

I know the gentleman from Georgia remembers the State of the Union Message where the President stood here behind us at the podium just in front of the Speaker's rostrum and offered a very curious type of family tax cut for families making only \$75,000 a year, so a family making \$76,000 a year I guess did not qualify as a working family, but also perhaps the gentleman from Georgia remembers the curious provision of what the President talked about at that time. Do you remember what that was? It was this, that the tax cut would only apply to children before the age of 13.

So, in short, the President's idea back in January was to penalize anyone who succeeded who made over \$75,000 a year and not only to penalize people who succeed but to penalize their children for growing up.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think maybe the President's idea was to put them all in the national service league so they could get paid for volunteer work. When they are 14, they do not need the money anymore. It was typical of this administration to come up with a complicated middle-class tax relief plan. It looked a little bit to me like Mrs. Clinton's health care revision last year, just a chart of dots and arrows and boxes and squares going this way and all over the page and that is their idea, I guess, of simplification and so forth. That is, I think, why the American people are getting a little leery of it.

My 2-year-old, actually 3-year-old, sings a song, did you ever see a laddie go this way and that way and this way and that way. That is what we have got going on. We all know that. One day you are for tax cuts; the next day you are against them. One day you cannot balance the budget; the next day you can.

MORE ON THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we will continue the colloquy, as I enjoy the comments of the gentleman from Georgia and appreciate the enlightening nature of the same.

It is curious tonight, again, to see this sea change from the White House. And again, reminiscent of that children's song—

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman think that maybe since the marriage of James Carville and Mary Matalin there will be cross winds going on at the White House weather vane?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would not care to speculate on the society status or where one might go on in terms of policy formulation at the White House, but I do find it curious that those members of the former majority, those guardians of the old order who would accuse the new majority of governance

by polls find themselves tonight foisted upon a new pole, the Chief Executive finding now that the American public does want to see a semblance of fiscal responsibility. The reason I use the term "semblance" is because, once again, the President says, well, it would be nice to have a balanced budget but let us not do it in 7 years, no, no, let us stretch it out over a decade, over 10 years.

Now, by my calendar, as I check it, and the gentleman from Georgia perhaps can bear me out on this, that would be the year 2005. In the interim, according to the Medicare trustees report, which three of the President's own cabinet officers signed, Secretaries Reich and Rubin and Shalala, the Medicare trust fund goes broke in 6 years.

The fear I have, even as I welcome the President, albeit late to the table and to the recognition of the necessity of reducing the growth of the size of government, is, again, an inability to own up to the stark reality we face. And I cannot fathom why that is.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things that I find, and I am sure you do in Arizona when you go home, is that people are saying, stay the course, cut the budget, and I am sick and tired of it. Get the Government out of my life. Reduce the regulations, reduce my taxes, make it work and stay out of Washington as much as possible.

With that in mind, what has happened here, suddenly somebody over at the administration has figured, wait, they did not tick off people when they actually carried through with their campaign promise of balancing the budget. Let us get in on this bandwagon. So now they are going to join the fray. But to do something a little differently, they have to say, let us do it in 10 years.

If you look back at the Grace commission, the Gramm-Rudman, the balanced budget amendment, every time we do something, it is always far off, it is not this year, not this budget. We did pass a budget that puts us having a balanced budget in 7 years, but even that is a long time.

And I think what the American people want is yesterday, not 10 years. And they are not even real happy with 7.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, what I believe the American people want is not only civility in political discourse but straight answers. It is borne out in the frustration of an unrepentant liberal, the ranking member on the minority side of appropriations, who says of his party's own standard-bearer, and again this bears repeating, for those who have just joined us, according to the Associated Press, the gentleman from Wisconsin, DAVE OBEY, "I think most of us learned some time ago that if you don't like the President's position on a particular issue, you simply need to wait a few weeks."

That is reflective of a frustration born of a failure of this administration

to rest comfortably with the mantle of leadership upon its shoulders.

Now, good people can change their minds from time to time on the issues. But I believe my friend from Georgia will bear me out, as he visits his district there along the beautiful Georgia coast, the fact is that people are highly suspicious when public policy is predicated on the prevailing winds akin to a weather vane.

Mr. KINGSTON. However, if the President of the United States is serious and wants to balance the budget, as we can only hope that he is, the Republican Party welcomes him and his administration, open arms, let us get in the arena, let us figure it out together and let us work for the good of America.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, we can say this tonight in the wake of the President's speech. He says now he wants a balanced budget. Let him work with us to achieve it in 7 years instead of a decade hence.

GATT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the GATT implementation legislation late last year was supposed to put into place the legal framework for trade policy that was required by a trade agreement that had been hammered out among the various nations of the world. That was what it was supposed to be. The only problem being a major change in the U.S. law was snuck into the implementation legislation, even though it was not required by the GATT treaty.

So what I am talking about tonight is something that was snuck into law late last year and is just now being implemented as the law of the United States of America.

What was this mysterious provision that magically appeared in the GATT implementation legislation? Oh, it was nothing more than just a little old change in the patent law, just a little change in the patent law that if allowed to stand will cost American inventors and American investors billions of dollars, if not corrected.

□ 2145

Something may be happening that is very sinister here in Washington, DC, or it might be very innocent. Whatever it is is going to result in the transfer of billions of dollars from one set of pockets to the other set of pockets. Why was this change, this change that actually redirects the money flow, why was it accomplished through the GATT implementation legislation?

This Congressman, along with a majority of my colleagues, voted for the GATT fast-track authority. What that did, it gave the administration the

right to negotiate this trade agreement, which would then be voted on as a single vote. It would be all or nothing. The implementation legislation would be presented to us, it would be one vote, all or nothing, and we could not vote to amend what was presented to us.

This arrangement was made to ensure that the trade agreement would not be amended to death, and that our negotiators could actually go and negotiate with our foreign trade potential partners, and that, basically, was a good idea, as long as everyone kept their word. The understanding, of course, was that the only changes that would be made part of the GATT implementation process would be changes that were required by the treaties that had been negotiated with our potential trading partners. There would not be anything else in the GATT implementation legislation, so we could vote on it up-or-down.

Congress and the American people were lied to, and we were betrayed. I personally feel betrayed, because I voted for fast-track authority for GATT. GATT did not require our country to diminish the patent protection enjoyed by our citizens. Yet, it was placed in this bill in hopes of passing this major change in patent law without full debate, without full scrutiny.

This Congressman was even denied the right to even see the language of the proposed legislative change until shortly before the vote was scheduled. I am an elected representative of the people. I asked for weeks to see the legislative language. I was denied the right to see that until it was sent to Congress itself.

Adding insult to injury, under fast track, Congress was supposed to have 60 days to examine the proposal and then to vote on it. This administration submitted GATT to Congress only a few days before a scheduled recess, which put us in the position of voting for all of it or none of it, with little time to consider the detail. This was either smart or it was sneaky or it was sinister, depending on one's perspective. Luckily, the administrator was forced to stand off, which gave us some more time. We had to come back to vote on the GATT later on.

What is the major change that was in GATT which eventually was voted on and made into law? What is this change that I'm talking about that was snuck into GATT, but not required by our trade negotiations?

Americans traditionally have been blessed with patent laws which protected our inventors and our investors. This protection of patent rights ensured that our country was in a position, over our country's history, in the forefront of technological change. Patent protection was considered so vital to our country's well-being that it is put right into our Constitution. Very few countries can say that their Founding Fathers were so committed to technological change in the ad-

vancement and well-being of the common man that patent protection, patent laws, the actual insistence that there be a Patent Office, was put into the Constitution of our country at our country's founding.

This could explain why the Americans were in the forefront of things like the reaper, which helped us bring in crops so well that we fed our people better than any other country in the world; the telegraph; telephones; steam engines; trains, and the list goes on and on. The secret, perhaps, is that we had the protection of those inventors and investors who were behind them, we had that protection in law, up until it was secretly changed by the GATT implementing legislation.

If an American inventor applied for a patent, no matter how long it took the Government to issue that patent, once it was issued to the inventor, it might take 10 years, it might take 5 years, it might take 15 years, but once it was issued, the inventor and the investor owned that invention for 17 years, so there was a profit motive, and they had control of the technology they had developed for 17 years.

That is the secret behind the genius of our people. We have built it into our country's laws. We have protected their rights to own what they have created. However, the GATT laws changed that.

The GATT law changes that dramatically. The change is designed, incidentally, to appear to be of little consequence. In fact, it appears to elongate the time of patent protection. Now, after the GATT changes are in effect, when an inventor files, if his patent is issued immediately, he will have 20, not 17 years but 20 years, of full protection. However, as the law now reads, after 20 years he is done. He does not have patent protection. Remember, before it was only 17 years.

That would be really great if patents were issued immediately, but they are not issued immediately. In fact, almost every technological breakthrough that has changed the lives of mankind that have been based on patents issued to Americans have taken years and years, sometimes more than a decade, sometimes more than 15 years, to issue.

Thus, the patent holder, under those laws, under the old laws, still had 17 years worth of protection. Under the new law, his or her patent rights would be virtually destroyed and meaningless. Under the new provisions, the real patent time is dramatically, dramatically reduced for people who are inventing important technology.

What does that mean? Again, it means billions of dollars that should be going into the bank accounts of American inventors and American investors will now end up in the bank accounts of multinational and foreign corporations. It also means that technology Americans have invested in and that Americans have created will not end up being used against us by our competitors, because the length of real patent

protection has been drastically reduced.

It is, in short, one of the greatest rip-offs in history. That is what just happened in slow motion and quietly and part of the GATT implementation legislation, and something that, unless we act, the perpetrators of this crime will get away with.

Why was it done? What was the excuse? Certainly, it could not have been the excuse that we are going to put this into the law, and it is going to rip off the American people. No one would have agreed to that.

We have to admit that some of the people who voted for this and supported it probably do honestly believe that it will have a positive effect, and the positive effect that has been heralded by those who believe it and those who do not believe it, who are just using it as a cover, the positive effect is called harmonization of patent law.

Yes, the United States, Japan, and Europe have different kinds of patent law. We have different laws to protect other rights as well: freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of press. There are different laws protecting rights in the United States, and we pride ourselves in having stronger protection of our rights in the United States than do other countries.

However, Bruce Lehman, head of our Patent Office in the United States, has decided that harmonization of patent law is really an important thing in and of itself, it will be something that is very good. In doing so, because he believes this, he agreed to put this change into our patent law, a change which eliminates the time certain of protection of American patent holders.

He did this in agreement with the Japanese, who were insisting upon this, and it was part of a verbal agreement, and yes, an agreement that was made in writing which has to be passed into law by Congress, but instead of going to Congress openly, he decided "Oh, well, I will fulfill my part of the bargain," which he had no right to make for the American people. Without the passage of Congress, he decided just to slip it into the GATT implementation legislation, so we would either have to accept that or we would have to vote down all of the changes in trade law that were encompassed in the trade negotiations, and we would have to suffer the consequences of a major disruption of trade in the United States.

What did Bruce Lehman, our negotiator, get in return for basically eliminating the rights that Americans have enjoyed for over 100 years in terms of their patent—their for sure time of patent protection? In exchange for it, we got the right to file in Japan, to file for a patent in Japan in English. We got that right.

We also got an agreement from the Japanese who, in good faith, promised our negotiator that "We will indeed improve our patent system so that the average patent in Japan, if you agree to make your changes, so that you no

longer have this 17 years of protection, we agree that you will have a patent system in Japan to work with in which the average patent will be issued within 3 years."

This deal reflects an almost criminal naivete. To cover up this absurd acquiescence to the Japanese interests, we have seen underhanded tactics being used to pass this legislation, and we have seen representatives from our government lying to the American people about what this is all about.

Mr. Lehman himself has been claiming that the average time to issue an American patent is only 19 months. Thus, if the average patent is issued in 19 months, and you have said it is 20 years, you have 20 years, after all, of patent protection from the time of filing, then actually the average person has more time, more patent protection, than he would have had we kept the law the same.

Mr. Speaker, this is not true here, what Mr. Lehman is saying about 19 months, the average time, and it will not be true in Japan. The American people are in the process of having their patent rights ripped off. Yes, 19 months is an average for something in our Patent Office. It is the average Patent Office action, although American businessmen all over this country are repeating the phrase that it only take 19 months for a patent, average patent, to be issued. That is, pardon me the pun, a patent lie.

The fact is that it is not 19 months for a patent to be issued in the United States, it is the 19 months that is an average patent action, meaning an action by the Patent Office. This includes the action on totally inconsequential patents, things that make no difference to anyone's lives, that are applied for in the hundreds, if not thousands, by businessmen, like the stripe on the bottom of a toothpaste tube.

There is a lot difference between talking about patenting the stripe on the bottom of a toothpaste tube and getting it approved in months, as compared to patenting a laser, which might take decades.

There is also another factor. Not only are they inconsequential patents that he is putting into the mix, but Mr. Lehman has been including patent rejections, meaning it is not 19 months for the average patent to issue. It is 19 months for the average action to take place, and those actions include inconsequential patents and rejections of patent requests, which also can be made in a very short order.

This type of absurdity with averages, Mr. Speaker, as they say, statistics can lie, and liars can use statistics. After altering my fellow Member's opinion on what they were being told, as to what the effect of this law would be, I moved forward to try to move forward with a provision and changing of our law that will bring back and restore the patent rights of the American people that were ripped off as part of the GATT implementation legislation.

□ 2200

My fellow members, we were sometimes unaware of what was going on in GATT, and some of them that were aware, when they talked to the so-called experts, were given these phony statistics and had no idea of the details which we are talking about tonight.

Well I authored the legislation, H.R. 359, to restore the American patent rights of the American people, and my colleagues from both parties, I have substantial support from both parties, rallied to the cause. One hundred seventy members from both parties have cosponsored H.R. 359 to restore American patent rights. A sister bill to the one that I am talking about was introduced by Senator DOLE in the Senate.

Thus we are poised, ready to take back the rights that were stolen from the American people. Yet there has been no action.

Here we are in June, no action has been taken on H.R. 359, which has had more cosponsors than almost any bill like it in history. Now, why is it? Why is it just sitting here? Why has not it been acted upon?

Well, it is because of the opposition of one Member of this body, one Member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Properties, to which this bill was assigned. He has refused even to hold a hearing on this piece of legislation. "Not enough time to hold a hearing."

Well, some of those opposing my bill, they, and maybe the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], is in the situation, maybe he is not, but there are some people who opposed this piece of legislation because they believed there is a bigger problem in the United States than simply protecting the patent rights of our people. There is an issue called the submarine patent issue, which has to be dealt with, and perhaps the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] is more concerned about dealing with that problem than in dealing specifically with my bill that deals with patent protection for the American people.

Just to give you a short background on the submarine patent issue, the idea is, and there are some indications that some inventors have manipulated the system over at the Patent Office to elongate the time that it takes for their own patent to be issued.

Now, almost every patent or inventor that I know does everything that he or she can possibly do to get that patent issued immediately because change in our society is so rapid that if you have an invention now, you want to get it issued to you so you can start making a profit on it, and nobody, nobody is going to invest in your new technology on a patent pending. They are waiting until after you have been issued the patent. But some inventors, it is claimed, and it is possibly true, that there are some inventors who have been ripping off other corporations by basically playing the system, and so

that they are not issued the patent and they elongate the time so when they are issued the patent, they have 17 years from that moment, which is longer than they would have otherwise.

Mr. Lehman claims there are hundreds of such cases. Unfortunately, he has not been able to prove that. There are some cases like that. Many of the examples he and other people in the Patent Office have given, in fact, are not cases of submarine patents, but are cases where the Government has, in fact, delayed the issuance of the patent, and sometimes for national security reasons, and not the patent applicant himself.

But I have been bent over backwards because I am concerned only about maintaining the 17 years of protection that is traditional for American patent applicants. So I have stated time and time again in meeting after meeting with the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] and others, Mr. Lehman and others, people representing industry, I have said I will put into my legislation anything that we can put in that legislation that will solve the submarine patent issue as long as it does not diminish the 17 years of guaranteed protection that our American inventors have enjoyed, and, you know, no one has ever come back to me with any suggestions, which means that in my way of thinking that perhaps that issue is being used as a cover, as an excuse to diminish the time of patent rights and enrich multinational and foreign corporations by billions of dollars that they would not have otherwise.

The submarine patent issue is based on the idea that someone is playing the system at the Patent Office, which means the correction could be made simply by reforming the way the system works at the Patent Office, the way decisions are made at the Patent Office, the way the structure is set up by the Patent Office, which can be done by administrative reform and in no way does it mandate the diminishing of the intellectual property rights enjoyed by the American people.

I happen to believe that most people using the submarine patent argument are honest. They truly believe that this is the reason why that we have to bring down the number of years of patent protection, but again there are many people who are using this as a front to take away patent rights and take away property rights when the real solution could be done administratively without diminishing people's property rights at all.

So there my bill sits. There sits my patent bill, H.R. 359. The gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] claims there is no time for a hearing. Yet my bill has 170 cosponsors.

And last week, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] had a hearing in his subcommittee on another patent bill that was quickly put together that has two cosponsors, two. And what did that bill do? H.R. 1733, what did it do? What did the bill that

is moving through the system accomplish? I will tell you what it does. It mandates that once an American files an application for a patent, that 18 months after that application is filed, whether or not the patent is issued within that 18 months, that patent application will be published for the world to see. This is before a patent has been issued, American inventors will see their creations published for the world.

It does not take a rocket scientist to understand the result of that will be the stealing of American technology by foreign interests and also by large corporations here. This, by the way, interestingly enough, why would anybody, why would anybody be stupid enough to come up with an idea about letting the world know all of our secrets of our technological creativity of our people even before the patents are issued to protect them? Why would they do this?

Well, this was another one of the demands that the Japanese had made to Bruce Lehman, and, you know, if we are going to have a harmonization and a goodwill between our countries, we have got to make sure that we have an understanding with Japan because, after all, it is our best trading partner, our biggest trading partner.

What we are talking about is a sign that says when a patent application is put into place, a sign that will be raised, a huge neon sign 18 months later that says, "Come and steal me. Anybody in the world, here is something of value, come and copy it."

There is something sinister happening here in Washington, or there is just something stupid happening here in Washington. The American people are about to become victimized in one of history's greatest ripoffs and they do not know what is coming down. They cannot see it happening. It is complicated; and it is a very complicated issue, and that is what all of these experts have been relying on.

But the Japanese and the Chinese, they are going to know; they know exactly what is happening. I will tell you that if the bill that the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD] is pushing through his subcommittee now passes and that every American inventor who applies after spending years trying to create new technology, if immediately after 18 months that this is published for the world, even before the patents are issued, before any kind of semblance of protection is granted, I can tell you that our Japanese and Chinese friends will have many people stationed here in Washington, DC. They will have offices right near the Patent Office because they will go there, and when it is published, the Japanese and Chinese runners will run to their offices, and the copy machines and the Xerox machines will be running, and the fax machines with overseas transmission lines to fax this material over to these other countries who are our competitors and trying to destroy us economically will be waiting for the

good news of what new things, what new things, what new creations have Americans come up with today?

Does that not make you feel good? Something is happening. Something is happening. Something sinister or something stupid.

We are entering into a new technological age, and our government is destroying our greatest asset, the creative genius of our people. We are giving it away for some feather-headed notion that we are going to have global harmonization of patent rights and that is going to make us all love each other and we can operate in goodwill.

If we told the American people at any time that we wanted to have harmonization of the individual rights of our citizens to pray and to speak and to assemble and the other constitutional rights that we have, and we had some feather-brained government official making a deal with the government of Singapore or some other country, whether Japan or any other country, say, "By the way, the American people are just going to have to give up these rights that they have been talking about for so much. They are too individualistic. We need a new global concept of human rights to make sure wherever you go, people have the same human rights, so from now on the American people are going to have to accept the same human rights level and the same rights, political and social rights, that they would have if they lived in Singapore."

Do you think the American people would stand for that? Do you think anybody but a lamebrain would even think about offering that to the American people?

Well, somebody might offer it to them, but they might have some other motives in mind. Maybe they do not like the American people. Maybe they do not want the American people to have the rights that they have had fundamentally, both economically and politically, because they do not like America because of what America stands for.

Well, that is that what is happening here today. We are entering into a technological age, and our creative people are losing the fundamental rights that they have had as Americans. The investor who invest in new technology are finding that their investment, they will lose control of that investment of the product, of that investment, just like the inventor, and that their competitors, after a much shorter period of time, will end up using that technology against them and, in fact, their competitors will learn every detail of what they have created with their investment and their time and their energies even before it is granted a patent.

How can we look into the future and say that in this new technological era we are going to change the rules in a way that diminishes the incentive of our people to invest in technology?

Our biotech industry has invested tens of billions of dollars. Yet we are

now going to tell our biotech industry whatever they come up with they are not going to have; if it takes them 10 years to get through the system, and sometimes it takes 15 years for them to get issued a patent, "Oh, I am just sorry, that means you are only going to have 5 years' or 3 years' worth of protection, even though you have invested billions and billions of dollars." What kind of effect will that have on America's future and our ability to lead the way, to keep and remain the technological leaders?

The biotech people will get ripped off, they know that, just like every other American inventor will get ripped off, and thus they will not invest, and thus they will not invest, because the system has changed fundamentally. Well, will these people, whoever they are, whether they are stupid or whether they are sinister, will they get away with this? Well, I do not know. But I can assure you this, the American people are going to hear about this. I am going to talk about it.

We have got 170 of my colleagues who have joined with me, and Senator DOLE who has joined with me in the Senate, to correct this horrible legislation, to restore American patent rights to what they were. We will not permit the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], one man, to make the decision for this whole body on an issue of this magnitude. I call the system that would permit one man to make that decision for all of us a system that does not function for the people. I would call it an abuse of power if one individual tried to prevent the entire body from having a chance to vote on and to discuss this issue on the floor.

We Americans are respected because of our courage, our strength, but also one word that always comes to mind when people talk about the United States of America is creativity and ingenuity.

You know, Thomas Jefferson himself was an inventor. Visit Monticello. See those things that Jefferson did. What did he do? He thought of new ways to save labor and to make life better without having gone to spend as much time and effort.

What about Benjamin Franklin? We know about Benjamin Franklin. Benjamin Franklin was one of the premier inventors of his time in the world. He was also there at the Declaration of Independence, and he was there when our Founding Fathers put together that fundamental document of law that has served us so well, the Constitution of the United States.

It is no coincidence that technologists, that people who look to the future, were the people who wrote the Constitution of the United States of America.

□ 2215

It is up to us to carry on that tradition. Those people talked about individual rights. They talked about freedom. They talked about the dignity of

the common man and that we would be a society that would be so prosperous that even the common man could own the product of his labor, could live in peace and harmony with his family. Unlike the other societies in Europe and in the vast stretches of Asia, tyranny would not reign in America because we believed in freedom and individual rights. Part of freedom and individual rights is the right of people to control their own creations, at least for a period of time in which they own that which they created. It is a precious right and as important to our society as any of the other rights Americans have enjoyed over these two hundred years, and now we have an unelected official, Bruce Lehman, making a secret deal with the Japanese, a deal that means that patent rights forever will be diminished for the American people, and we are supposed to accept that this will just be slipped through the system on a piece of legislation, the GATT implementation legislation in which it had no right to be in in the first place, and we had to vote yes on everything unless we wanted to say no in order to get that one little piece out.

This is a crime in progress. It is a rip-off of historic magnitude, and I can swear to you tonight they will not get away with it. We will alert the American people. This Congress is alerted to it already, and one man will not stand in the way.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. MYRICK (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of family illness.

Mr. LAFALCE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 8 p.m., and tomorrow, June 14, on account of attending my son's graduation ceremonies.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

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. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JACKSON-LEE for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KNOLLENBERG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. SEASTRAND, for 5 minutes, on June 14.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAHAM, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, today and June 14.
Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
Ms. LOFGREN.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. HILLIARD in two instances.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. FAZIO of California.
Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. DEUTSCH.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. DOOLEY.
Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mr. FARR.
Mr. CONDIT.
Mr. HAYES.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. MINETA.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. WYDEN.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. PASTOR.
Mr. TEJEDA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BAKER of California, in two instances.

Mr. COBLE, in two instances.
Mr. SOLOMON, in two instances.
Mr. FORBES, in two instances.
Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, in two instances.

Mr. GEKAS, in two instances.
Mr. SHAW, in two instances.
Mr. ZIMMER, in two instances.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. RADANOVICH, in two instances.
Mr. HANSEN, in two instances.
Mrs. KELLY.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. GILMOOR, in two instances.
Mr. ARCHER, in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRABACHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEJEDA.
Mr. BENTSEN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes

p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 14, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1015. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of June 1, 1995, pursuant to U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 104-84); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1016. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of the Department's determination that it is in the public interest to use other than competitive procedures for awarding a proposed contract, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(c)(7); to the Committee on National Security.

1017. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual comprehensive litigation report, pursuant to Public Law 103-204, section 3(a) (107 Stat. 2374); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1018. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 22d report concerning the impact on competition and small business of the development and implementation of voluntary agreements and plans of action to carry out provisions of the International Energy Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6272(i); to the Committee on Commerce.

1019. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Australia (Transmittal No. 23-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1020. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to the Netherlands for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 95-27), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1021. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report on nuclear nonproliferation in South Asia for the period October 1, 1994, through April 1, 1995, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2376(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1022. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by William J. Hughes, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Panama, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

1023. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that the Department has authorized danger pay for employees assigned to the Sindh Province of Pakistan, including the city of Karachi, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

1024. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by David L. Hobbs, of California, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary