

which I do not even think should be in this bill. Does that mean that we are not going to have time to get to anybody else's amendment?

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it will all depend on the amount of time that we can conserve in the remaining time that has been allotted to us by the rule. We have an hour and 45 minutes remaining, and we will try to work with the minority as best we can.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to note that under this unfair rule we have, the quorum call, a totally unnecessary quorum call came out of the time for amendments. We will probably have one less amendment because for no valid parliamentary reason, we spent about 25 minutes with a quorum call so somebody could get a bigger audience. And under the crazy rule we have, a quorum call comes out of the time and the quorum call has probably eclipsed one amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, let me explain that on four occasions this evening, I attempted to arrive at unanimous consent to cut back on the debate time so we would have additional time left for other amendments.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I do not regard it as an acceptable trade-off that you cut off debate time to have a quorum call. I do not think cutting debate on important amendments is an acceptable defense of a very arbitrary and unfair rule.

#### CLARIFICATION SOUGHT CONCERNING DEBATE ON BOSNIA AMENDMENT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object if the request is something other than an imploring of the chairman that someone else be allowed to offer an amendment. If the request is something other than that, I will not object.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the chairman, with the big events in Bosnia this past week, we are dealing with a very, very important foreign aid bill. I know that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has an amendment which I am sure the American people would like to see debated.

I just find it incongruous that we are being denied, for whatever reason; I am not blaming anyone, but the way it is working out, it seems that Mr. HOYER will not be allowed to put forth his amendment which would call for an end to the arms embargo. I think this is a very, very important vote on a very important amendment at a very important time.

I am wondering if I could somehow or other ask unanimous consent or ask the chairman if we can somehow get some time to debate Mr. HOYER's amendment because I think the American people want to see us debate it and it is too important to just push it to the side.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to respond to the gentleman. We all share the concern about the Bosnia situation. Tomorrow afternoon we will be having a hearing on Bosnia in the Committee on International Relations. I discussed the Bosnia amendment with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. We talked about trying to have sufficient time to properly debate that measure on a single standing bill rather than to take it up as part of this in a very short and limited period of time.

I assured Mr. HOYER that I would try to work with him in bringing that measure to the floor at an early date following the consideration of this measure.

#### ON BOSNIA

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee. As the Members of this House know, I, along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and others, offered an amendment last year that dealt with lifting the arms embargo to allow the Bosnians to defend themselves. This situation has gone on now for almost 3 years. The largest number of refugees since the Second World War have been created as a result of this confrontation and over 100,000 deaths. Genocide is occurring.

I regret that it appears, based upon the schedule that is going forward now, that I will be precluded from offering this amendment, which I believe is critically timely today and will be critically timely tomorrow.

I would hope that we could configure the schedule tomorrow so that I would have a half an hour to offer this amendment at the end of the other amendments so that this House can address this issue. It is critical. It is on the front page of every newspaper in Europe and the United States. It is in the councils of the armed forces of every NATO nation. And it seems to me it is timely now for this Congress to speak.

#### EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-83)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

##### *To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1158, a bill providing for emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions for fiscal year 1995.

This disagreement is about priorities, not deficit reduction. In fact, I want to increase the deficit reduction in this bill.

H.R. 1158 slashes needed investments for education, national service, and the environment, in order to avoid cutting wasteful projects and other unnecessary expenditures. There are billions of dollars in pork—unnecessary highway demonstration projects, courthouses, and other Federal buildings—that could have been cut instead of these critical investments. Indeed, the Senate bill made such cuts in order to maintain productive investments, but the House-Senate conference rejected those cuts.

For example, H.R. 1158 would deprive 15,000 young adults of the opportunity to serve their communities as AmeriCorps members.

It would deprive 2,000 schools in 47 States of funds to train teachers and devise comprehensive reforms to boost academic standards.

It would reduce or eliminate antiviolence and drug prevention programs serving nearly 20 million students.

It would prevent the creation and expansion of hundreds of community development banks and financial institutions that would spur job growth and leverage billions of dollars of capital in distressed communities across the country.

And it would seriously hamper the ability of States to maintain clean drinking water, thus jeopardizing the health of residents.

In the end, the Congress chose courthouses over education, pork barrel highway projects over national service, Government travel over clean water.

At my instruction, the Administration has provided alternatives to the

Congress that would produce greater deficit reduction than H.R. 1158, cutting even more in fiscal year 1995 spending than is included in H.R. 1158. But the spending reductions would come out of unnecessary projects and other spending, not investments in working families.

My position on this legislation has been made clear throughout the legislative process. The Administration strongly and consistently opposed the House version of the bill because it would have unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that educate our children, invest in our future, and protect the health and safety of the American people. We worked closely with the bipartisan leadership of the Senate to improve the bill, and I indicated my approval of those improvements. Regrettably, the conference went well beyond the spending reductions contained in the bipartisan compromise despite my Administration's consistent urging to adhere to the Senate bipartisan leadership amendment.

In addition, I continue to object to language that would override existing environmental laws in an effort to increase timber salvage. Increasing timber salvage and improving forest health are goals that my Administration shares with the Congress. Over the last 6 months, my Administration has put in motion administrative reforms that are speeding salvage timber sales in full compliance with existing environmental laws. It is not appropriate to use this legislation to overturn environmental laws. Therefore, I urge the Congress to delete this language and, separately, to work with my Administration on an initiative to increase timber salvage and improve forest health.

My Administration has provided the Congress with changes that would enable me to sign revised legislation. I urge the Congress to approve a bill that contains the supplemental funding included in H.R. 1158—for disaster relief activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for the Federal response to the bombing in Oklahoma City, for increased antiterrorism efforts, and for providing debt relief to Jordan in order to contribute to further progress toward a Middle East peace settlement—along with my Administration's alternative restorations and offsets.

I will sign legislation that provides these needed supplemental appropriations and that reduces the deficit by at least as much as this bill. However, the legislation must reflect the priorities of the American people. H.R. 1158, as passed, clearly does not.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 7, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of

the President, together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object, but I would simply use this reservation to ask the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana what the intention of the committee would be with respect to the disposition of the president's veto message.

Do we intend to take this up for a vote or, if you do not, do you intend that there would be a new bill? If so, what do you think the timing would be and what would be your intention with respect to trying to work out a compromise accommodation?

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am making this unanimous consent request to refer the veto message of the president on H.R. 1158 to the Committee on Appropriations so that, basically, we can terminate discussion on this bill and get it behind us.

Frankly, sending the bill to the committee, it will help us clear the air so we can see if there might be a way we can reach an agreement on a different approach that will satisfy the president. There is no point in proceeding further on H.R. 1158. I do not believe that the votes are present to override the veto. I am disappointed that we have reached this point because I believe it is a good bill. Frankly, I wish the president had signed it. I think he would have been better served had he done so. But he has decided to veto it.

Now, we need to spend our time productively on fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills, not by continuing to argue about the merits and faults of this bill. So I would hope that the gentleman would not object and that we can send this message to committee, and we can go ahead and confer with the representatives of the White House in hopes that we might come up with an alternative agreement.

Mr. OBEY. Continuing my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I do not necessarily share the gentleman's judgment about the wisdom of the president's veto. I think under the circumstances it was correct. But I do hope that we will be able to get together and work out a rational compromise so that we can proceed to the regular appropriations process without too much delay intervening.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman has summarized my own feelings in that the sooner we get to a final settlement of this matter, the better. Every day that goes by, the American taxpayer loses some \$25 million in savings. That is one estimate that I have seen. The fact is that the

bureaucracy continues to spend money. And if we are going to reap anything near the \$9.2 billion in savings that this bill gave us, we need to reach a conclusion, reach an agreement with the White House as expeditiously as possible.

□ 2045

But we would expect that the leadership of both sides of the aisle in the House would work with both sides of the aisle on the other side of this Congress and work in turn with the White House and develop a new bill, hopefully within the next few days.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would simply say that I hope that next time around, we can find reductions that do not in fact attack programs for seniors and children in order to provide tax increases for very high income people that we cannot afford under these circumstances.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman's characterization of the bill is not my own. I would only say that when one attempts to downsize Government, nobody is going to be completely satisfied, but of course the purpose in referring this message to committee and then developing another bill is to come up with a compromise which is satisfactory to a majority of the House, a majority of the Senate, and one that will gain the President's signature, and doing all that will take compromise.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope in any bill that can be produced, we can protect the Brewster amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the veto message of the President to H.R. 1158, and that I might include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### CLEANER WATER

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, last week the Santa Maria Times, a local newspaper in my district on the central coast of California, let the Sun shine on some of the arguments big government groups and the Clinton administration had made against our clean