

auto and auto part market has remained flat for nearly two decades. As a matter of fact, the import share for all foreign manufacturers in Japan has remained stuck at 4.6 percent for autos and 2.6 percent for auto parts.

The gigantic United States automotive deficit with Japan defies all economic rationale. In 1985, when the yen was 240 to the dollar, the United States had an automotive deficit with Japan of \$23.9 billion. Now, with the yen hovering around 80 to the dollar—a 300-percent decrease in the dollar's value against the yen—our automotive trade deficit is on track to break last year's record of \$37 billion.

As this chart shows, the facts are on our side. The United States has a trade surplus in the automotive sector with the rest of the world. Isn't it time for Japan to play fair?

THE OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, the reason we do not sell cars in Japan is because we do not build right-hand drive cars in this country, and for no other reason.

Mr. Speaker, today and tomorrow the House will debate the Overseas Interests Act. This bill cuts foreign aid and ends the status quo of the bloated foreign aid bureaucracy.

The American people, by very lopsided majorities, have expressed their desire to make these cuts. But unfortunately, the liberal Democrats in the White House and in Congress stand in the way. Liberals oppose any cut in the Federal bureaucracy and are wedded to the old Washington ways. They refuse to see that out-of-control Government is causing deficits and debt. If we do not cut the growth of Washington, our children will be saddled with unimaginable debt and unimaginable taxation.

The Overseas Interest Act addresses these concerns. It will cut foreign aid and the bureaucracies that attempt to globally redistribute the hard-earned tax dollars of ordinary Americans. Republicans realize that we can no longer base our policies on waste, fraud, and ever-expanding bureaucracies. Instead, we must insure that the interests of Americans are served, and not just those of the Federal Government.

MORE ON THE UNITED STATES-JAPAN AUTO DISPUTE

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in referring to what the previous speaker said, he made an untrue statement. United States manu-

facturers manufacture 60 different models of right-hand drive vehicles both in this country and around the world, and for a Member from the State of Michigan to speak out against the United States, and we are hemorrhaging in terms of these trade deficits with Japan for over two decades, I think is unconscionable.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, dealing with the other part of the gentleman's remarks, I think it ought to be pointed out what the President is budgeting are those who would almost eliminate the Safe Schools Act, the Drug Free Schools Act, eliminate, almost eliminate, summer youth programs, all of which has been funded, is in line with the budget, a budget, I might add, cutting the deficit one-half in relation to our gross domestic product over what it was a few years ago, a budget which will mean the third straight year of deficit reduction, the first time that has happened since Harry Truman.

THE NATION'S MALL

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital is famed for its parks and wide open spaces. The Mall, the area between this Capitol and the Lincoln Memorial, is one of the most venerable and most visited of our alabaster city's sights and all Americans have a right to enjoy it. Of course, we have to ensure that one set of rights does not outweigh another. Today, a walk down The Mall suggests that we have lost our balance on that score. Simply put, large parts of The Mall have become a disorderly tourist trinket bazaar. This famous open space has become haven to countless unsightly, makeshift tables and weather covers from which temporary vendors push their merchandise in an atmosphere of cacophony and hustle. Those vendors, it seems, secured U.S. Park Service permits under their first amendment rights. As an ardent defender of the Constitution and its amendments, I certainly support the right to free speech. But Americans also have a right to and an expectation of unobstructed, safe, and peaceful use of their national parks. Especially one with such majestic monuments. I hope we can restore some balance and find a more suitable spot to relocate the tourist merchants while there is still summer ahead to enjoy The Mall peacefully.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS REDUCING BUREAUCRACY

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, although I had not intended to include this, let me say "amen" to the remarks of the gentleman from Florida. He is absolutely right. We ought to get a handle on that.

The gentleman from Michigan who preceded him was absolutely wrong, however. He talks about reducing bureaucracy.

This administration, ladies and gentlemen, has reduced bureaucracy by 272,000 over the next 6 years, actually the next 4 years. We have already reduced over 100,000 Federal employees. This administration, contrary to the previous two administrations, is not just talking about it, and has saved \$30 billion in Federal expenses, which is funding the crime bill.

Whether you take the 1994 Crime Act, which I think was a smart and tough crime act, or the crime act that passed this House, both relied on the reductions in Federal employees that this administration, in its reinvention of Government, of doing more with less, has led and the Congress has supported.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Tuesday, June 6, 1995 at 2:45 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a report on the activities of the United States Government relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation for calendar year 1994.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk.

ACTIVITIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT RELATING TO PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required under section 601(a) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-242; 22 U.S.C. 3281(a)), I am transmitting a report on

the activities of United States Government departments and agencies relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation. It covers activities between January 1, 1994, and December 31, 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 6, 1995.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. BOB FRANKS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. BOB FRANKS, Member of Congress:

SEVENTH DISTRICT, NJ.
May 24, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena issued by the Municipal Court of Manville, New Jersey.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB FRANKS,
Member of Congress.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on National Security; and Committee on Science.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is correct. The Democrat leadership has been consulted and agrees with all of these requests.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1561, AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 156 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 156

Resolved, That when the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union resumes consideration of H.R. 1561 pursuant to House Resolution 155, consideration for amendment under the five-minute rule may continue beyond the initial period of ten hours prescribed in House Resolution 155 for an additional period of six further hours. Consideration for amendment may not continue beyond such additional period. During further consideration for amendment only the following further amendments to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified and amended, shall be in order—

(1) pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate;

(2) amendments printed before May 25, 1995, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII;

(3) amendments en bloc described in section 2 of House Resolution 155, but only if consisting solely of amendments so printed before May 25, 1995, in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII or germane modifications of any such amendment; and

(4) one amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on International Relations after consultation with the ranking minority member of that Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, as most Members know, this rule is the product of an emergency rules committee meeting held the day before the House adjourned for the Memorial Day recess. At that time, H.R. 1561 had been under consideration for almost 12 hours and a host of amendments were still pending—amendments offered by Republicans and Democrats. Using past precedents on similar bills as our guide, we had hoped that the original allotment of 2 hours of general debate and 10 hours of open amendment process would be sufficient, if properly managed, to allow a full and free debate on all the major issues at play in this important foreign policy bill. Looking back at the rules granted for foreign aid authorizations during past Congresses, where 1 hour of general debate and amendment time caps of 8 to 10 hours were standard, we felt that our formula would be sufficient.

Clearly we underestimated Members' interest in extending debate on several standard issues along the way. That's somewhat understandable, partially because we have so many new Members and these programs have not been

properly reauthorized since 1985. So, when it became clear that more time would be needed on this bill, our leadership attempted to work out a compromise with the minority to allow the extension of debate by unanimous consent. Unfortunately, some Members of the minority were not interested in that type of bipartisan cooperation. Hence the emergency rules meeting that produced this rule, a rule which responds to Members requests to add debate time, hopefully for some important points.

I commend Chairman SOLOMON for his flexibility and his efforts to work this out in a congenial manner—and I do believe this rule leans over backwards to provide a fair solution. Under this rule we will have an additional 6 hours of open debate, with Members having the opportunity to offer any amendment that was properly prefiled by May 24. In addition, this rule allows the chairman of the international relations committee, in consultation with the minority, to offer one amendment that was not prefiled but is otherwise in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, as we gear up for the appropriations cycle in the immediate months ahead it is crucial that we complete our work on H.R. 1561, and I am pleased that our rules committee was able to develop a plan to ensure that the major issues properly managed can be dealt with in a reasonable period of time without jeopardizing that legislative schedule. I say "properly managed," because under this type of fair open rule, there is always a possibility for some abuse of allotted time by some Members who for whatever motive choose to indulge in dilatory tactics. Nevertheless, I urge support for this good workable, fair rule.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding.

Under the rule, can the gentleman tell me, at the end of the 6 hours, if there are still pending printed amendments, will they be allowed to be offered without debate?

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, my understanding is that we have used that provision up in the first rule, so we will have to complete all of the business in the time left for debate; that is, the 6 hours plus, I understand, with some 25 or 35 minutes of carry-over. I am not sure what the exact number was. It is at that time we will be finished with the debate.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield further for a question, does that mean there are 35 minutes remaining under the old rule? Is that correct?

Mr. GOSS. I cannot confirm that. I believe approximately.

Mr. HOYER. Approximately a half an hour?

Mr. GOSS. I believe it is in that order.