set the moral tone for the Nation, ought to believe in what that says, "In God We Trust." And we ought to live by the religious teachings that the Bible and other great religions teach.

When we start flying in the face of Almighty God, in my opinion, and I am not preaching tonight, I am telling my colleagues it is going to hurt the Nation. It is going to hurt the Nation, and we should pay attention.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from

Tennessee if he has any further requests for time.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time at this moment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], our great Committee on Rules leader.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I will try to be brief.

My colleagues, I have laid on the desk of the majority leader and the Speaker an amendment which, if we defeat the previous question, we will have that opportunity to vote on. It would simply give my colleagues a chance to vote again on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that passed this House by a substantial majority.

But even more importantly, it would give my colleagues the only opportunity they are going to have to continue the Department of Defense policy of service of homosexuals in our armed services.

Let me just read that amendment to my colleagues, because it is terribly, terribly important.

It simply says that all "executive orders, Department of Defense directives and regulations of the military departments concerning the appointments, the enlistment and induction and retention of homosexuals in our Armed Forces of the United States, as was in effect on January 1, 1993, shall remain in effect," with respect to the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps, "unless changed by law." And that means my colleagues here.

Our military has a very important mission. That mission is more important than our mission here today. Because our military is the reason that we are the greatest, freest nation on Earth.

Right now is going to be the only chance that any man or woman in this body is going to have to vote on this terribly important issue.

I would just point out that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], my good friend, the majority whip, said the Senate had defeated this amendment. That is right. And Senator MITCHELL, in the other body, had the fairness to give that body a chance to vote, a chance to do what we were sent here to do, to cast our vote for the people we represent, and we know how they feel.

I know that there are 276 men and women in this body that support this

amendment, if we were given a chance to vote, a clean chance up or down. There is probably even more than that.

We owe it to the people of this country to allow this vote to take place. Please, vote against the previous question. We can stand up and be men and women that we were sent here to be.

For gosh sakes, get up and do it and vote down the previous question.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to move a single vote here tonight. I think it is decided.

But I would like to refocus on what we are actually doing here. We have talked about gays in the military, and the gentleman from Michigan has made a spirited defense of the bill, which passed earlier today. But that is not what this vote is.

This vote is on a rule, a rule that self-actuates a change made by the Senate which this House is unwilling to let us vote upon.

I think it is important for the people who might be watching in a large audience to begin to understand that the capricious nature we treat these rules by, the arrogance of the majority, which is so unsure of itself that it is unwilling to leave an open vote on the changes made by the Senate, will just abuse the rules they rammed down our throats on opening day to try and win their case.

This is not a vote, this is not a vote on family leave. We had that. The other side won that. We grant them that.

This is a vote on whether or not the House agrees to the Senate amendment to our bill on family leave, and they are unwilling to let us vote on that.

That is a brutal, capricious, arrogant abuse of the rules that were put forth.

My colleagues, we do not expect to win many of these votes. We are outnumbered. But we expect you to treat the rules with the reverence they were intended in a free society.

Absent that, we have no freedom, we have no democracy, and we have no law.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I likewise continue to be appalled at the arrogance that I have seen here today. I want to share with my colleagues a little story. This story is about 2 years ago, in the fall of 1990.

I had just finished a Thanksgiving dinner. I invited my family over. My parents were there, and I took my father on a father-and-son walk, the first time I ever really had the opportunity to have that walk with that father.

And I said, "Dad, it is highly remote that I will go to Saudi Arabia."

Three days later, late in the night, I received a phone call. And the voice on

the other end of that phone said, "Steve, it is your turn."

With that, my two small children were in the kitchen. I leaned down, I gave my 8-year-old daughter and 5-year-old son a hug that I wanted to last a lifetime.

□ 2300

My wife saw the look on my face. Then the Army gave me 3 days notice to leave this country and go to Saudi Arabia. I lost my business. The woman who sat next to me was 2d Lt. Laurie Laughton of Lafayette, IN. I sat next to Laurie with 270 people crammed in an air transport, in combat gear, going to a theater of war knowing we were about to be gassed.

I will tell the Members, they are going to share all of their hopes and dreams, their fears, their aspirations, with the person sitting next to them. When we landed in Saudi Arabia, I patted Laurie upon the knee and said, "Laurie, we are all coming home, and I will see you in Indiana."

The next time I saw 2d Lt. Laurie Laughton was at the cemetery in Lafayette, IN. She did not come home the same way, and I will tell the Members, it was her spirit that made me exercise courage to come to this body. That sacrifice is no different than the sacrifices of thousands of people, the sacrifices of men and women who have come before us. We owe it to them to act in reason and fairness for this democratic form of government, and this is completely unfortunate and unfair, and the American people are judging the Members right now.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to put this in perspective. I am hearing a lot of debate from this side about why we are in this mess. We would begin to consider the family leave bill, which we have considered for 8 long years, and many of us have voted on many times, we heard from across the aisle, "We are going to attach the homosexuals and the military thing to the family leave bill." It has absolutely nothing to do with family leave, and if it stood on its own in this House, it is absolutely, totally irrelevant. It is not germane to this bill, and it is a delaying tactic. It is a political maneuver. It has nothing to do with family leave.

If they cannot win on the merits, they want to sabotage family leave. The debate has totally gone from the family leave position. Now we are relegated to talking about gays in the military, which has absolutely nothing to do with family leave.

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

Mr. HEFNER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman might have been right when the

bill left here, and we did not offer this when the bill left here. The bill has come back. We are acting on the Senate bill. This is the Senate language dealing with the very subject that I am attempting to change. I am attempting to remove Senator MITCHELL's language, which is in the bill, and replace it with some more language that takes a different approach, so it is relevant, it is germane.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I will re-take my time.

We would not even be dealing with Senator MITCHELL's language had it not been put on a bill from the Republican side. It was not even camouflaged. The gentleman said, some Senators on that side said, "We are going to sabotage the family leave bill. We are going to attach the gays in the military thing to the family leave bill." It is not germane. In this House it would not even be germane.

I am not an authority on homosexuality. I do not even understand the lifestyle. A lot of people know a lot more about it from this side than I do, but I do know about family values. I do know about the value of this family leave bill.

Some of the language that the gentleman is talking about, the language of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], I watched the debate in the Senate. Senator KIT BOND insisted on the language change on the Goodling legislation because it dealt with if a child would have had cancer, and these were his words, a child could be going for cancer treatment and the mother could be forced to take six weeks off to get two days during the week. That was Mr. KIT BOND's argument on the other side when he changed the Goodling part of the bill.

It seems to me that this is a delaying tactic. It has nothing to do with family leave. Would the gentleman explain to me what it has to do?

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

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

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman should be aware that the debate to which he makes reference, that of the Senator, I think, from Missouri, regarding the Goodling amendment occupied about 3 to 5 minutes on the floor of the Senate. We debated the Goodling amendment at length and voted on it twice, and it prevailed.

What we are asking to do in this rule, leaving aside all the matters of homosexuals in the military, is to say "House, forget it. What you debated, what you discussed, what you worked your will on twice, we are going to preempt you and not even have a vote on it."

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, we have been debating. We have been back in session here debating this family leave

bill. We came back from dinner and we have been debating this bill now, and soon it will be two hours, and we have not talked about any of the merits of the family leave bill because we are not really allowed to address it under this rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Staten Island, NY, Ms. MOLINARI.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am a supporter of the family and medical leave bill. I have been a sponsor of the family and medical leave bill. I wanted to see it get out of this Chamber tonight, to become law, but once again the Democrats have chosen to use this bill as a political pawn. They used it last year and delayed bringing it to the floor to embarrass President Bush, and this year they try and break the law to give President Clinton an opportunity to hold a ceremony while we are not in session.

As a supporter of this bill, Mr. Speaker, and a supporter of the Goodling amendment, this move is very wrong, wrong for those of us who want this bill to become law and wrong for the men and women in this country who have waited too long for it to become a reality.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR].

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me tell the Members that I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] for giving this time to go to Desert Storm and fight on our behalf. I am sorry he lost this business. He talks about this lieutenant, this woman who he patted her knee and he talked about the American dream. I am sorry that she died in action, died for her country.

However, Mr. Speaker, she would have probably told him, she would have probably said to him that as a woman, probably with two kids, no child support, that she needed to have the American society ideal; when she wanted to take care of her kids, when she wanted to take care of her parents, that she would be able to choose, not on her job, but to choose on her family.

I ask my colleagues, who a year ago with the administration said they were for family values, today to join us and be for family values, be for those mothers that want to take care of their children, be for those children who want to take care of their parents, and be for America, who asks that this bill be passed.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some comment on this debate about the need for the Goodling amendment as we passed it last night. I voted

for the Goodling amendment last night.

I have also listened to the debate in the Senate and looked at the Bond amendment to the reduced leave policy. What we have now from the Senate is a lot better than what the Goodling amendment did last night. It is a lot better, because it provides reasons so that a woman, the mother, can be able to take her child if it needs chemotherapy and yet has to have a doctor's certificate.

□ 2310

We did not have that in our language last night. The Goodling amendment did not have that. It does do a thing that I think, Mr. Speaker, that is really better than anything we have done before, and I want to commend my junior Senator, a good Republican from Missouri, for coming up with the language so that we can get this bill passed.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member I had this same experience as the other new Members who heard from the people in our district, and what I heard over and over again is that they could not understand why Congress was dealing in matters that had nothing to do with the main subject matter of the legislation at hand, why bills were held up with gridlock, why bills were held up and derailed for things that were totally irrelevant to the main public policy issues.

I came here to vote for family and medical leave because I considered it to be a good public policy, and for the last 2 days all I have heard is a debate that is more in minutia and irrelevancies, and I for one hold my head up high and will continue to vote for this bill on good sound public policy grounds, and I think we should all do so.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hamburg, NY, Mr. QUINN, another one of our freshmen.

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

Mr. Speaker, I testified just this morning as a freshman before the Joint Committee on Congressional Reform, and I testified at that time as the gentleman just spoke, that as we went on the camping trail this past year we heard about congressional reform, we heard from residents that said that they wanted change, that they did not want business as usual. And I know for a fact that freshmen were not the only ones who heard that message, that our veteran and distinguished Members heard the same thing: "We don't want business as usual."

The family leave bill has merit. I voted for it and I support it. I believe

there is not a single person in this room that disagrees with the situation of a mother with a sick child.

The gentleman talked about gridlock earlier. We are here only weeks into this session, weeks. We are talking about procedural changes, we are talking about changing rules, we are talking about adding amendments, we are talking about attaching changes, making critical decisions into the middle of the night almost, Democrats blaming Republicans, Republicans blaming Democrats, and it is back to business as usual.

That disappoints me. I agree with the gentleman on the other side of the aisle. Business as usual is what we were asked not to do, and here we are at it again.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the previous question.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, as much as the opponents of family and medical leave would like this issue to go away, it will not. As much as the opponents of family and medical leave would like to confuse this issue, they cannot.

The question before us tonight is whether American workers should have the same right as workers in 125 other nations. The vote is, and get ready for it because here it comes, the vote is do you think American workers deserve to have the right to take time with a sick child, spouse or parent, without fear of losing their job.

If you agree with that proposition, vote "yes." If you do not agree with that proposition, vote "no." That is the question before us.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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 ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 172, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—227

Abercrombie	Andrews (TX)	Barcia
Ackerman	Applegate	Barlow
Andrews (ME)	Bacchus (FL)	Barrett (WI)
Andrews (NJ)	Baessler	Becerra

Bellenson	Hamburg	Ortiz
Berman	Harman	Orton
Bevill	Hastings	Owens
Bilbray	Hayes	Pallone
Bishop	Hefner	Pastor
Blackwell	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Bonior	Hinchey	Payne (VA)
Borski	Hoagland	Pelosi
Boucher	Hochbrueckner	Penny
Brooks	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Browder	Hughes	Peterson (MN)
Brown (FL)	Inalee	Pomeroy
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Poshard
Bryant	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Byrne	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Cantwell	Johnson, E. B.	Ravenel
Cardin	Johnston	Reed
Carr	Kanjorski	Reynolds
Chapman	Kaptur	Richardson
Clay	Kennedy	Roemer
Clayton	Kennelly	Roukema
Clement	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kleczka	Rush
Coleman	Klein	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Klink	Sanders
Collins (MI)	Kopetski	Sangmeister
Condit	Kreidler	Sawyer
Conyers	LaFalce	Schenk
Cooper	Lambert	Schroeder
Coppersmith	Lancaster	Schumer
Costello	Lantos	Scott
Coyne	LaRocco	Serrano
Danner	Lehman	Sharp
Darden	Levin	Shays
de la Garza	Lewis (GA)	Shepherd
Deal	Long	Skaggs
DeFazio	Lowey	Skelton
DeLauro	Maloney	Slatery
Dellums	Mann	Slaughter
Derrick	Martolies	Smith (IA)
Deutsch	Mezvrinsky	Spratt
Dicks	Markey	Stark
Dingell	Martinez	Stokes
Dixon	Matsui	Strickland
Dooley	Mazzoli	Stupak
Durbin	McCloskey	Swett
Edwards (CA)	McCurdy	Swift
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Synar
Engel	McHale	Tanner
English (AZ)	McKinney	Tejeda
Eshoo	McNulty	Thornton
Evans	Meehan	Thurman
Fazio	Meek	Torres
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Torricelli
Fliner	Mfume	Towns
Fingerhut	Miller (CA)	Traficant
Flake	Mineta	Tucker
Foglietta	Minge	Unsoeld
Ford (MI)	Mink	Velazquez
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Vento
Frost	Mollohan	Visclosky
Furse	Moran	Volkmer
Gejdenson	Morella	Waters
Gephardt	Murphy	Watt
Gibbons	Murtha	Wheat
Glickman	Nadler	Williams
Gonzalez	Natcher	Wilson
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Wise
Green	Neal (NC)	Woolsey
Gunderson	Oberstar	Wyden
Gutierrez	Obey	Wynn
Hall (OH)	Oliver	Yates

NAYS—172

Allard	Callahan	English (OK)
Armey	Calvert	Everett
Bachus (AL)	Camp	Ewing
Baker (CA)	Canady	Fawell
Baker (LA)	Castle	Fish
Ballenger	Clinger	Fowler
Barrett (NE)	Coble	Franks (CT)
Bartlett	Collins (GA)	Franks (NJ)
Bateman	Combest	Gallely
Bentley	Cramer	Gallo
Bereuter	Crapo	Gekas
Billakis	Cunningham	Geren
Bliley	DeLay	Gilchrist
Blute	Diaz-Balart	Gillmor
Boehlert	Dickey	Gilman
Boehner	Doollittle	Goodlatte
Bonilla	Dornan	Goodling
Brewster	Dreier	Goss
Bunning	Duncan	Grams
Burton	Dunn	Grandy
Buyer	Emerson	Greenwood

Hall (TX)	Lloyd	Roth	Dixon	Lambert	Reed	Kyl	Nussle	Skelton
Hamilton	Machtley	Rowland	Dooley	Lantos	Regula	Lancaster	Orton	Slattery
Hansen	Manzullo	Royce	Durbin	Lazio	Reynolds	LaRocco	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Hastert	McCandless	Sarpalius	Edwards (CA)	Leach	Richardson	Levy	Packard	Smith (OR)
Hefley	McCollum	Saxton	Edwards (TX)	Lehman	Roemer	Lewis (CA)	Parker	Smith (TX)
Herger	McCrery	Sensenbrenner	Engel	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen	Lewis (FL)	Paxon	Spence
Hobson	McDade	Shaw	English (AZ)	Lewis (GA)	Roukema	Lightfoot	Payne (VA)	Stearns
Hoekstra	McHugh	Skeen	English (OK)	Lloyd	Roybal-Allard	Linder	Penny	Stenholm
Hoke	McInnis	Smith (MI)	Eshoo	Long	Rush	Livingston	Pombo	Stump
Holden	McKeon	Smith (NJ)	Evans	Lowey	Sabo	Manzullo	Porter	Sundquist
Horn	McMillan	Smith (OR)	Fazio	Machtley	Sanders	McCandless	Pryce (OH)	Talent
Houghton	Meyers	Smith (TX)	Fields (LA)	Maloney	Sangmeister	McCollum	Rahall	Tauzin
Huffington	Mica	Snowe	Fliner	Mann	Sawyer	McCrery	Ridge	Taylor (MS)
Hunter	Michel	Solomon	Fingerhut	Margolies-	Saxton	McInnis	Roberts	Thomas (CA)
Hutto	Miller (FL)	Spence	Fish	Mezvinsky	Schenk	McKeon	Rogers	Thomas (WY)
Hyde	Molinari	Stearns	Flake	Markey	Schroeder	McMillan	Rohrabacher	Torkildsen
Inglis	Montgomery	Stenholm	Foglietta	Martinez	Schumer	Meyers	Roth	Upton
Inhofe	Moorhead	Stump	Ford (MI)	Matsui	Scott	Mica	Rowland	Valentine
Istook	Myers	Sundquist	Frank (MA)	Mazzoli	Serrano	Michel	Royce	Vucanovich
Jacobs	Nussle	Talent	Franks (NJ)	McCloskey	Sharp	Miller (FL)	Sarpalius	Walker
Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Tauzin	Frost	McCurdy	Shays	Montgomery	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Kasich	Packard	Taylor (MS)	Furse	McDade	Shepherd	Moorhead	Shaw	Zeliff
Kim	Parker	Thomas (CA)	Gejdenson	McDermott	Skaggs	Myers	Skeen	
King	Paxon	Thomas (WY)	Gephardt	McHale	Slaughter			
Kingston	Petri	Torkildsen	Gibbons	McHugh	Smith (IA)			
Klug	Pombo	Upton	Gillmor	McKinney	Smith (NJ)			
Knollenberg	Porter	Valentine	Gilman	McNulty	Snowe			
Kolbe	Pryce (OH)	Vucanovich	Gonzalez	Meehan	Solomon			
Kyl	Quinn	Walker	Gordon	Meek	Spratt			
Lazio	Rahall	Walsh	Green	Menendez	Stark			
Leach	Ramstad	Weldon	Gutierrez	Mfume	Stokes			
Levy	Regula	Wolf	Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Strickland			
Lewis (CA)	Roberts	Young (AK)	Hamburg	Mineta	Stupak			
Lewis (FL)	Rogers	Zeliff	Harman	Minge	Swett			
Lightfoot	Rohrabacher	Zimmer	Hastings	Mink	Swift			
Linder	Ros-Lehtinen		Hefner	Moakley	Synar			
Livingston			Hilliard	Molinari	Tanner			

NOT VOTING—31

Archer	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Barton	Laughlin	Shuster
Brown (CA)	Lipinski	Sisisky
Cox	Manton	Studds
Crane	Pickett	Taylor (NC)
Fields (TX)	Pickle	Washington
Ford (TN)	Quillen	Waxman
Gingrich	Rose	Whitten
Hancock	Rostenkowski	Young (FL)
Henry	Santorum	
Hutchinson	Schaefer	

□ 2333

Mrs. FOWLER changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 152, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie	Boehlert	Collins (IL)
Ackerman	Bonior	Collins (MI)
Andrews (ME)	Borski	Condit
Andrews (NJ)	Boucher	Conyers
Andrews (TX)	Brooks	Cooper
Applegate	Brown (FL)	Coppersmith
Bacchus (FL)	Brown (OH)	Costello
Baessler	Bryant	Coyne
Barcia	Byrne	Danner
Barlow	Cantwell	de la Garza
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	DeFazio
Becerra	Castle	DeLauro
Beilenson	Chapman	DeLums
Berman	Clay	Derrick
Bibray	Clayton	Deutsch
Bishop	Clement	Diaz-Balart
Blackwell	Clyburn	Dicks
Blute	Coleman	Dingell

NAYS—152

Allard	Combust	Goss
Armey	Cox	Grams
Bachus (AL)	Cramer	Grandy
Baker (CA)	Crapo	Greenwood
Baker (LA)	Cunningham	Gunderson
Ballenger	Darden	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Deal	Hamilton
Bartlett	DeLay	Hansen
Bateman	Dickey	Hastert
Bentley	Doolittle	Hayes
Bereuter	Dornan	Hefley
Bilirakis	Dreier	Herger
Bliley	Duncan	Hobson
Boehner	Dunn	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Emerson	Houghton
Brewster	Everett	Hunter
Browder	Ewing	Hutto
Bunning	Fawell	Inglis
Burton	Fowler	Inhofe
Buyer	Franks (CT)	Istook
Callahan	Gallely	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Gallo	Johnson, Sam
Camp	Gekas	Kasich
Canady	Geren	Kim
Carr	Gilchrest	King
Clinger	Glickman	Kingston
Coble	Goodlatte	Knollenberg
Collins (GA)	Goodling	Kolbe

NOT VOTING—31

Archer	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Barton	Laughlin	Shuster
Bevill	Lipinski	Sisisky
Brown (CA)	Manton	Studds
Crane	Pickett	Taylor (NC)
Fields (TX)	Pickle	Washington
Ford (TN)	Quillen	Waxman
Gingrich	Rose	Whitten
Hancock	Rostenkowski	Young (FL)
Henry	Santorum	
Hutchinson	Schaefer	

□ 2349

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Manton for, with Mr. Laughlin against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD shows that I did not vote on the final passage of H.R. 1, the Family and Medical Leave Act, which was vote No. 29. I was in the Chamber for the vote, attempted to vote and thought that I had. The RECORD indicates, however, that my vote was not recorded.

I would like to state that I supported the passage of this important piece of legislation, as I did during the previous Congress. I believe it will prove to be in the best interests of America's work force.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I had been advised there may be several more recorded votes this evening. Unfortunately, tomorrow, I have an appointment for minor foot surgery which cannot be rescheduled. Therefore, I will have to leave for Texas tonight prior to these final votes. Had I been present, I would have again expressed my support for the Family and Medical Leave Act and would have voted accordingly.

□ 2350

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CHARLIE ROSE, chairman of the Committee on House Administration:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 1, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, H-204 The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the authority vested in the Committee on House Administration by House Rule X, Clause 4(d)(3), and upon recommendation of the Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight of the Committee on House Administration pursuant to Clause 3(j)(2), the Committee has directed the following, effective on February 1, 1993:

"The responsibility for the operation of the House Finance Office is transferred to the Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services, subject to the oversight of the Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight of the Committee on House Administration."

It is intended that the House Finance Office continue to operate under the existing statutory authority of the Clerk of the House, but at the direction of the Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services, until such time as the necessary statutory changes are enacted.

Upon receipt of a copy of this letter, the Clerk of the House is directed to continue to carry out the ministerial functions imposed by statute with regard to the operation of the House Finance Office subject to the direction of the Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services, and to work cooperatively with the Director and the Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight of the Committee on House Administration to ensure that all functions and operations of the House Finance Office are timely executed.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE ROSE
Chairman.
BILL THOMAS,
Ranking Republican Member.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE THROUGH FEBRUARY 16, 1993

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 4, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable STENY H. HOYER to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through February 16, 1993.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

APPOINTMENT AS GENERAL COUNSEL TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 11 of rule I he has appointed Steven R. Ross as General Counsel to the House of Representatives, effective February 1, 1993.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, February 16, 1993, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Senate:

S. CON. RES. 10

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, February 4, 1993, or Friday, February 5, 1993, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until 12 noon, or until such time as may be specified by the majority leader, or his designee, in the motion to adjourn or recess, on Tuesday, February 16, 1993, or until 12 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, February 4, 1993, or Friday, February 5, 1993, pursuant to a motion made by the majority leader, or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Tuesday, February 16, 1993, or until 12 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Senate concurrent resolution is concurred in.

There was not objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE 103D CONGRESS

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, I am submitting for the RECORD a copy of the Committee Rules for the 103d Congress, as follows:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

A. RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION

Rule 1. Rules of the House.—Rule XI of the Rules of the House, which pertains entirely to Committee procedure, is incorporated and made a part of the Rules of the Committee which are supplementary to the Rules of the House. Written rules adopted by the Committee, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each Subcommittee. Each Subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee. Unless otherwise explicitly stated references to Committee and to Chair shall apply to each Subcommittee and its respective Chair.

Rule 2. Schedule of Meetings.—(a) Regular meetings of the Full Committee shall be held at 9:45 a.m. on the first and third Wednesday of each month that Congress is in session unless canceled by the Chair.

(b) Additional meetings may be called and convened by the Chair.

(c) Special meetings shall be called and convened by the Chair as provided in Rule XI, clause 2, paragraph (c)(1), of the Rules of the House.

(d) Each regular, additional or special meeting shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair, or, in the absence of the Chair, by the Ranking Majority Member of the Committee present.

(e) Any meeting that conflicts with a party caucus or party conference of either party shall be rescheduled, at the discretion of the Chair.

Rule 3. Agenda for Meetings.—(a) The business to be considered at regular and additional meetings shall be available and delivered to the office of each Member no later than noon of the second day preceding the day of the meeting.

(b) The agenda for special meetings shall be made available as provided in Rule XI, clause 2, paragraph (c)(2), of the Rules of the House.

(c) The requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) may be waived by a majority vote.

Rule 4. Committee Procedure for Hearings.—(a) The date, time, place and subject matter of all hearings of the Committee shall be announced at least one week before the commencement of such hearings, unless the Committee expedites the hearing as provided in Rule XI, clause 2, paragraph (g)(3), of the Rules of the House.

(b) No Member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee unless the House by majority vote, authorizes the Committee to exclude Members under Rule 5.

(c) Each witness before the Committee shall file a copy of the written testimony to be presented at least 24 hours in advance of his or her appearance, and shall limit the oral presentation of the testimony to a brief summary, unless this requirement is waived by the Committee.

(d) Committee Members may question witnesses only when recognized by the Chair for that purpose. All questions shall be pertinent to the subject matter of the hearing.

(e) The right to question witnesses before the Committee shall alternate between the Majority Members and the Minority Members, taking into consideration the ratio of Majority and Minority Members present. Each Member shall be limited to five minutes in the questioning of witnesses until such time as each Member of the Committee who is present has had an opportunity to question the witness.

Rule 5. Open Meetings and Hearings.—(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this rule, each meeting and hearing conducted by the Committee shall be open to the public.

(b)(1) A meeting of the Committee may be closed to the public if the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public.

(2) A hearing may be closed to the public if the Committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote, to close all or part of the remainder of the hearing on that day because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives.

(3) A hearing may be closed to the public if a majority of the Members of the Committee who are present vote to close the hearing as provided in Rule XI, clause 2(k)(5), provided that the number of Members present is at least equal to the number of Members required to be present for the purpose of taking testimony.

(4) A hearing may be closed to the public if a majority of the Members of the Committee who are present vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate Rule XI, clause 2(k)(5), provided that the number of Members present is at least equal to the number of Members required to be present for the purpose of taking testimony.

(5) No person other than Members of the Committee and such Congressional staff and departmental representatives as a majority of the Members may authorize shall be present at any meeting or hearing which has been closed to the public unless authorized by the Chair after consultation with the Ranking Minority member.

(6) Any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters may be closed by the Chair after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

Rule 6. Committee Consideration.—(a) Except as provided in paragraph (c), no bill, recommendation, or other matter reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the Committee until two calendar days have elapsed from the time of Subcommittee action.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c), no bill shall be considered by the Committee unless a copy has been delivered to the office of each Member requesting a copy, together with a section-by-section explanation.

(c) The requirements in paragraphs (a) and (b) may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee, a quorum being present.

Rule 7. Quorum.—(a) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Members of the Committee are present which shall be deemed the case if a majority of the Committee responded on a roll call vote on that question.

(b) For the purpose of transacting any Committee business other than that described in paragraph (a), one-third of the Members shall constitute a quorum.

(c) Testimony and evidence may be received at any meeting at which two or more Members of the Committee are present.

(d) When a call of the roll is required to ascertain the presence of a quorum, the offices of all Members shall be notified and the Members shall have not less than 10 minutes to prove their attendance. The Chair shall have the discretion to waive this require-

ment when a quorum is actually present or whenever a quorum is secured and may direct the Clerk to note the names of all Members present within the 10-minute period.

Rule 8. Proxies.—A vote by any Member in the Committee or in any Subcommittee may be cast by proxy. Each proxy shall be in writing, shall designate the Member who is to execute the proxy authorization, shall assert that the Member is absent on official business or otherwise unable to attend, and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a Member may authorize a general proxy for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the Member assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

Rule 9. Subpoenas and Oaths.—(a) The Committee may authorize and issue a subpoena under Rule XI, clause 2(m)(2)(A) of the Rules of the House, if authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. In addition, the Chair of the Full Committee may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period of time in which the House has adjourned for more than three days. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the Chair of the Full Committee, or any member of the Committee authorized by the Committee and may be served by any person designated by a such Chair or member.

(b) The Chair of the Committee, the Chair of any of its Subcommittees, or any Member designated by either, may administer oaths to any witness.

Rule 10. Rollcalls, Committee Records, Transcripts.—(a) The Committee shall make available for inspection by the public at reasonable times at the Committee office, the result of each rollcall vote taken at any Committee meeting including a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and against, and whether by proxy or in person; and the Members present but not voting. Such records shall constitute the official attendance records of the Committee.

(b) All Committee and Subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Members serving as Chairs; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

(c) House records of the Committee which are at the National Archives shall be made available pursuant to House Rule XXXVI. The Chair of the Committee shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision to withhold a record pursuant to the rule, and shall present the matter to the Committee upon written request of any Committee member.

(d) At the beginning of any meeting of the Committee, the Chair may announce to the Committee, in his discretion, that further proceedings will be postponed on any motions on which a recorded vote is ordered or on which the vote is objected to under Rule 7 until immediately preceding the conclusion of the meeting. In such instances, the Committee shall proceed with the consideration of the next regularly scheduled measure or matter until all such business is disposed of or until such time as the Chair announces that the question will be put on the matter deferred. The question on any postponed motion shall be put by the Chair and shall be disposed of by the Committee, without fur-

ther debate, as expeditiously as possible. If the Committee adjourns before the question is put and determined on such motion, then the first order of business at the next meeting shall be the disposition of such motion.

(e) No demand for a rollcall shall be made or entertained except for the purpose of securing a record vote or in the apparent absence of a quorum.

(g) All transcripts of public meetings and hearings shall be available for review in the offices of the Committee, except that unrevised and unedited transcripts shall not be reproduced in any form without the consent of the Chair.

(h) Notwithstanding the other paragraphs of Rule 10, no records or transcripts of Committee meetings or hearings closed to the public under Rule 5 shall be released unless the Committee votes to release such records and transcripts in accordance with the procedure utilized to close the Committee meeting. All classified documents, transcripts, or other materials shall be maintained in an appropriately secured location and shall not be released for review by any unauthorized person. Authorized persons must review such classified materials at an appropriate location in the Committee offices, but such material shall not be removed from the Committee offices for any reason without the written permission of the Chair.

Rule 11. Filing of Committee Reports.—If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by this Committee, any Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) to file such views, in writing and signed by that Member or Members, with the Clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more Members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

Rule 12. Broadcasting of Committee Hearings.—As provided in Rule XI, clause 3 of the Rules of the House, any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee that is open to the public may be covered in whole or in part by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, as provided in Rule XI, clause 3 of the Rules of the House. The Chair shall have the discretion to establish reasonable requirements for implementing such coverage consistent with the Rules of the House including the following:

(1) Accredited press must obtain advance clearance for coverage of committee hearings or meetings from the appropriate gallery, and

(2) Persons other than accredited press will be permitted to cover meetings via audio or video recording only as approved in advance by the Chair, and upon agreeing in writing to comply with all House and Committee Rules pertaining to recording Committee meetings and hearings.

Rule 13. Committee Staffs.—(a)(1) The Committee shall appoint by a majority vote, appropriate professional and clerical staff personnel, in accordance with the provisions of clause 6 of Rule XI of the House Rules, from a list submitted by the Chair.

(2) Each employee on the professional, clerical and investigative staff of the Committee shall be entitled to pay at a single gross per annum rate, to be fixed by the Chair, which does not exceed the maximum rate of pay, as in effect from time to time, under applicable provisions of law. In the

case of staff designated directly to a Subcommittee, such rate of pay shall be fixed by the Chair in consultation with the relevant Subcommittee Chair.

(b) From the funds provided for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expenses resolutions—

(1) The Chair of each standing Subcommittee is authorized to appoint one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the Subcommittee Chair.

(2) The Ranking Minority Member of each standing Subcommittee is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of the Subcommittee Ranking Minority Member.

(3) The staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of (1) and (2) shall be compensated at the rate determined by the Subcommittee Chair in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, not to exceed: (a) 75 per centum of the maximum established in paragraph (c) of clause 6 of Rule XI of the House Rules, or (b) the rate paid the staff member appointed pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph.

(c) Each staff member, other than a staff member appointed pursuant to the request of Minority Members or under the authority of subsection (b) above, is assigned to the Chair for purposes of general supervision and shall perform such duties as the Chair may assign. Any staff member designated by the Chair to perform Subcommittee staff duties shall be responsible to carry out duties assigned by the Chair and by the relevant Subcommittee Chair pursuant to the Subcommittee's legislative and oversight responsibilities. In the case of staff members appointed pursuant to the request of Minority Members, the Ranking Minority Member shall exercise general supervision, subject to the assignments designed by Minority Members in accordance with clause 6 of Rule XI of the House Rules.

B. SUBCOMMITTEES: JURISDICTION, COMPOSITION, AND POWERS

Rule 14. Reference of Legislation.—(a) Every bill, resolution, or other matter referred to the Committee shall be referred to subcommittee within two weeks from the date of its referral to the Committee unless the Chair, with the approval of majority of the Majority Members of the Committee, orders that it be retained for consideration by the Committee or that it be referred to a select or special Subcommittee.

(b) A bill, resolution, or other matter referred by the Chair to a Subcommittee may be recalled for the purpose of direct consideration by the Full Committee or for referral to another Subcommittee provided Members of the Committee receive one week written notice of the recall and a majority of the Members of the Committee do not object.

(c) A bill, resolution, or other matter referred by the Chair to a Subcommittee may be recalled from such Subcommittee at any time by majority vote, a quorum being present, for its consideration by the Committee or for reference to another Subcommittee.

Rule 15. Subcommittees.—There shall be the following five standing Subcommittees of the Committee: Oversight and Investigations; National Parks, Forest and Public Lands; Insular and International Affairs; Energy and Mineral Resources; and Native American Affairs.

Rule 16. Jurisdiction of Subcommittees.—The jurisdiction, including legislative, investigative, and oversight responsibilities of the five standing Subcommittees shall, subject to alteration as other Subcommittees are created, be as follows:

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

(a) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(b) Remedial legislation resulting from the findings or recommendations of the Subcommittee.

(c) Generation and marketing of electric power from Federal water projects by federally chartered or Federal regional power marketing authorities.

(d) All measures and matters concerning water resources planning conducted pursuant to the Water Resource Planning Act, water resource research and development programs, saline water research and development.

(e) Compacts relating to the use and apportionment of interstate waters, water rights, and major interbasin water or power movement programs.

(f) All measures and matters pertaining to irrigation and reclamation projects and other water resources development programs, including policies and procedures.

(g) Selected matters and proposals, regarding the environmental impacts of any laws or programs under jurisdiction of the Committee.

(h) Measures concerning the transportation of natural gas from or within Alaska, disposition of oil transported by the trans-Alaska oil pipeline.

(i) Measures and matters relating to Alaska public lands, including forestry and forest management issues, and Federal reserved water rights.

(j) Selected matters and proposals, as referred by the Chairman, involving the environmental impacts of any laws or programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee.

Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands

(a) Measures and matters related to the National Park System and all of its units.

(b) National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Trails System, national recreation areas, and other national units established for protection, conservation, preservation or recreational development administered by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) Such military parks, battlefields, cemeteries, and parks administered by the Secretary of the Interior within the District of Columbia.

(d) Except for Alaska, National Wilderness Preservation System generally; and all matters regarding wilderness in the National Park System.

(e) Federal outdoor recreation plans, programs, administration including the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

(f) Plans and programs concerning non-federal outdoor recreation and land use, including such related plans and programs authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 and the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963.

(g) Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain and other historic preservation programs and activities, including programs for international cooperation in the field of historic preservation.

(h) Matters concerning the following agencies and programs: Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Program, Historic American Buildings Survey, Historic American Engineering Record, American Conservation Corps, U.S. Holocaust Memorial, and Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.

(i) Except for public lands in Alaska, public lands, generally, including measures or

matters related to entry, easements, withdrawals, and grazing.

(j) Forest reserves, including management thereof, created from the public domain, except in Alaska.

(k) Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

(l) Federal reserved water rights on public lands and forest reserves.

(m) All legislation concerning use, occupancy, development and management of public lands in California Desert Conservation Area.

Subcommittee on Insular Affairs and International Affairs

(a) All matters regarding insular areas of the United States.

(b) All measures or matters regarding the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Freely Associated States, and Antarctica.

(c) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources

(a) All measures and matters concerning the U.S. Geological Survey.

(b) All measures and matters affecting geothermal resources.

(c) Regulation of the domestic nuclear energy industry, including regulation of research and development of reactors and nuclear regulatory research and special oversight functions with respect to nonmilitary nuclear energy and research and development including the disposal of nuclear waste.

(d) Conservation of United States uranium supply.

(e) Mining interests generally, including all matters involving mining regulation and enforcement, including the reclamation of mined lands, the environmental effects of mining, and the management of mineral receipts, mineral land laws and claims, long-range mineral programs, and deep seabed mining and matters regarding Law of the Sea Treaty.

(f) Mining Schools, experimental stations and long-range mineral programs.

(g) Mineral resources on public lands.

(h) Conservation and development of oil and gas resources of the Outer Continental Shelf.

(i) Conservation of petroleum on public lands and of radium supply.

Subcommittee on Native American Affairs

(a) Measures relating to the welfare of Native Americans, including management of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

(b) All matters regarding the relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes, including special oversight functions under clause 3(e) of the Rule X of the House of Representatives.

(c) All matters regarding Native Hawaiians.

(d) All matters related to the Federal trust responsibility to Native Americans and the sovereignty of Native Americans.

Rule 17. Party Ratios.—The ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members, excluding ex officio Members, on each Subcommittee shall be no less favorable to the Majority party than the ratio for the Committee. The Chair and the Ranking Minority shall serve as ex officio Members of each Subcommittee, and shall have the right to participate fully, including the right to vote on all matters before the Subcommittees, but shall not be

considered in establishing the presence of a quorum. The size and party representation for each Subcommittee during the 103rd Congress shall be as follows:

Subcommittee	Total members	Majority party	Minority party
Oversight and Investigations	23	14	9
National Parks, Forests and Public Lands	23	14	9
Insular and International Affairs	5	3	2
Energy and Mineral Resources	15	9	6
Native Americans Affairs	10	6	4

Rule 18. Task Force, Special or Select Subcommittee.—The Chair is authorized, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, to appoint such task forces, special or select Subcommittees as he deems advisable for carrying out the responsibilities and functions of the Committee. Party representation on each such Subcommittee shall be in the same proportion as that on the Committee.

Rule 19. Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.—(a) Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. The Chair of each Subcommittee shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective Subcommittee after consultation with the Chair of the Full Committee and of other Subcommittees with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(b)(1) In order to enable the Committee to carry out its responsibilities under Rule X, clause 2, of the Rules of the House, each Subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, each such Subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of that Subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(2) Pursuant to Rule X, Clause 2, of the Rules of the House, the Chair of the Committee and the Chair of the Subcommittee having jurisdiction over the matter involved or their respective designees, shall meet with representatives of the Committee on Government Operations to discuss and to assist in coordinating oversight plans of their respective Committees.

Rule 20. Travel.—All travel of Members and staff of the Committee or its Subcommittees, to hearings, meetings, conferences, investigations, including all foreign travel, must be authorized by the Full Committee Chair prior to any public notice of such travel and prior to the actual travel. Funds authorized for the Committee under Rule XI, Clause 5, of the Rules of the House are for expenses incurred in the Committee's activities within the United States.

Rule 21. Subcommittee Chairs.—The Majority Members of the Committee shall have

the right, in order of Full Committee seniority, to bid for Standing Subcommittee Chairs. Any such bid shall be subject to approval by a majority of the Majority Members of the Committee. The Minority shall select a counterpart to the Subcommittee Chair for each of the Subcommittees. The Chair of select and special Subcommittees shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee, subject to approval by a majority of the Majority Members of the Committee.

Rule 22. Duties of Chair Upon Favorable Action by Committee.—Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee, the Chair shall report the same or designate some Members of the Committee to report the same to the House and shall use or cause to be used all parliamentary methods to secure passage thereof, without such additional authority being set forth particularly in the motion to report each individual bill or resolution. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the authority contained herein extends in appropriate cases to moving in accordance with Rule XXIV, Clause 5, of the said rules that the House go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to consider the bill or resolution; and to moving in accordance with Rule XXIV, Clause 2, of said rules for the disposition of a Senate rules for the disposition of a Senate bill or resolution that is substantially the same as the House bill or resolution as reported.

Rule 23. Committee Budget and Expenses.—(a) At the beginning of each session of Congress, after consultation with the Chair of each Subcommittee, the Chair shall propose and present to the Committee for its approval a budget covering the funding required for staff, travel, and miscellaneous expenses. The budget shall include amounts required for all activities and programs of the Committee and the Subcommittees.

(b) Upon approval by the Committee of each such budget, the Chair, acting pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 5, of the Rules of the House, shall prepare and introduce in the House a supporting expense resolution, and take all action necessary to bring about its approval by the Committee on House Administration and by the House.

(c) The Chair shall report to the Committee any amendments to each expense resolution and any changes in the budget necessitated thereby.

(d) Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen Committee and Subcommittee expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions processed in the same manner as set out herein.

(e) Copies of each monthly report, prepared by the Chair for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel shall be available to each Member.

Rule 24. Recommendation of Conferees.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chair shall determine the suitable number of conferees in a ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members no less favorable to the Majority party than the ratio of Majority Members to Minority party Members on the Committee. The Chair shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those Majority Members of the Committee who were primarily responsible for the legislation, and the names of those Minority Members of the Committee recommended by the

Ranking Minority Member of the Committee who were primarily responsible for the legislation.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS FOR THE 103D CONGRESS

(Mr. LAFALCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Rules of the Committee on Small Business for the 103d Congress, which were adopted by the Committee in open session on February 3, 1993.

RULES AND PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 103D CONGRESS

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Rules of the House, and in particular the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Small Business to the extent applicable and by this reference are incorporated, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") is a part of the committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee, and its rules to the extent applicable.

2. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

Unless retained for consideration by the full committee, all legislation and other matters referred to the committee shall be referred by the chairman to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdictions, the chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the chairman when, in his judgment, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement thereon.

3. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee on Small Business shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House is in session. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives.

At least three days' notice of such additional meeting shall be given unless the chairman determines that there is good cause to call the meeting on less notice.

The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives.

A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered or, upon at least three days' notice, it may be set for a different date.

4. ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

Unless the chairman, or the committee by majority vote, determines that there is good

cause to begin a hearing at an earlier date, public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the committee at least one week before the commencement of that hearing.

5. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(A) Meetings

Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or its subcommittees, shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however*, That no person other than members of the committee, and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

This provision does not apply to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(B) Hearings

Each hearing conducted by the committee or its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearings.

No member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the committee or any subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to members by the same procedures designated for closing hearings to the public.

6. WITNESSES

(A) Interrogation of witnesses

The right to interrogate witnesses before the committee or any of its subcommittees shall alternate between the majority members and the minority members. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority and minority party members present and may recognize two majority party members for each minority party member recognized. Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each member of the committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(B) Statement of witnesses

Each witness shall file with the committee, 48 hours in advance of his appearance, 100 copies of his proposed testimony and shall make a brief oral summary of his views.

7. SUBPENAS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the chairman of the committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities to require the attend-

ance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents as he deems necessary. The ranking minority member shall be promptly notified of the issuance of such a subpoena.

Such a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the chairman of a subcommittee with the approval of a majority of the members of the subcommittee and the approval of the chairman of the committee or a majority of the members of the committee.

8. QUORUM

No measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a majority of the committee is actually present; for purposes of taking testimony or receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum; and for all other purposes one-third of the members shall constitute a quorum.

9. AMENDMENTS DURING COMMITTEE MARKUP

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the committee must be made available in written form when requested by any member of the committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the chairman shall allow an appropriate period of time for the provision thereof.

10. PROXIES

A vote by any member of the committee or any of its subcommittees by proxy is permitted, provided that such proxy shall be in writing, and delivered to the clerk of the committee, shall assert that the member so voting by proxy is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting of the committee or its subcommittee, shall designate the person who is to execute the proxy authorization, and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn, or other procedural matters. Each proxy shall be signed by the member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

11. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

There will be five subcommittees as follows:

SBA Legislation and the General Economy (9 Democrats and 6 Republicans).

Regulation, Business Opportunities and Technology (9 Democrats and 6 Republicans).

Procurement, Taxation and Tourism (6 Democrats and 4 Republicans).

Minority Enterprise, Finance and Urban Development (8 Democrats and 5 Republicans).

Development of Rural Enterprises, Exports and the Environment (6 Democrats and 4 Republicans).

During the 103d Congress, the chairman and ranking minority member shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees, without vote, and the full committee shall conduct oversight of all areas of the committee's jurisdiction.

In addition to conducting oversight in the area of their respective jurisdiction, each subcommittee shall have the following jurisdiction:

SBA Legislation and the General Economy

Small Business Act, Small Business Investment Act and related legislation.

General economic problems.

Access to capital.

Promotion of women-owned business.

Job creation.

Regulation, Business Opportunities and Technology

Responsibility for, and investigative authority over, the regulatory policies of Federal departments and agencies.

General promotion of business opportunities.

Energy issues in general.

Small Business Innovation and Research Program and technology in general.

Procurement, Taxation and Tourism

Participation of small business in Federal procurement, in general.

Impact of tax policy.

Travel and tourism.

Minority Enterprise, Finance and Urban Development

Oversight of programs to promote minority enterprise development, access to capital, enterprise zones, and finance issues in general.

Investigation of special problems facing minority-owned businesses.

Development of small businesses in urban areas.

Development of Rural Enterprises, Exports and the Environment

Development of small businesses in rural areas.

Agricultural enterprises.

Export Opportunities.

Environmental and hazardous waste.

12. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the chairman of the full committee and other subcommittee chairmen, with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible. Meetings of subcommittees shall not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full committee.

13. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

(A) Investigative hearings

The report of any subcommittee on a matter which was the topic of a study or investigation shall include a statement concerning the subject of the study or investigation, the findings and conclusions, and recommendations for corrective action, if any, together with such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate.

Such proposed report shall first be approved by a majority of the subcommittee members. After such approval has been secured, the proposed report shall be sent to each member of the full committee for his supplemental, minority or additional views.

Any such views shall be in writing and signed by the member and filed with the clerk of the committee within 5 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) from the date of the transmittal of the proposed report to the members.

After the expiration of such 5 calendar days, the report may be filed as a House report.

(B) End of Congress

Each subcommittee, not later than November 15th of each even-numbered year, shall submit to the Committee a report on the activities of the subcommittee during the Congress.

14. COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee on Small Business shall be as follows:

(A) The professional and clerical employees of the committee, except those assigned to the minority or to a subcommittee chairman or ranking minority members as provided below, shall be appointed and assigned, and may be removed, by the chairman. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the chairman, and they shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman.

(B) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined as the minority members of the committee shall determine; *Provided, however*, That no minority staff person shall be compensated at a rate which exceeds that paid his or her majority staff counterpart. Such staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee who may delegate such authority as they deem appropriate.

(C) Each subcommittee chairperson and each ranking minority member on not more than five subcommittees shall have the right to appoint and assign one person to work on subcommittee business at a salary commensurate with the responsibilities prescribed but at a rate not to exceed 75 percent of the maximum established rate for the employees on the professional staff of the committee. Such staff members shall perform services in facilities assigned to the committee and to the extent that they are not occupied during regular working hours with tasks assigned by the subcommittee chairperson or ranking minority member who appointed them, they shall perform other tasks as assigned by the chairman or the appropriate staff director.

15. RECORDS

The committee shall keep a complete record of all actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each subcommittee rollcall vote, together with a description of the matter voted upon, shall be promptly made available to the full committee and such votes shall be available for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee.

The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available in accordance with rule XXXVI of the rules of the House, except that the committee authorizes use of any record to which clause 3(b)(4) would otherwise apply after such record has been in existence for 20 years. The chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the committee.

16. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED OR SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Access to classified information supplied to the committee and attendance at closed sessions of the committee or its subcommittees shall be limited to members, and to members of the committee staff and stenographic reporters who have appropriate security clearance when the chairman determines that such access or such attendance is essential to the functioning of the committee.

The procedure to be followed in granting access to those hearings, records, data, charts, and files of the committee which involve classified intelligence information or information deemed by a subcommittee to be sensitive shall be as follows:

(a) Only Members of the House of Representatives may have access to such information.

(b) Members who desire to read materials that are in the possession of the committee should notify the clerk of the committee or the subcommittee possessing the materials.

(c) The clerk will maintain an accurate access log which identifies without revealing the material examined, the staff member involved, and the time of arrival and departure of all members having access to the information.

(d) If the material desired is material the committee or subcommittee deems to be sensitive enough to require special handling, before receiving access to such information, Members of the House will be required to identify the information they desire to read and sign an access information sheet acknowledging such access and that the Member has read these procedures.

(e) Such material shall not be removed from the room.

(f) A staff representative shall insure that the documents used by the Member are returned to the proper custodian or to original safekeeping as appropriate.

(g) No notes, reproductions or recordings may be made of any portion of such information.

(h) The contents of such information shall not be divulged to any person in any way, form, shape, or manner and shall not be discussed with any person who has not received the information in an authorized manner either under these rules or the laws or rules in effect for officials and employees of the executive branch.

(i) When not being examined in the manner described herein, such information will be kept in secure safes in the committee rooms.

(j) These procedures only address access to information the committee or a subcommittee deems to be sensitive enough to require special treatment.

(k) If a Member believes the material should not be classified or considered restricted as to dissemination or use, the Member may ask the committee or subcommittee to so rule; however, as far as materials and information in the custody of the Small Business Committee is concerned, the classification of materials as determined by the executive branch shall prevail unless affirmatively changed by the committee or the subcommittee involved, after consultation with the appropriate executive agencies.

(l) Other materials in the possession of the committee are to be handled in accordance with the normal practices and traditions of the committee and its subcommittees.

17. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Upon approval by the committee or its subcommittees, all committee and subcommittee hearings which are open to the public may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography or by any such methods of coverage.

The chairman of the full committee or the chairmen of the subcommittees are authorized to determine on behalf of the full committee or its subcommittees, respectively, whether hearings which are open may be broadcast, unless the committee or its subcommittees respectively by majority vote determine otherwise.

Permission for such coverage shall be granted only under the following conditions:

(1) Live coverage by radio or television shall be without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the

broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

(3) Each committee or subcommittee chairman shall determine, in his discretion, the number of television and still cameras to be permitted in the room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of television cameras permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in the room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures as devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Television and radio media equipment shall not be installed in, or removed from, the room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage at the then current state of the art.

(8) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International News pictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage by the other media.

(11) Television and radio media personnel shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Still photography personnel shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

18. OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The chairman of the full committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee.

The committee may not be committed to any expense whatever without the prior approval of the chairman of the full committee.

19. AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the committee may be modified, amended or repealed by a majority vote

of its members, but only if written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each such member at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting at which the vote on the change occurs.

APPENDIX

Rule XI—Rules of procedures for committees In general

1. (a)(1) The Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege in committees and subcommittees.

(2) Each subcommittee of a committee is a part of that committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of that committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(b) Each committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under Rule X, and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of a committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

(d) Each committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of that committee under this rule and Rule X during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

Committee rules

Adoption of written rules

2. (a) Each standing committee of the House shall adopt written rules governing its procedure. Such rules—

(1) shall be adopted in a meeting which is open to the public unless the committee in open session and with a quorum present, determined by rollcall vote that all or part of the meeting on that day is to be closed to the public;

(2) shall be not inconsistent with the Rules of the House or with those provisions of law having the force and effect of Rules of the House; and

(3) shall in any event incorporate all of the succeeding provisions of this clause to the extent applicable.

Each committee's rules specifying its regular meeting days, and any other rules of a committee which are in addition to the provisions of this clause, shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than thirty days after the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year. Each select or joint committee shall comply with the provisions of this paragraph unless specifically prohibited by law.

Regular meeting days

(b) Each standing committee of the House shall adopt regular meeting days, which shall be not less frequent than monthly, for the conduct of its business. Each such committee shall meet, for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the transaction of other committee business, on all regular meeting days fixed by the committee, unless otherwise provided by written rule adopted by the committee.

Additional and special meetings

(c)(1) The Chairman of each standing committee may call and convene, as he or she

considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the chairman.

(2) If at least three members of any standing committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the chairman does not call the requested special meeting, to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour of, and the measure or matter to be considered at, that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at the special meeting.

Vice chairman or ranking majority Member to preside in absence of chairman

(d) The member of the majority party on any standing committee or subcommittee thereof ranking immediately after the chairman shall be vice chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, and shall preside at any meeting during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at that meeting.

Committee records

(e)(1) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(2) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto, except that in the case of records in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct respecting the conduct of any Member, officer, or employee of the House, no Member of the House (other than a member of such committee) shall have access thereto without the specific, prior approval of the committee.

(3) Each committee shall include in its rules standards for availability of records of

the committee delivered to the Archivist of the United States under rule XXXVI. Such standards shall specify procedures for orders of the committee under clause 3(b)(3) and clause 4(b) of rule XXXVI, including a requirement that nonavailability of a record for a period longer than the period otherwise applicable under that rule shall be approved by vote of the committee.

Proxies

(f) No vote by any member of any committee or subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy unless such committee, by written rule adopted by the committee, permits voting by proxy and requires that the proxy authorization shall be in writing, shall assert that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to present at the meeting of the committee, shall designate the person who is to execute the proxy authorization, and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

Open meetings and hearings

(g)(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of each standing committee or subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: Provided, however, That no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to open committee hearings which are provided for by clause 4(a)(1) of Rule X or by subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by each committee or subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony,

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI. No Member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of any committee or subcommittee, with the exception of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, unless the House of Representatives shall by a majority vote authorize a particular com-

mittee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subparagraph for closing hearings to the public: *Provided*, however, That the committee or subcommittee may be the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing except that the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subcommittees therein may, by the same procedure, vote to close up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

(3) Each committee of the House (except the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, it shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this subparagraph shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems.

(4) Each committee shall, insofar as is practicable, require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the committee (in advance of his or her appearance) a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of his or her argument.

(5) No point of order shall lie with respect to any measure reported by any committee on the ground that hearings on such measure were not conducted in accordance with the provisions of this clause; except that a point of order on that ground may be made by any member of the committee which reported the measure if, in the committee, such point of order was (A) timely made and (B) improperly overruled or not properly considered.

(6) The preceding provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the committee hearings which are provided for by clause 4(a)(1) of Rule X.

Quorum for taking testimony and certain other action

(h)(1) Each committee may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence which shall be not less than two.

(2) Each committee (except the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Budget, and the Committee on Ways and Means) may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking any action other than the reporting of a measure or recommendation which shall be not less than one-third of the members.

Prohibition against committees meeting during joint sessions and joint meetings

(i) No Committee of the House may sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

Calling and interrogation of witnesses

(j)(1) Whenever any hearing is conducted by any committee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(2) Each committee shall apply the five-minute rule in the interrogation of witnesses

in any hearing until such time as each member of the committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question each witness.

Investigative hearing procedures

(k)(1) The chairman at an investigative hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigatory hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person,

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of this Rule, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the committee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if a majority of the members of the committee, a majority being present, determine that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

In either case the committee shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (5), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

Committee procedures for reporting bills and resolutions

(l)(1)(A) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring a matter to a vote.

(B) In any event, the report of any committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to

the chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request. This subdivision does not apply to the reporting of a regular appropriation bill by the Committee on Appropriations prior to compliance with subdivision (C) and does not apply to a report of the Committee on Rules with respect to the rules, joint rules, or order of business of the House or to the reporting of a resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of an executive department.

(2)(A) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present, which shall be deemed the case if the records of the committee establish that a majority of the committee responded on a rollcall vote on that question. No point of order shall lie with respect to any measure or recommendation on the ground that it was reported without a majority of the committee actually present unless such point of order was timely made in committee.

(B) With respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution of a public character, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such bill or resolution shall be included in the committee report.

(3) The report of any committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee (A) shall include the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of Rule X separately set out and clearly identified; (B) the statement required by section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority (other than continuing appropriations), new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2) of such Act, new credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures; (C) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such Act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the committee; and (D) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations under clause 4(c)(2) of Rule X separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been submitted to the legislative committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the committee's deliberations on the measure.

(4) Each report of a committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by such committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(5) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by any committee, other than the Committee on Rules, any member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the committee

upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(A) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(B) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subdivisions (C) and (D) of subparagraph (3)) are included as part of the report.

This subparagraph does not preclude—

(i) the immediate filing or printing of a committee print unless timely requests for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views have been made as provided by this subparagraph; or

(ii) the filing by any such committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that committee upon that measure or matter.

(6) A measure or matter reported by any committee (except the Committee on Rules in the case of a resolution making in order the consideration of a bill, resolution, or other order of business), shall not be considered in the House until the third calendar day, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, on which the report of that committee upon that measure or matter has been available to the Members of the House or as provided by section 305(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the case of a concurrent resolution on the budget: *Provided, however*, That it shall always be in order to call up for consideration, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 4(b), Rule XI, a report from the Committee on Rules specifically providing for the consideration of a reported measure or matter notwithstanding this restriction. If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the committee reporting the measure or matter, shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House. This subparagraph shall not apply to—

(A) any measure for the declaration of war, or the declaration of a national emergency, by the Congress; or

(B) any decision, determination, or action by a Government agency which would become or continue to be, effective unless disapproved or otherwise invalidated by one or both Houses of Congress.

For the purposes of the preceding sentence, a Government agency includes any department, agency, establishment, wholly owned Government corporation, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

(7) If, within seven calendar days after a measure has, by resolution, been made in order for consideration by the House, no motion has been offered that the House consider that measure, any member of the committee which reported that measure may be recognized in the discretion of the Speaker to offer a motion that the House shall consider that measure, if that committee has duly authorized that member to offer that motion.

Power to sit and act; subpoena power

(m)(1) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under this rule and Rule X (including any matters referred to it under clause 5 of Rule X), any committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized (subject to subparagraph (2)(A) of this paragraph)—

(A) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House

is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, and

(B) to require, by subpoena—or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by such chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(2)(A) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (1)(B) in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (1)(B) may be delegated to the chairman of the committee pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee.

(B) Compliance with any subpoena issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (1)(B) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

Use of committee funds for travel

(n)(1) Funds authorized for a committee under clause 5 are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities: however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and its employees engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories or possessions. No appropriated funds, including those authorized under clause 5, shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of the committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose; and the following conditions shall apply with respect to travel outside the United States or its territories or possessions:

(A) No member or employee of the committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country for any day at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem set forth in applicable Federal law, or if the Member or employee is reimbursed for any expenses for such day, then the lesser of the per diem or the actual, unreimbursed expenses (other than for transportation) incurred by the member or employee during that day.

(B) Each member or employee of the committee shall make to the chairman of the committee an itemized report showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, any funds expended for any other official purpose and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies and/or appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports shall be filed no later than sixty days following the completion of travel with the chairman of the committee for use in complying with reporting requirements in applicable Federal law and shall be open for public inspection.

(2) In carrying out the committee's activities outside of the United States in any country where local currencies are unavailable, a member or employee of the committee may not receive reimbursement for expenses (other than for transportation) in excess of the maximum per diem set forth in applicable Federal law, or if the member or employee is reimbursed for any expenses for such day, then the lesser of the per diem or the actual unreimbursed expenses (other than for transportation) incurred, by the member or employee during any day.

(3) A member or employee of a committee may not receive reimbursement for the cost of any transportation in connection with travel outside of the United States unless the member or employee has actually paid for the transportation.

(4) The restrictions respecting travel outside of the United States set forth in subparagraphs (2) and (3) shall also apply to travel outside of the United States by Members, officers, and employees of the House authorized under clause 8 of Rule I, clause 1(b) of this rule, or any other provision of these Rules of the House of Representatives.

(5) No local currencies owned by the United States may be made available under this paragraph for the use outside of the United States for defraying the expenses of a member of any committee after—

(A) the date of the general election of Members in which the Member has not been elected to the succeeding Congress; or

(B) in the case of a Member who is not a candidate in such general election, the earlier of the date of such general election or the adjustment sine die of the last regular session of the Congress.

Broadcasting of committee hearings

3. (a) It is the purpose of this clause to provide a means, in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum, by which committee hearings, or committee meetings, which are open to the public may be covered, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage—

(1) for the education, enlightenment, and information of the general public, on the basis of accurate and impartial news coverage, regarding the operations, procedures, and practices of the House as a legislative and representative body and regarding the measures, public issues, and other matters before the House and its committees, the consideration thereof, and the action taken thereon; and

(2) for the development of the perspective and understanding of the general public with respect to the role and function of the House under the Constitution of the United States as an organ of the Federal Government.

(b) In addition, it is the intent of this clause that radio and television tapes and television film of any coverage under this clause shall not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(c) It is further, the intent of this clause that the general conduct of each meeting (whether of a hearing or otherwise) covered, under authority of this clause, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, and the personal behavior of the committee members and staff, other Government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations and shall not be such as to—

(1) distort the objects and purposes of the hearing or other meeting or the activities of committee members in connection with that hearing or meeting or in connection with the general work of the committee or of the House; or

(2) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the committee, or any Member or bring the House, the committee, or any Member into disrepute.

(d) The coverage of committee hearings and meetings by television broadcast, radio broadcast, or still photography is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(e) Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by any committee of the House is open to the public, that committee may permit, by majority vote of the committee, that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, but only under such written rules as the committee may adopt in accordance with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause: *Provided, however*, Each committee or subcommittee chairman shall determine, in his discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room.

(f) The written rules which may be adopted by a committee under paragraph (e) of this clause shall contain provisions to the following effect:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of this rule, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(3) The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to

photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

Privileged reports and amendments

4. (a) The following committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Appropriations—on general appropriation bills and on joint resolutions continuing appropriations for a fiscal year if reported after September 15 preceding the beginning of such fiscal year; the Committee on the Budget—on the matters required to be reported by such committee under Titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; the Committee on House Administration—on enrolled bills, contested election, and all matters referred to it of printing for the use of the House or the two Houses, and on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House and on all matters relating to preservation and availability of noncurrent records of the House under Rule XXXVI; the Committee on Rules—on rules, joint rules, and the order of business; and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct—on resolutions recommending action by the House of Representatives with respect to an individual Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives as a result of any investigation by the committee relating to the official conduct of such Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business (except it shall not be called up for consideration on the same day it is presented to the House, unless so determined by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the Members voting, but this provision shall not apply during the last three days of the session), and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced the Speaker shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the report shall have been fully disposed of. The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which provides that business under clause 7 of Rule XXIV shall be set aside by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members present; nor shall it report any rule or order which would prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 4 of Rule XVI.

(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint

rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when the bill or resolution involved is ordered reported by the committee. If any such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege (but only on the day after the calendar day on which such Member announces to the House his intention to do so) and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules makes an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of such resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege.

(d) Whenever the Committee on Rules reports a resolution repealing or amending any of the Rules of the House of Representatives or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

(1) the text of any part of the Rules of the House of Representatives which is proposed to be repealed; and

(2) a comparative print of any part of the resolution making such an amendment and any part of the Rules of the House of Representatives to be amended, showing by an appropriate typographical device the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

Committee expenses

5. (a) Whenever any committee, commission or other entity (except the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget) is to be granted authorization for the payment, from the contingent fund of the House, of its expenses in any year, other than those expenses to be paid from appropriations provided by statute, such authorization initially shall be procured by one primary expense resolution for the committee, commission or other entity providing funds for the payment of the expenses of the committee, commission or other entity for that year from the contingent fund of the House. Any such primary expense resolution reported to the House shall not be considered in the House unless a printed report on that resolution has been made available to the Members of the House for at least one calendar day prior to the consideration of that resolution in the House. Such report shall, for the information of the House—

(1) state the total amount of the funds to be provided to the committee, commission or other entity under the primary expense resolution for all anticipated activities and programs of the committee, commission or other entity; and

(2) to the extent practicable, contain such general statements regarding the estimated foreseeable expenditures for the respective anticipated activities and programs of the committee, commission or other entity as may be appropriate to provide the House with basic estimates with respect to the expenditure generally of the funds to be provided to the committee, commission or other entity under the primary expense resolution.

there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such amounts as may be necessary for the period beginning at noon on January 3 and ending at midnight on March 31 of each year.

(2) In the case of the first session of a Congress, amounts shall be made available under this paragraph for a select committee established by resolution in the preceding Congress only if—

(A) a reestablishing resolution for such select committee is introduced in the present Congress; and

(B) no resolution of the preceding Congress provided for termination of funding of investigations and studies by such select committee at or before the end of the preceding Congress.

(3) Each committee receiving amounts under this paragraph shall be entitled, for each month in the period specified in subparagraph (1), to 9 per centum (or such lesser per centum as may be determined by the Committee on House Administration) of the total annualized amount made available under expense resolutions for such committee in the preceding session of Congress.

(4) Payments under this paragraph shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, except as provided in subparagraph (5), and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

(5) Notwithstanding any provision of law, rule of the House, or other authority, from noon on January 3 of the first session of a Congress, until the election by the House of the committee involved in that Congress, payments under this paragraph shall be made on vouchers signed by—

(A) the chairman of such committee as constituted at the close of the preceding Congress; or

(B) if such chairman is not a Member in the present Congress, the ranking majority party member of such committee as constituted at the close of the preceding Congress who is a Member in the present Congress.

(6)(A) The authority of a committee to incur expenses under this paragraph shall expire upon agreement by the House to a primary expense resolution for such committee.

(B) Amounts made available under this paragraph shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

(C) The provisions of this paragraph shall be effective only insofar as not inconsistent with any resolution, reported by the Committee on House Administration and adopted after the date of adoption of these rules.

Committee staffs

6. (a)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2) of this paragraph and paragraph (f) of this clause, each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote of the committee, not more than eighteen professional staff members. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority party member of such committee, as the committee considers advisable.

(2) Subject to paragraph (f) of this clause, whenever a majority of the minority party members of a standing committee (except the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence) so request, not more than six persons may be selected, by majority vote of the minority party members, for appointment by the committee as professional staff members from among the number au-

thorized by subparagraph (1) of this paragraph. The committee shall appoint any persons so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee. If the committee determines that the character and qualifications of any person so selected are unacceptable to the committee, a majority of the minority party members may select other persons for appointment by the committee to the professional staff until such appointment is made. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority party members of the committee consider advisable.

(3) The professional staff members of each standing committee—

(A) shall be appointed on a permanent basis, without regard to race, creed, sex, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions;

(B) shall not engage in any work other than committee business; and

(C) shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business.

(4) Services of the professional staff members of each standing committee may be terminated by majority vote of the committee.

(b) After the date of adoption by the House of any such primary expense resolution for any such committee, commission or other entity for any year, authorization for the payment from the contingent fund of additional expenses of such committee, commission or other entity in that year, other than those expenses to be paid from appropriations provided by statute, may be procured by one or more supplemental expense resolutions for that committee, commission or other entity as necessary. Any such supplemental expense resolution reported to the House shall not be considered in the House unless a printed report on that resolution has been made available to the Members of the House for at least one calendar day prior to the consideration of that resolution in the House. Such report shall, for the information of the House—

(1) state the total amount of additional funds to be provided to the committee, commission or other entity under the supplemental expense resolution and the purpose or purposes for which those additional funds are to be used by the committee, commission or other entity; and

(2) state the reason or reasons for the failure to procure the additional funds for the committee, commission or other entity by means of the primary expense resolution.

(c) The preceding provisions of this clause do not apply to—

(1) any resolution providing for the payment from the contingent fund of the House of sums necessary to pay compensation for staff services performed for, or to pay other expenses of, any committee, commission or other entity at any time from and after the beginning of any year and before the date of adoption by the House of the primary expense resolution providing funds to pay the expenses of that committee, commission or other entity for that year; or

(2) any resolution providing in any Congress, for all of the standing committees of the House, additional office equipment, air-mail and special delivery postage stamps, supplies, staff personnel, or any other specific item for the operation of the standing committees, and containing an authorization for the payment from the contingent fund of the House of the expenses of any of the foregoing items provided by that resolution, sub-

ject to and until enactment of the provisions of the resolution as permanent law.

(d) From the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions—

(1) the chairman of each standing subcommittee of a standing committee of the House is authorized to appoint one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the subcommittee chairman.

(2) the ranking minority party member of each standing subcommittee on each standing committee of the House is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of the ranking minority party member.

(3) the staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be compensated at a rate determined by the subcommittee chairman not to exceed (A) 75 per centum of the maximum established in paragraph (c) of clause 6 or (B) the rate paid the staff member appointed pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph.

(4) for the purpose of this paragraph, (A) there shall be no more than six standing subcommittees of each standing committee of the House, except for the Committee on Appropriations, and (B) no member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to the above provisions.

(5) the staff positions made available to the subcommittee chairman and ranking minority party members pursuant to subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this paragraph shall be made available from the staff positions provided under clause 6 of Rule XI unless such staff positions are made available pursuant to a primary or additional expense resolution.

(e) No primary expense resolution or additional expense resolution of a committee may provide for the payment or reimbursement of expenses incurred by any member of the committee for travel by the member after the date of the general election of Members in which the Member is not elected to the succeeding Congress, or in the case of a Member who is not a candidate in such general election, the earlier of the date of such general election or the adjournment sine die of the last regular session of the Congress.

(f)(1) For continuance of necessary investigations and studies by—

(A) each standing committee and select committee established by these rules; and

(B) except as provided in subparagraph (2), each select committee established by resolution;

(5) The foregoing provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee on the Budget and the provisions of subparagraphs (3) (B) and (C) do not apply to the Committee on Rules.

(b)(1) The clerical staff of each standing committee shall consist of not more than twelve clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority party members, and to the professional staff, as the committee considers advisable. Subject to subparagraph (2) of this paragraph and paragraph (f) of this clause, the clerical staff shall be appointed by majority vote of the committee, without regard to race, creed, sex, or age. Except as provided by subparagraph (2) of this paragraph the clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work both for the committee staff and for the chairman and the ranking minority party member on matters related to committee work.

(2) Subject to paragraph (f) of this clause, whenever a majority of the minority party

members of a standing committee (except the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence) so request, four persons may be selected, by majority vote of the minority party members, for appointment by the committee to positions on the clerical staff from among the number of clerks authorized by subparagraph (1) of the paragraph. The committee shall appoint to those positions any person so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee. If the committee determines that the character and qualifications of any person so selected are unacceptable to the committee, a majority of the minority party members, may select other persons for appointment by the committee to the position involved on the clerical staff until such appointment is made. Each clerk appointed under this subparagraph shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work for the minority party members of the committee and for any members of the professional staff appointed under subparagraph (2) of paragraph (a) of this clause on matters related to committee work.

(3) Services of the clerical staff members of each standing committee may be terminated by majority vote of the committee.

(4) The foregoing provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

(c) Each employee on the professional, clerical and investigating staff of each standing committee shall be entitled to pay at a single gross per annum rate, to be fixed by the chairman which does not exceed the maximum rate of pay, as in effect from time to time, under applicable provisions of law.

(d) Subject to appropriations hereby authorized, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget may appoint such staff, in addition to the clerk thereof and assistants for the minority, as it determines by majority vote to be necessary, such personnel, other than minority assistants, to possess such qualifications as the committee may prescribe.

(e) No committee shall appoint to its staff any experts or other personnel detailed or assigned from any department or agency of the Government, except with the written permission of the Committee on House Administration.

(f) If a request for the appointment of a minority professional staff member under paragraph (a), or a minority clerical staff member under paragraph (b), is made when no vacancy exists to which that appointment may be made, the committee nevertheless shall appoint, under paragraph (a) or paragraph (b), as applicable, the person selected by the minority and acceptable to the committee. The person so appointed shall serve as an additional member of the professional staff or the clerical staff, as the case may be, of the committee, and shall be paid from the contingent fund, until such a vacancy (other than a vacancy in the position of head of the professional staff, by whatever title designated) occurs, at which time that person shall be deemed to have been appointed to that vacancy. If such vacancy occurs on the professional staff when seven or more persons have been so appointed who are eligible to fill that vacancy, a majority of the minority party members shall designate which of those persons shall fill that vacancy.

(g) Each staff member appointed pursuant to a request by minority party members under paragraph (a) or (b) of this clause, and each staff member appointed to assist minor-

ity party members of a committee pursuant to an expense resolution described in paragraph (a) or (b) of clause 5, shall be accorded equitable treatment with respect to the fixing of this or her rate of pay, the assignment to him or her of work facilities, and the accessibility to him or her of committee records.

(h) Paragraphs (a) and (b) of the clause shall not be construed to authorize the appointment of additional professional or clerical staff members of a committee pursuant to a request under either of such paragraphs by the minority party members of that committee if six or more professional staff members or four or more clerical staff members, provided for in paragraph (a)(1) or paragraph (b)(1) of this clause, as the case may be, who are satisfactory to a majority of the minority party members, are otherwise assigned to assist the minority party members.

(i) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a)(2) and (b)(2), a committee may employ nonpartisan staff, in lieu of or in addition to committee staff designated exclusively for the majority or minority party, upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the majority party and a majority of the members of the minority party.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION FOR THE 103D CONGRESS

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of clause 2(a) of rule XI of the rules of the House, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of procedure adopted by the Committee on House Administration for the 103d Congress on January 27, 1993.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, 103D CONGRESS

RULE NO. 1

General provisions

(a) The Rules of the House are the rules of the committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under House Rule X and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by House Rule XI, clause 5) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) The committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

(d) The committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of the committee under House Rules X and XI during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(e) The committee's rules shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than 30 days after the Congress convenes in each odd-numbered year.

RULE NO. 2

Regular and special meetings

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee on House Administration shall be the first Wednesday of every month when the House is in session in accordance with Clause 2(b) of House Rule XI. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with Clause 2(c) of the House Rule XI. The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the chairman subject to Clause 2(c) of House Rule XI. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered.

(b) If the chairman of the committee or subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE NO. 3

Open meetings

As required by Clause 2(g), of House Rule XI, each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or its subcommittees, shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however*, That no person other than members of the committee, and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This provision does not apply to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

RULE NO. 4

Records and rollcalls

(a) The result of each rollcall vote in any meeting of the committee shall be made available for inspection by the public at reasonable times at the committee offices, including a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and against, and whether by proxy or in person; and the members present but not voting.

(b) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

(c) In order to facilitate committee compliance with House Rule XI, Clause 2(e)(1), each subcommittee shall keep a complete record of all subcommittee actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be promptly made available to the full committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and against such, and whether by proxy or in person; and the names of members present but not voting.

(d) All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files, shall be kept distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as chairman of the subcommittee. Such records shall be coordinated with the records of the full committee, shall be the property of the House, and all members of the House shall have access thereto.

(e) House records of the committee which are at the National Archives shall be made available pursuant to House Rule XXXVI. The chairman of the committee shall notify the ranking minority party member of any decision to withhold a record pursuant to the rule, and shall present the matter to the committee upon written request of any committee member.

RULE NO. 5

Proxies

A vote by any member in the committee or in any subcommittee may be cast by proxy, but such proxy must be in writing and in the hands of the clerk of the committee or the clerk of the subcommittee, as the case may be, during each rollcall in which such member's proxy is to be voted. Each proxy shall designate the member who is to execute the proxy authorization and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum. The member does not have to appear in person to present the proxy.

RULE NO. 6

Power to sit and act; subpoena power

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rules X and XI, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph)—

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings; and

(2) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents; as it deems necessary. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by the chairman, may administer oaths of any witness.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (a)(2) may be delegated to the chairman of the committee pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee.

(2) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

RULE NO. 7

Quorums

No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the committee is actually present. For the

purposes of taking any action other than reporting any measure, issuance of a subpoena, closing meetings, promulgating committee orders, or changing the rules of the committee, the quorum shall be one-third of the members of the committee. For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

RULE NO. 8

Amendments

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the committee must be made available in written form when requested by any member of the committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the chair will allow an appropriate period of time for the provision thereof.

RULE NO. 9

Hearing procedures

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least 1 week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event the chairman or the subcommittee chairman whichever the case may be shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) Unless excused by the chairman, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(d) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearing or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(e) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of a witness in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning

in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority. The chairman may accomplish this by recognizing two majority members for each minority member recognized.

(f) The following additional rules shall apply to hearings:

(1) The chairman at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) If the committee determines that evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall—

(A) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness;

(B) receive such evidence or testimony in executive session; and

(C) receive and dispose of requests from such persons to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (f)(5), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

RULE NO. 10

Procedures for reporting bills and resolutions

(a)(1) It shall be the duty of the chairman of the committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request.

(b)(1) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present.

(2) With respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution of a public character, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such bill or resolution shall be included in the committee report.

(c) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall include—

(1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to House Rule X, of clause 2(b)(1) separately set out and clearly identified;

(2) the statement required by section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority or new or increased tax expenditures;

(3) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such Act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the committee; and

(4) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations under House Rule X, clause 4(c)(2) separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been submitted to the committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the committee's deliberations on the measure.

(d) Each report of the committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by the committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(e) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the committee, any member of the committee gives notice of intention of file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than 3 calendar days, commencing on the day on which the measure or matter(s) was approved, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(1) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(2) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subparagraphs (c)(3) and (c)(4) are included as part of the report. This subparagraph does not preclude—

(A) the immediate filing or printing of a committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by paragraph (c); or

(B) the filing of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the committee upon that measure or matter.

(f) If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the committee shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to the members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House.

RULE NO. 11

Subcommittee oversight

The standing subcommittees of the committee shall conduct oversight of matters within their jurisdiction in accordance with House Rule X, clauses 2 and 3.

RULE NO. 12

Review of continuing programs; Budget Act provisions

(a) The committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, insure that appropriation for continuing programs and activities of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirement, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. For the purposes of this paragraph a Government agency includes the organizational units of government listed in clause 7(c) of Rule XIII of House Rules.

(b) The committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdictions for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor be made annually.

(c) The committee shall, on or before February 25 of each year, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year which are within its jurisdiction or functions, and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction which it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) As soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget for any fiscal year is agreed to, the committee (after consulting with the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate) shall subdivide any allocation made to it, the joint explanatory statement accompany the conference report on such resolution, and promptly report such subdivisions to the House, in the manner provided by section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(e) Whenever the committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RULE NO. 13

Broadcasting of committee hearings

The rule for the broadcasting of committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 3 of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE NO. 14

Committee and subcommittee staff

Except as provided in House Rule XI, clause 5(d), the staff of the Committee on House Administration shall be appointed as follows:

A. The subcommittee staff shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the subcommittee chairman within the budget approved for the subcommittee by the full committee;

B. The staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority party members of the committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee;

C. The employees of the committee not assigned to a standing subcommittee or to the minority under the above provisions shall be appointed, and may be removed, and their remuneration determined by the chairman within the budget approved for such purposes by the committee.

RULE NO. 15

Travel of Members and staff

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of committee members and staff. Travel for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the chairman. Travel may be authorized by the chairman for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the chairman in writing the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel;

(2) The dates during which the travel will occur;

(3) The locations to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the committee or of a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the committee or pertinent subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the chairman. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the chairman, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

(A) the purpose of the travel;

(B) the dates during which the travel will occur;

(C) the names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;

(D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of committee jurisdiction involved; and

(E) the names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States shall be initiated by the Chairman and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the committee.

(3) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the chairman covering the activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the committee performing authorized travel on official busi-

ness shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel.

RULE NO. 16

Number and jurisdiction of subcommittees

(a) There shall be five standing subcommittees. The ratio (majority/minority) and jurisdiction of the subcommittees shall be: Subcommittee on Elections. (53)—Matters pertaining to the Federal Election Commission (FEC) authorization, FEC regulations, presidential public funding checkoff, federal voter registration provisions, poll closing provisions, Overseas Citizens' Voting Rights Act, and Voter Accessibility Act.

Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials. (42)—Matters pertaining to the Library of Congress; statutory and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; purchase of books and manuscripts; erection of monuments to the memory of individuals; matters relating to the Smithsonian Institution and the incorporation of similar institutions.

Subcommittee on Office Systems. (42)—Matters pertaining to furniture and furnishings for District offices; approval of all electrical and mechanical office equipment and other accoutrements for use in the offices of Members, Officers or Committees.

Subcommittee on Accounts. (74)—Internal budget matters; expenditures from the contingent fund; changes in amounts of allowances; and consultant contracts for committees.

Subcommittee on Personnel and Police. (4/2)—Matters pertaining to House employees and Police, parking, restaurant, barber and beauty shop, and other House facilities and services.

(b) The chairman of the Committee may appoint such ad hoc subcommittees as he deems appropriate.

(c) The chairman of the Committee and the ranking minority member shall serve as ex officio members on all subcommittees of the committee and may be counted in determining the presence of a quorum.

RULE NO. 17

Powers and duties of subcommittees

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the chairman of the full committee and other subcommittee chairmen, with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee or subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible. It shall be the practice of the committee that meetings of subcommittees not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full committee. In order to ensure orderly and fair assignment of hearing and meeting rooms, hearings and meetings should be arranged in advance with the chairman through the clerk of the committee.

Rule No. 18

Referral of legislation to subcommittees

All legislation and other matters referred to the committee shall be referred by the chairman of the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks, unless by majority vote of the members of the full committee, consideration is to be otherwise effected. The chairman may refer the matter simultaneously to two or more subcommittees, consistent with House Rule X, clause 5, for concurrent consideration or for consideration

in sequence (subject to appropriate time limitations), or divide the matter into two or more parts and refer each such part to a different subcommittee, or refer the matter to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the chairman for the specific purpose of considering that matter and reporting to the full committee thereon, or such other provisions as may be considered appropriate. The chairman may designate a subcommittee chairman or other member to take responsibility as "floor manager" of a bill during its consideration in the House.

RULE NO. 19

Other procedures and regulations

The chairman of the full committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee.

RULE NO. 20

Designation of clerk of the committee

For the purposes of these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives, the staff director of the committee shall act as the clerk of the committee.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE 103RD CONGRESS

(Mr. NATCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to and in accordance with clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the rules of the Committee on Appropriations for the 103d Congress as approved by the committee on January 27, 1993:

COMMITTEE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Resolved, That the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in the One Hundred Second Congress, except as otherwise provided hereinafter, shall be and are hereby adopted as the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations in the One Hundred Third Congress.

The foregoing resolution adopts the following rules:

SEC. 1: POWER TO SIT AND ACT

For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee or any of its subcommittees is authorized:

(a) To sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings; and

(b) To require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, reports, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. The Chairman, or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(c) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees under subsection 1(b) in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee voting, a majority being present. The

power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subsection 1(b) may be delegated to the chairman pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(d) Compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or its subcommittees may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

SEC. 2: SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall establish the number of subcommittees and shall determine the jurisdiction of each subcommittee.

(b) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee all matters referred to it.

(c) All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks unless, by majority vote of the Majority Members of the full Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee.

(d) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of Majority to Minority Members for each subcommittee. The Chairman is authorized to negotiate that ratio with the Minority; Provided, however, That party representation in each subcommittee, including ex-officio members, shall be no less favorable to the Majority than the ratio for the full Committee.

(e) The Chairman is authorized to sit as a member of any subcommittee and to participate in its work.

SEC. 3: STAFFING

(a) Committee Staff—The Chairman is authorized to appoint the staff of the Committee, and make adjustments in the job titles and compensation thereof subject to the maximum rates and conditions established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. In addition, he is authorized, in his discretion, to arrange for their specialized training. The Chairman is also authorized to employ additional personnel as necessary.

(b) Assistants to Members—Each Member may select and designate two staff members who shall serve at the pleasure of that Member. Such staff members shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the Member, not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; Provided, That Members designating staff members under this subsection must specifically certify by letter to the Chairman that the employees are needed and will be utilized for Committee work.

SEC. 4: COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meeting Day—The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the first Wednesday of each month while the House is in session, unless the Committee has met within the past 30 days or the Chairman considers a specific meeting unnecessary in the light of the requirements of the Committee business schedule.

(b) Additional and Special Meetings:

(1) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(2) If at least three Committee Members desire that a special meeting of the Commit-

tee be called by the Chairman, those Members may file in the Committee Offices a written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Upon the filing of the request, the Committee Clerk shall notify the Chairman.

(3) If within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the Committee Members may file in the Committee Offices their written notice that a special meeting will be held, specifying the date and hour of such meeting, and the measure or matter to be considered. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour.

(4) Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Committee Clerk shall notify all Committee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered. Only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at the special meeting.

(c) Vice Chairman or Ranking Majority Member To Preside in Absence of Chairman—The member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee thereof ranking immediately after the chairman shall be vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, and shall preside at any meeting during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting of the Committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(d) Business Meetings:

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the Committee or its subcommittees, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed.

(2) No person other than Committee Members and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed.

(3) The provisions of this subsection do not apply to open hearings of the Committee or its subcommittees which are provided for in Section 5(b)(1) of these Rules or to any meeting of the Committee relating solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(e) Committee Records:

(1) The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action, including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of each roll call vote shall be available for inspection by the public during regular business hours in the Committee Offices. The information made available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, or other proposition, and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

(2) All hearings, records, data, charts, and files of Committee shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chairman of the Committee. Such records shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

(3) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administra-

tion shall be made available in accordance with Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House, except that the Committee authorizes use of any record to which Clause 3(b)(4) of Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House would otherwise apply after such record has been in existence for 20 years. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to Clause 3(b)(3) or Clause 4(b) of Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination upon the written request of any Member of the Committee.

SEC. 5: COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Overall Budget Hearings—Overall budget hearings by the Committee, including the hearing required by Section 242(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and Clause 4(a)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be conducted in open session except when the Committee in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that the testimony to be taken at that hearing on that day may be related to a matter of national security; except that the Committee may by the same procedure close one subsequent day of hearing. A transcript of all such hearings shall be printed and a copy furnished to each Member, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

(b) Other Hearings:

All other hearings conducted by the Committee or its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee in open session and with a majority present determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or Rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present at a hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its subcommittees, there being in attendance the number required under Section 5(c) of these Rules to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, (1) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate Clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or (2) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in Clause 2(k)(5) of such Rule. No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or its subcommittees unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or any of its subcommittees, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public; Provided, however, That the Committee or its subcommittees may by the same procedure vote to close five subsequent days of hearings.

(2) Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

(3) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or any of its subcommittees

as the case may be, insofar as is practicable, shall file in advance of such appearance, a written statement of the proposed testimony and shall limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary, except that this provision shall not apply to any witness appearing before the Committee in the overall budget hearings.

(c) Quorum for Taking Testimony—The number of Members of the Committee which shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence in any hearing of the Committee shall be two.

(d) Calling and Interrogation of Witnesses:

(1) The Minority Members of the Committee or its subcommittees shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, by a majority of them before completion of any hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to the matter under consideration during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(2) The Committee and its subcommittees shall observe the five-minute rule during the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each Member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(e) Broadcasting and Photographing of Committee Meetings and Hearings:

(1) The Chairman is authorized to determine the extent and nature of broadcasting and photographic coverage for the overall budget hearing and full Committee meetings and hearings, subject to the guidelines for such coverage set forth in Section 116(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and Clause 3(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) Unless approved by the Chairman and concurred in by a majority of the subcommittee, no subcommittee hearings or meetings shall be recorded by electronic device or broadcast by radio or television.

(3) Unless approved by the subcommittee chairman and concurred in by a majority of the subcommittee, no subcommittee hearing or meeting or subcommittee room shall be photographed.

(4) Broadcasting and photographic coverage of subcommittee hearings and meetings authorized under the provisions of (2) and (3) above shall be subject to the guidelines for such coverage set forth in Clause 3(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(f) Subcommittee Meetings—No subcommittee shall sit while the House is reading an appropriation measure for amendment under the five-minute or while the Committee is in session.

(g) Public Notice of Committee Hearings—The Chairman is authorized and directed to make public announcements of the date, place, and subject matter of Committee and subcommittee hearings at least one week before the commencement of such hearings. If the Committee or any of its subcommittees, as the case may be, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, the Chairman is authorized and directed to make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

SEC. 6: PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) Prompt Reporting Requirement:

(1) It shall be the duty of the Chairman to report, or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill or resolution approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, a report on a bill or resolution which the Committee has approved

shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days in which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Committee Clerk a written request, signed by a majority of Committee Members, for the reporting of such bill or resolution. Upon the filing of any such request, the Committee Clerk shall notify the Chairman immediately of the filing of the request. This subsection does not apply to the reporting of a regular appropriation bill or to the reporting of a resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of an executive department.

(b) Presence of Committee Majority—No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(c) Roll Call Votes—With respect to each roll call vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such a bill or resolution shall be included in the Committee report.

(d) Compliance With Congressional Budget Act—A Committee report on a bill or resolution which has been approved by the Committee shall include the statement required by Section 306(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority.

(e) Inflationary Impact Statement—Each Committee report on a bill or resolution reported by the Committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(f) Changes in Existing Law—Each Committee report on a general appropriation bill shall contain a concise statement describing fully the effect of any provision of the bill which directly or indirectly changes the application of existing law.

(g) Rescissions and Transfers—Each bill or resolution reported by the Committee shall include separate headings for rescissions and transfers of unexpended balances with all proposed rescissions and transfers listed therein. The report of the Committee accompanying such a bill or resolution shall include a separate section with respect to such rescissions or transfers.

(h) Supplemental or Minority Views:

(1) If, at the time the Committee approves any measure or matter, any Committee Member gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, the Member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views in writing and signed by the Member, with the Clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed shall be included in and shall be a part of the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(2) The Committee report on that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(i) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(ii) shall have on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views are included as part of the report.

(3) Subsection (h)(1) of this section, above, does not preclude—

(i) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for

the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by such subsection; or

(ii) the filing by the Committee of a supplemental report on a measure or matter which may be required for correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that measure or matter.

(4) If, at the time a subcommittee approves any measure or matter for recommendation to the full Committee, any Member of that subcommittee who gives notice of intention to offer supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be entitled, insofar as is practicable and in accordance with the printing requirements as determined by the subcommittee, to include such views in the Committee Print with respect to that measure or matter.

(i) Availability of Reports—A copy of each bill, resolution, or report shall be made available to each Member of the Committee at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in advance of the date on which the Committee is to consider each bill, resolution, or report; Provided, that this subsection may be waived by agreement between the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee.

SEC. 7: VOTING

(a) No vote by any Member of the Committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(b) The vote on any question before the Committee shall be taken by the yeas and nays on the demand of one-fifth of the Members present.

SEC. 8: STUDIES AND EXAMINATIONS

The following procedure shall be applicable with respect to the conduct of studies and examinations of the organization and operation of Executive Agencies under authority contained in Section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in Clause 2(b)(3) of Rule X, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(a) The Chairman is authorized to appoint such staff and, in his discretion, arrange for the procurement of temporary services of consultants, as from time to time may be required.

(b) Studies and examinations will be initiated upon the written request of a subcommittee which shall be reasonably specific and definite in character, and shall be initiated only by a majority vote of the subcommittee, with the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member thereof participating as part of such majority vote. When so initiated such request shall be filed with the Clerk of the Committee for submission to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member and their approval shall be required to make the same effective. Notwithstanding any action taken on such request by the chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee, a request may be approved by a majority of the Committee.

(c) Any request approved as provided under subsection (b) shall be immediately turned over to the staff appointed for action.

(d) Any information obtained by such staff shall be reported to the chairman of the subcommittee requesting such study and examination and to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, shall be made available to the members of the subcommittee concerned, and shall not be released for publication until the subcommittee so determines.

(e) Any hearings or investigations which may be desired, aside from the regular hear-

ings on appropriation items, when approved by the Committee, shall be conducted by the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the matter.

SEC. 9: OFFICIAL TRAVEL

(a) The chairman of a subcommittee shall approve requests for travel by subcommittee members and staff for official business within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee. The ranking majority member of a subcommittee shall concur in such travel requests by minority members of that subcommittee and the Ranking Minority Member shall concur in such travel requests for Minority Members of the Committee. Requests in writing covering the purpose, itinerary, and dates of proposed travel shall be submitted for final approval to the Chairman. Specific approval shall be required for each and every trip.

(b) The Chairman is authorized during the recess of the Congress to approve travel authorizations for Committee Members and staff, including travel outside the United States.

(c) As soon as practicable, the Chairman shall direct the head of each Government agency concerned not to honor requests of subcommittees, individual Members, or staff for travel, the direct or indirect expenses of which are to be defrayed from an executive appropriation, except upon request from the Chairman.

(d) In accordance with Clause 2(n) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and Section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, local currencies owned by the United States shall be available to Committee Members and staff engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories, or possessions. No Committee Member or staff member shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law.

(a) Travel Reports:

(a) Members or staff shall make a report to the Chairman on their travel, covering the purpose, results, itinerary, expenses, and other pertinent comments.

(2) With respect to travel outside the United States or its territories or possessions, the report shall include: (1) an itemized list showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose; and (2) a summary in these categories of the total foreign currencies and/or appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports on foreign travel shall be filed with the Chairman no later than sixty days following completion of the travel for use in complying with reporting requirements in applicable Federal law, and shall be open for public inspection.

(3) Each Member or employee performing such travel shall be solely responsible for supporting the amounts reported by the Member or employee.

(4) No report or statement as to any trip shall be publicized making any recommendations in behalf of the Committee without the authorization of a majority of the Committee.

(f) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Committee shall be governed by applicable laws or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, and as promulgated from time to time by the Chairman.

SEC. 10: ELIGIBILITY OF COMMITTEE MEMBER SERVING AS BUDGET COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIP

If the Chairman of the Budget Committee of the House of Representatives is chairman of a subcommittee on the Appropriations committee when he becomes Budget Committee Chairman, or would be eligible to become chairman of an Appropriations subcommittee under the rules of the Majority Caucus of the House of Representatives during his tenure as Budget Committee Chairman, the Appropriations committee may nominate such Member to serve as chairman of such subcommittee, subject to the approval of the Majority Caucus. But, if so elected and confirmed, the Member shall take a leave of absence while Chairman of the Budget Committee, and the responsibilities of the subcommittee chairmanship shall devolve onto a temporary chairman as determined by the Appropriations Committee and the Majority Caucus of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PICKLE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for the balance of the day, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SANTORUM (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today after 9 p.m., on account of illness in the family.

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. GOSS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, for 60 minutes, on February 16.

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes each day, on March 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, and 25.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PICKETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes each day, on February 5, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 22.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. PICKETT) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONYERS, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and to include a statement regarding the Council of Kalistan in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today immediately after Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA's remarks relevant to the same issue.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. KOLBE.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut in two instances.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. LAZIO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. ROWLAND.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. TEJEDA.

Mr. SYNAR.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois in two instances.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. DE LUGO.

Mr. LAROCOCO.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, 103d Congress, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, February 16, 1993.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 16, 1993, 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:

710. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting notification that the report on the Scholarship and Fellowship Program for Environmental Restoration and Waste Management will be completed by March 1, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 102-190, section 3132(h) (105 Stat. 1574); to the Committee on Armed Services.

711. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and services sold commercially to Japan (Transmittal No. DTC-16-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

712. A letter from the Chairman, Board for International Broadcasting, transmitting the Board's annual report on its activities, as well as its review and evaluation of the operation of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty for the period October 1, 1991 through September 30, 1992, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2873(a)(9); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

713. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

714. A letter from the Director, National Park Service, transmitting a report of surplus Federal real property disposed of for parks and recreation, fiscal years 1991 and 1992, pursuant to Public Law 100-612, section 5 (102 Stat. 3181); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

715. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a report on the extent and manner of compliance by State prison industry enhancement certification programs with the requirements set forth in 18 U.S.C. 1761(c), pursuant to Public Law 101-647, section 2908 (104 Stat. 4915); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

716. A letter from the Chairman, Copyright Royalty Tribunal, transmitting its annual report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. 808; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

717. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled "Commemoration of Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways," pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1023(e)(4) (105 Stat. 1955); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

718. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report of the Cultural Property Advisory Committee on the request of the Government of Mali, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 71. Resolution relating to the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1) to grant family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances (Rept. 103-13). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 811. A bill to reauthorize the independent counsel law for an additional 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 812. A bill to establish the Congressional Advisory Commission on Amateur Boxing and to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the participation in and promotion of professional boxing; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Texas (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. KING, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. BLUTE, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. JACOBS):

H.R. 813. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that charitable contributions of appreciated property will not be treated as an item of tax preference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARMEY (for himself, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. HOKE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KYL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. COX, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BAKER of California, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. ZIMMER, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 814. A bill to eliminate the outdated price support and production adjustment program for honey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska:

H.R. 815. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore and increase tax deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the exemption from the firearms tax for shells and cartridges supplied by a customer for reloading; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska:

H.R. 817. A bill to amend the International Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that certain cash rents will not result in the recapture of the benefits of the special estate tax valuation rules for certain farm and other real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

H.R. 818. A bill to amend title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 to establish a community services empowerment program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 819. A bill to revise the boundaries of the George Washington Birthplace National

Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VALENTINE (for himself and Mr. OLVER):

H.R. 820. A bill to amend the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to enhance manufacturing technology development and transfer, to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BONILLA (for himself and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 821. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for burial in national cemeteries to persons who have 20 years of service creditable for retired pay as members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 822. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the availability of individual retirement accounts, to increase amount deductible for contributions to such accounts, and to permit penalty-free withdrawals from such accounts to pay educational, medical, and business start-up expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRYANT (for himself, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. GLICKMAN):

H.R. 823. A bill to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLINGER (for himself, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 824. A bill to establish a Department of Environmental Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 825. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Institute on Minority Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.R. 826. A bill to provide for the establishment, testing, and evaluation of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. COYNE (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SHAW, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the treatment of qualified small issue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 828. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that service performed for an elementary or secondary school operated primarily for religious purposes is exempt from the Federal unemployment tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. KOPETSKI):

H.R. 829. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize funds received by States and units of local government to be expended to improve the quality and availability of DNA records; to authorize the establishment of a DNA identification index; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EWING (for himself, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. KYL, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. SISISKY):

H.R. 830. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify procedures for judicial review of Federal agency compliance with regulatory flexibility analysis requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EWING (for himself, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. KLINK, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON):

H.R. 831. A bill to provide that cost-of-living adjustments in rates of pay for Members of Congress be made contingent on there not being a deficit in the budget of the U.S. Government; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETE GEREN:

H.R. 832. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide waiver of late enrollment penalty and establishment of a special enrollment period under part B of the Medicare Program for certain military retirees and dependents living near military bases that are closed; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 833. A bill to amend the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 to improve the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself and Mr. MCCURDY):

H.R. 834. A bill to provide for comprehensive health care access expansion and cost control through reform and simplification of private health care insurance and other means; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Education and Labor, and Rules.

By Mr. HUFFINGTON:

H.R. 835. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to add Morro Bay, CA, to the priority list of the National Estuary

Program; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore and increase the deduction for the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 837. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a monthly insurance benefit thereunder shall be paid for the month in which the recipient dies and that such benefit shall be payable for such month only to the extent proportionate to the number of days in such month preceding the date of the recipient's death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a fee on the importation of crude oil or refined petroleum products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 839. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow Federal employees to seek election to local office, and otherwise take an active part in political management or in political campaigns relating to an election to such an office; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 840. A bill to establish a national program to reduce the incidence of stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 841. A bill to establish economic conversion programs in the Department of Defense to assist communities, businesses, and workers adversely affected by reductions in defense contracts and spending and closures of military installations and to provide an additional credit against Federal unemployment tax for States with reemployment assistance programs; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 842. A bill to increase the number of weeks for which emergency unemployment compensation is payable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 843. A bill to withdraw certain lands located in the Coronado National Forest from the mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.R. 844. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a permanent extension of the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 845. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority for construction of wastewater treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. COYNE, Mr. KYL, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 846. A bill to amend section 118 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for certain exceptions from rules for determin-

ing contributions in aid of construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.R. 847. A bill to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and design an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 848. A bill to continue the authorization of appropriations for the East Court of the National Museum of Natural History; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DERRICK:

H.R. 849. A bill to amend title 1 of the United States Code to define the type of adjournment that prevents the return of a bill by the President, and to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate to receive bills returned by the President at any time their respective Houses are not in session; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Rules.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the establishment of tax enterprise zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 851. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize the Immigration and Naturalization Service to accept volunteer services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 852. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to increase border patrol personnel to 6,800 by the end of fiscal year 1995 in the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund for the additional border patrol personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 853. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that career positions in the Senior Executive Service may not be filled, during the period between the date of a Presidential election and the next Inauguration Day thereafter, by any current or recently separated political appointee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MYERS of Indiana (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT):

H.R. 854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the capital gains tax in the case of senior citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 855. A bill to require the Administrator of General Services, the Director of the National Park Service, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to provide notice to the District of Columbia before carrying out any activity affecting property located in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the District of Columbia, House Administration, Natural Resources, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself and Mr. FORD of Michigan):

H.R. 856. A bill to improve education in the United States by promoting excellence in research, development, and the dissemination of information; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OXLEY (for himself, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.R. 857. A bill to establish procedures to improve the allocation and assignment of the electromagnetic spectrum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 858. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of historic structures within the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway National Recreation Area in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey:

H.R. 859. A bill to exclude shipboard supervisory personnel from selection as employer representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAYNE of Virginia:

H.R. 860. A bill to authorize the National Park Service to provide funding to assist in the restoration, reconstruction, rehabilitation, preservation, and maintenance of the historic buildings known as "Poplar Forest" in Bedford County, VA, designed, built, and lived in by Thomas Jefferson, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of certain buildings under the rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND:

H.R. 862. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit to the Congress a proposal for the regulation of long-term care insurance policies, including an analysis and evaluation of such policies as are available to individuals, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free distributions from individual retirement accounts for the purchase of long-term care insurance coverage by individuals who have attained age 59½; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHAEFER:

H.R. 863. A bill to provide that all new revenue must be dedicated to deficit reduction and to establish, for fiscal years 1994 through 1998, discretionary spending limits for the defense, international, and domestic categories and maximum deficit amounts; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 864. A bill to prohibit the entry into the United States of items produced, grown, or manufactured in the People's Republic of China with the use of forced labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 865. A bill to ensure that any peace dividend is invested in America's families and deficit reduction; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Rules, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 866. A bill entitled, "United States-Japan Partnership Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 867. A bill to transfer the functions of the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to the Secretary of Defense; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. LAMBERT, and Mr. GILLMOR):

H.R. 868. A bill to strengthen the authority of the Federal Trade Commission to protect consumers in connection with sales made with a telephone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 869. A bill to promote biological diversity conservation and cooperation in the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. COX, Mr. HORN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GALLO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 870. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide relief to local taxpayers, municipalities, and small businesses regarding the cleanup of hazardous substances, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. VISCLOSKEY:

H.R. 871. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national cemetery for veterans in Lake County or Porter County, IN; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 873. A bill entitled, "Gallatin Range Consolidation and Protection Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 874. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits and benefits for congressional election campaigns, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Energy and Commerce, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 875. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to phase out the earnings test over a 5-year period for individuals who have attained retirement age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H.R. 876. A bill to prevent States from reducing unemployment compensation benefits by certain remuneration for services in the military reserves; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr.

CONYERS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. E.B. JOHNSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WHEAT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 877. A bill to authorize the establishment of the National African-American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. UPTON and Mr. ROEMER:

H.R. 878. A bill to restore Federal services to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. LANCASTER:

H.R. 879. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of pharmaceutical grade phospholipids and soybean oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 880. A bill to withdraw certain Federal lands in the State of California for military purposes, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to authorize the National Committee of American Airmen Rescued by General Mihailovich to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the U.S. limiting the number of terms for Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 100. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOPETSKI (for himself, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SARPALIUS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. EWING, Mr. EMERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DE LUGO, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SABO, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HOKE, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. VUCANOVICH,

Mr. MORAN, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. LONG, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DOOLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. REED, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CARR, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. TEJEDA, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BROOKS, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HASTER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BONIOR, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WISE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MINGE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BAESLER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. ORTON, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DICKS, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HYDE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FISH, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mrs. LLOYD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. APPELEGATE):

H.J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to designate February 21 through February 27, 1993, as "National FFA Organization Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. McDADE):

H.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALAHAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COX, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma, Mr. EWING, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KLUG, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KYL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MACHTEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. McMILLAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MICHEL, Ms. MOINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALK-

ER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DEAL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DICKEY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOKE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HORN, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MANN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MINGE, Mr. POMBO, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. TORKILDSEN);

H.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government and for greater accountability in the enactment of tax legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Hanna Holburn Gray as a citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution recognizing Belleville, N.J., as the birthplace of the industrial revolution in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACHTEY:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any economic stimulus package that is passed by the 103d Congress should include the permanent extension of the mortgage revenue bond and low-income housing tax credit programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOPETSKI (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SABO, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. LEACH):

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution urging the President to negotiate a comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Res. 66. Resolution designating membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 67. Resolution designating membership on certain standing committees; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 68. Resolution electing Representative SCHIFF to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Res. 69. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the

Committee on Government Operations in the 1st session of the 103d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 70. Resolution electing Representative PELOSI of California to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H. Res. 72. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Armed Services in the 1st session of the 103d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Res. 73. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in the 1st session of the 103d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H. Res. 74. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a rollcall vote on passage of any measure making appropriations or providing revenue; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H. Res. 75. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Small Business in the 1st session of the 103d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H. Res. 76. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the 1st session of the 103d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 77. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Natural Resources in the 1st session of the 103d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MINETA:

H. Res. 78. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation in the 1st session of the 103d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STARK:

H. Res. 79. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on the District of Columbia in the 1st session of the 103d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. DE LUCA.

H.R. 20: Mr. VENTO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 21: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LAROCOCO, and Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 24: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 25: Mr. GALLO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KREIDLER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 65: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 66: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 68: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 71: Mr. PARKER, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 82: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DORNAN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KYL, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 85: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 86: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 87: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 101: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LINDER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 116: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 139: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 140: Mr. PARKER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DELAY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HUFFINGTON, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 159: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 163: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 174: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SANDERS, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 303: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 349: Ms. LONG, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. MCMALE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CARR, Mr. MCCURDY, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 381: Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 383: Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 388: Mr. DORNAN and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 389: Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 390: Mr. STUMP, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 419: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 431: Ms. BONIOR, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 453: Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 465: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 493: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. WELDON, Mr. KING, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. EWING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HENRY, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 503: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 513: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 526: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 535: Mr. GORDON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 556: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MANTON, and Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 567: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 571: Mr. VALENTINE and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 578: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 660: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SARPALUIS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. KLINK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 667: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 671: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 672: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 702: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 710: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 760: Mr. DE LUGO, Ms. BYRNE, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 777: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 789: Mr. DICKS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COBLE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 799: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. HYDE.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. KING.

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. KASICH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WISE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SABO, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. FAWELL, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ORTON, Mr.

M McNULTY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. MEEK, Mr. LEACH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.J. Res. 83: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HENRY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LEVIN.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. PACKARD.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. WELDON, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. REED, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. BYRNE.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. BYRNE.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. FROST.

H. Res. 14: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KING, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. KLUG.

H. Res. 16: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H. Res. 31: Mr. ZELIFF.

H. Res. 45: Mr. SAM JOHNSON and Mr. BUYER.

H. Res. 50: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. STUMP, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. KING, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KYL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. POMBO.

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. 300: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 688: Mr. FORD of Michigan.