

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-214), on the resolution (H. Res. 205) providing for consideration of bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE PROBLEM OF ELECTION FRAUD

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

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about two issues. One concerns the integrity of the electoral process, and in that respect, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the Maryland gubernatorial election, November 8, 1994.

After my brief comments on that, I am going to engage my fine colleague from Indiana, Mr. MCINTOSH, concerning the issue of grant reform.

But, Mr. Speaker, before I get to that, I wanted to talk about the hearings this past week that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight conducted with respect to vote fraud in America, geared primarily to the Federal motor-voter law.

Officials and advocates from around the country speak of abuses and misconduct that occurred during the balloting process. In California, Mr. Speaker, witnesses testified that noncitizens regularly voted, as did a 5-year-old child and a dog.

In Alabama, witnesses reported three briefcases containing 1,100 completed absentee ballots where hand-carried to an election board on election day. These, and similar incidents, Mr. Speaker, impugn the integrity of this country's electoral process.

This issue is particularly important to me in light of allegations of election abuse and official misconduct in Maryland during the general election of November 1994. That election, the gubernatorial election, Mr. Speaker, was decided by a very slim margin of several thousands vote. Concerned citizens from around the State began to investigate widespread reports of irregularities in the days following the election.

Besides problems with extremely lax voting security, Mr. Speaker, these investigations determined that 34,000 voters were not purged in Baltimore City in 1994 prior to the election as required by State law.

The Baltimore City elections supervisor was reminded by a deputy 7 months prior to the election that the

purge had not been conducted. It was never done and that fact appears, at least at this point in time, to have been concealed from city and State election officials. The enormous implications of this official problem, I will characterize it, is apparent from the following sample facts about the November election in Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, a computer analysis done of total vote counts for each of the 408 precincts in Baltimore City using the Baltimore City Election Board electronic tape of registered voters and the certified list of votes cast on election day forwarded to the State Board of Elections revealed, Mr. Speaker, 5,929 more votes were cast in the election than individuals recorded as having appeared to have voted at the polls or by absentee ballot; 5929, Mr. Speaker.

Another analysis was done comparing the same electronic tape of registered voters in Baltimore City with thousands of abandoned houses provided by the city housing commission. This revealed a total of 667 votes cast in the election.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, 1,881 votes were cast from houses owned either by the mayor and city council of Baltimore or the city housing authority. There is compelling evidence, Mr. Speaker, that a total of potentially as many as 2,548 votes were cast from abandoned or unoccupied buildings in that election.

Where did these voters live, Mr. Speaker? Was there a direct correlation between the failure to purge and these terrible statistics? I think that there was. So did State Election Board officials. After these facts, and others, Mr. Speaker, were discovered the State election board made a bipartisan call for the purge to be conducted after the fact to prove that mistakes had been made.

Let me reiterate, the State Board of Elections, consisting of three Democrats and three Republicans, wanted the purge to be done to prevent similar problems from occurring in the future.

Instead, the State Attorney General's office represented the city election board against the State Election Board and convinced the court to retroactively apply the Federal motor-voter law in order to prevent any purges from being conducted. This is not the original purpose of the Federal motor-voter law, Mr. Speaker. Clearly, we in Congress are, and should be, concerned that similar problems are not repeated in other States.

Problems such as those encountered in Maryland should be corrected immediately. Vigorous investigation must be conducted to determine if there was any fraud or official misconduct or simple negligence in that election that affected the outcome, Mr. Speaker.

If there is evidence of such behavior, it should be prosecuted to the fullest extent possible. It should not and must not be condoned or ignored using the cloak of law applied retroactively.

Mr. Speaker, In conclusion, in an election there is no such thing as a little fraud or a little problem. Such behavior attacks the very foundation of our society, because it destroys the fundamental trust between the voters, our constituents, and their government. This during a time, Mr. Speaker, when we are attempting to get more people to vote and we are having problems, as you well know.

To tolerate such abuse or circumvent the laws of the land designated to protect the sanctity of the citizen's right to vote by any means possible, will only make Americans more cynical and more disinterested in this process. In Maryland, we must not let this situation happen again.

Mr. Speaker, those are my comments with respect to the integrity of the voting process. You very well know I feel very strongly about this, because of in my view some of the substantiated allegations concerning events surrounding the general election in Maryland in November.

GRANT REFORM

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue that is coming to this floor next week, and I rise to engage my friend and colleague and chairman, Mr. MCINTOSH from Indiana, in a colloquy about grant reform. Before I get into grant reform, Mr. Speaker, I would like the country to know of Mr. MCINTOSH's leadership on this issue.

I truly appreciate the leadership you have shown, Mr. MCINTOSH, my colleague and friend, concerning this very important issue and I know you have introductory comments to make.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Thank you very much, Mr. EHRLICH. I appreciate those kind remarks. Your leadership on this issue has been equally important for us. When I came here last January as a freshman, I did not have any idea that there was some vicious little cycle that was going on. It is one of Washington's best-kept secrets: That we give out billions of dollars in grants to entities that are supposed to be helping the poor, helping us clean up the environment, providing a solution to many of our social problems, but those entities take this Federal money and use it to help subsidize an incredibly extensive lobbying and political network. That political network comes back and lobbies for more spending, and so you get this vicious cycle here in Washington.

As I say, it is one of those secrets that they have tried to keep from the American people.

When I go home to my district in Indiana and I tell people what we have uncovered here in the subcommittee, and we have had two hearings on it already and plan to have more hearings in the future, they are shocked. They say, I do not believe that is happening. And when you show them the documented evidence, they are outraged that their taxpayer dollars are being used to subsidize this type of lobbying and political activity.

I would like to work with you, Mr. EHRLICH, because you have helped us write a bill to put an end to this and this is a great opportunity to tell the American public about the things we have discovered in our hearings and the way we are going to solve this problem next week with the Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich amendment.

Mr. EHRLICH. I am glad you brought up our friend Mr. ISTOOK. He is not here today. I believe his son is returning from a 2-year mission and family obligations come first with Mr. ISTOOK, and we love him for that. He has also been a wonderful member of this team, this true team effort; not just the three of us, but our staffs and the leadership as well.

I think we would be remiss if we did not give credit where credit is due, and that is to the leadership in this House who came through for us when the chips were down to get this rider out of the Committee on Appropriations, so that next week on this floor the American people can really take advantage of a full and fair debate about an important issue.

□ 1700

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a question for you: During our hearing today we had had a number of witnesses come forward, and those witnesses were not happy. Those witnesses, in my view, had either misread the bill or not read the bill. If they have not read the bill, I have very little sympathy for them. If they misread the bill, I think it is up to us on our side of the aisle, I mean our side of the aisle, not Republicans-Democrats, but all Republicans and all Democrats who support us in this reform effort, to explain not just to these advocates but to the American people what precisely we are doing. I understand you have some graphs with you, and I know you want to talk about those graphs.

I see a pig.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes. Let me explain this graph here. It is titled "Welfare for Lobbyists." That is, in fact, what we have going on here. This graph represents the cycle of what happens: The taxpayer pays in taxes due to the Federal Government; they go to these grant recipients, approximately \$39 billion worth of grants each year; and the grant recipients end up turning around and lobbying the Government to spend more of the taxpayer dollars.

Mr. EHRLICH. I think we need to, at this point, get it very straight for the American people. These are grant recipients, recipients of Federal dollars who are not using the grant money for the money's intended purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct. In fact, let me make a distinction here, because there are a lot of grant recipients who work very hard to provide services. They set up Meals on Wheels for the elderly, they have programs to help clean up the environment, they set up programs to fight drug addiction

in their communities. They use these moneys for a very good purpose. But there are other groups who take these moneys and then also have more private donations, set up a lobbying campaign.

I was, quite frankly, shocked at the hearing today to hear people who were representing some of our charitable organizations say that really what they wanted to do would be lobbyists. They were less concerned about providing the programs to help those who are unfortunate in our society and wanted to be able to come in and lobby Congress, and they wanted to be able to do that while maintaining all of these taxpayer grants.

The second chart I have there shows you the breakdown, and this statistic comes from the group themselves. This is a coalition of very large, very rich, very well-endowed nonprofit groups called the Independent Sector, and it shows where they get their funding. If you can see the chart there, you notice that they estimate just under \$160 billion ends up coming from government sources. Now, that is not all of their funding. A larger portion of it comes from the private money. But \$160 billion comes from the government taxpayer funding, and yet they today were out walking the halls of Congress lobbying against our proposal to say we are going to end welfare for lobbyists.

I should take a few minutes at this point to explain to the public how our proposal works. It basically says we are going to give you a choice. You can either be a grant recipient, in which case we want you to engage in social, helpful activities, helping the poor, helping the disadvantaged, helping clean the environment, helping do research; or you can be a lobbyist organization. In that case we are not going to give you taxpayer-funded grants.

Mr. EHRLICH. I really believe my colleague has hit the very bottom line with this issue, and the reason I think, we believe the American people support us, and we will get in a few minutes into the groups that support us, but the difference between doing in a tradition sense what nonprofits are supposed to do, which is help people, and the difference between actually performing the service and acting as an advocate, those lines have become skewed. That distinction is no more, in any respects.

Is that not correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct. In fact, many of them now consider themselves primarily advocates or lobbyists and engage in political activity. You know, I think we should share with folks some of the things we found out at our hearings.

The record has shown that there are numerous instances where these groups who receive grants have come to lobby congress. The most recent one that I am aware of was the American Bar Association that received \$2.5 million last year in Federal grants. They were here in Washington when we were debating

the flag burning amendment, standing on the steps of Capitol Hill, saying that congress should not pass an amendment to protect the flag from desecration. Now, if that is their view, I disagree with them totally, but if that is their view, they are entitled to it. But I do not think we should have a Government subsidy going to a group that comes and lobbies us on those types of issues.

Mr. EHRLICH. The reality of it is, with the law in its current shape, we can not prove or disprove where that \$2.2 million poison was spent. Is that not correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct. The reporting by these organizations is nonexistent in some cases. In some cases they have one report that they turn in to the IRS because they have a tax-exempt status, but it is very, very general. It gives no detailed accounting of how the Federal moneys are spent, and, frankly, the government agencies do not know where all of their grants go. You can have a very difficult time finding out exactly how many grants that are given to each of these groups.

So, there is no accountability and money is fungible. They end up subsidizing the overhead to groups that end up engaging in this lobbying activity.

Mr. EHRLICH. I know a source of frustration for you, for myself, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] has been the apparent confusion concerning the difference between laws which cover contractors and laws which cover Federal grantees, and I know you want to get into this. But I brought one of your favorite props with me today, my colleague, and what I have brought with me is laws relating to, the actual laws of the land, relating to Federal procurement. These are the laws, and these are the regulations that govern Federal contractors, and people know this, people know these laws are on the books and these regulations have been promulgated.

Yet today we have people coming before our committee and making the charge that we should include contractors in our law because there is no difference between contractors who provide a good for consideration of the Government and these nonprofit grantees, when everybody knows the difference is obvious. There is law on the books concerning contractors, but there is no law concerning grantees. That is the purpose of this bill.

Is that not correct, my colleague?

Mr. MCINTOSH. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I think you make a very telling point. You have also touched upon something else that is occurring. The opponents of this legislation cannot come out and argue the merits. They cannot come out and say we need to keep our \$39 billion in grants so we can be an effective, powerful Washington lobbying organization.

So, what they are going to try to do is scare people and they are going to come up with a lot of false scenarios.

Mr. EHRLICH. We have seen that strategy before, have we not?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes, we have. We see it a lot of times. Frankly, we are going to get to the bottom and be truthful with the American people about what is going on. What they are saying, for example, is students who receive a grant to go to school might be covered by this. Well, no. Our legislation says individuals who are getting a study grant, it is fine for them to engage in advocating whatever views they want. They are going to say that famers who receive price supports would be covered by this. Well, no, that is not a grant for research or other social activities. They are not covered by this legislation.

What we are going to do is say to very powerful, rich, well-endowed groups that spend a lot of their time walking the halls of Congress lobbying us for more Federal spending, they are covered by this law, but enough is enough. The American people are going to finally find out about this dirty little secret and put an end to it.

I think you have pointed out one of the fallacies very well, that in the case of contractors, there is established law. If that needs to be strengthened, that can be addressed by the appropriate committee. But what we have here is an entire group of people who are totally unregulated in their lobbying activities, totally unfettered, and that would be fine with me except that they are getting all of this taxpayer money that ends up subsidizing their activities.

Mr. EHRLICH. Facts are dangerous; facts are dangerous, particularly in a debate like this where demagogues can use misinformation or lack of information to their advantage.

Now, speaking of demagoguery on this issue, we have both heard the charge, the traditional charge, and I guess it has been thrown around this town quite easily over the last few years, of defunding the left, they are trying to defund the left, those mean, nasty Republicans are trying to defund the political left.

The fact is, as you know, anyone who has read this legislation would know there is defunding those who misuse public money regardless of right, left, far right, far left, or the political center. If you are the NRA, if you are the Chamber of Commerce, if you are an environmental group, it does not make any difference to us. We do not care about your philosophical direction. We care how you spend taxpayer money. I know you want to comment on this.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is exactly right. We are getting to the bottom line, which is that we are not going to have this abuse of taxpayer funds to support lobbying activities. You know, if you step back and think about it, the contrast between the groups who want to lobby and those who are out there trying to do good in society is enormous.

In my hometown of Muncie, there is the Muncie Mission, which is, as far as I know, supported completely by dona-

tions from citizens in the town of Muncie. They do not have a big lobbying outfit. They do have a building which is kind of run down. They can house up to 20 homeless people who are down on their luck, need a place to live, and they actually have a program where they, kind of like the Salvation Army, take old equipment, old household goods and have people work on them.

Mr. EHRLICH. I am not familiar with this group. Do you mean they actually help the homeless?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes. They actually do. They are very effective. They are right in one of the worst areas of town in terms of people who have trouble and need help, and they do not come up here and lobby us in Washington. They are very quietly out there doing their mission, helping the people in my home town of Muncie, and you compare that to one of the groups we heard about in the first hearing, the Nature Conservancy, that was bragging about in one of its reports a grant that they received that was used in the State of Florida to lobby local government to successfully defeat an effort by farmers to preserve their ability to continue to grow crops on their land.

Now, to me, those are two completely different types of charitable activities, and I think if someone wants to lobby, let them do it with their own money. But do not come here to Washington and say we need Federal grants to be able to support our operations out in the countryside and we are going to lobby against what the people in local areas, like this area in Florida, may want, and we are going to use taxpayer money to help us in that effort. To me that is wrong and needs to be cut out.

Mr. EHRLICH. You have provided great leadership in securing support from a variety of groups around this country, and this is a true grassroots effort, and I know because of your efforts, particularly, and it has been a team effort, but your efforts particularly, we have groups like, and I have the letters right here, the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens for a Strong Economy, the Association of Concerned Taxpayers, the 60-Plus Association, a seniors group, and that needs to be emphasized, I believe, we have the chamber of commerce, who may actually feel the sting from this piece of legislation, yet coming forward and saying you are doing the right thing, we are with you, and that is to be commended, the Seniors Coalition, another group, the Association of Concerned Taxpayers, Americans for Tax Reform, the National Association of Manufacturers, Chairman ARCHER, the National Restaurant Association, and on and on and on and on and on, and you deserve the credit because we have started a grassroots movement. People love to talk about lobby reform. They love to talk about getting our fiscal house in order in this town. Here we are, with maybe arguably one of the more important lobbying reform measures that has hit this floor in the last decade, and we are

receiving this type of support, and it must be gratifying for you.

Mr. MCINTOSH. It is tremendously gratifying to see that kind of grassroots response. To be honest, a lot will be told next week when Congress comes back into session.

If voters call up their Congressmen and say, "Get rid of this welfare for lobbyists, we have had enough of taxpayer subsidies for lobbying," then this body will be able to pass this reform and send it over to the Senate.

I heard that one of the groups, the National Taxpayers Union, is actually sending out an alert to its members to call in to Members of Congress, and once they find out the facts, tell them about how terrible it is that we have been continuing this process and to support our amendment to put an end to it.

Mr. EHRLICH. When you really come down to it, the average taxpayer, the person who keeps the lights on in this country, should ask himself or herself the following question when it comes to this issue: Do the groups that I just read and that we have analyzed here have his or her best interest at heart, or is it the groups who are fighting this bill? And I know we, as the three cosponsors of this piece of legislation, will rest with that individual taxpayer because we believe that individual taxpayer and that individual constituent will make the right determination when confronted with that issue.

Mr. MCINTOSH. If the gentleman would yield, let me share with you and my colleagues and the American people one of the things that happened today in our hearing on this issue, and then I must excuse myself. I have to go to an appointment.

□ 1715

But one of the witnesses was Mrs. Arianna Huffington, and she brought with her several leaders here in Washington, DC, who had been working on their own to try to combat crime, try to help in poor neighborhoods to give children a chance, try to really establish hope and good deeds in these communities that are falling apart all around us here in the Nation's Capital.

One of them she brought with her was a lady named Mrs. Hawkins. She was a black lady, retired. She started contributing her pension to set up a program where young black kids who are in danger of joining gangs, starting to use drugs, going down a path where their lives would be totally ruined, she set up a program with her own retirement money to have them come to her house after school to give them a program and an opportunity, something to do so they were not turned loose onto the streets, so they were not captured by the gangs, they were not captured by the drug dealers who wanted to corrupt them and destroy their lives, and Mrs. Hawkins is one of the noble heroes in America. She did this with her own money. She is not wealthy. It was very clear that she was a strong lady of

faith, and she had contributed her retirement to set this up for young people in this country. And she said that she is troubled that there are these groups that receive all of these taxpayer dollars who claim to be helping people, and could they not take that money, and stop lobbying, stop coming up here and giving out meals, trying to win and influence votes in the Halls of Congress and use a little bit of that money to go help the young people in this country, the people who do not have an opportunity, who need these programs, who need love, who need to be told you are important by people like Mrs. Hawkins.

So we need to engage her and people like her, and I think one of the most telling things about our grant reform proposal is that, if we can succeed in cutting off this welfare for lobbyists, we will actually have more people like Mrs. Hawkins contributing their own money, working with their own time, providing these services that are very much needed in our community.

And so we will see that charitable activity in this country actually increases and actually is directed to the people who need help, and so I am confident that not only is this the right thing to do for the taxpayers, but, based on our hearing today, this is the right thing to do to make sure that these activities to promote a good society will flourish in our country, and I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this today and would welcome you, hope you can continue to inform the American people about our efforts on this.

Mr. EHRLICH. I thank my colleague as well, and your last point is really the point to leave the American people to ponder, because no longer should there be a distinction between the mission of a group and the actual work, and that fine lady we saw today does not distinguish between those two concepts, and that is why she is successful, and we really appreciate her.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank you for your leadership on this as a freshman colleague. You have taken the bull by the horns, and I do not think we would be here if you had not worked very, very hard to make this legislation come to fruition. I know you spent several nights working on drafting the actual text of the legislation, something that a lot of Congressmen turn over to their staff, and so you are to be commended for this hard work on this, Mr. EHRLICH.

Mr. EHRLICH. It is wonderful to work with such a great colleague, and I appreciate the time tonight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 12:30 p.m., on account of illness.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 1:45 p.m., on account of personal business.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 2 p.m., on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MCKINNEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 11:30 a.m., on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DICKS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and to include extraneous material, during debate on the Vento amendment to H.R. 2099 in the Committee of the Whole on Thursday, July 27, 1995.)

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Ms. NORTON.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. RUSH in two instances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

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

Mr. EHLERS in two instances.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. MARTINI.

Mr. THORNBERRY.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 31, 1995, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1275. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Report to Congress: The International Cooperative Research and Development Program," pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350; to the Committee on National Security.

1276. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-119, Rock Creek Parish Cemetery Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Act of 1995, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1277. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-120, College and University Campus Security Amendment Act of 1995, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1278. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report entitled, "Physicians Comparability Allowances (PCA's)," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5948(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1279. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Plan for the Further Development and Deployment of Existing Defense Technologies in Support of the Dredging Requirements of Dual-Ports," pursuant to section 1143 of the National Defense Authorization Act, fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1280. A letter from the Chief, Forest Service, transmitting the Department of Agriculture's annual report of the Forest Service accomplishments, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1602; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Resources.

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. ROBERTS: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 714. A bill to establish the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-191 Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALKER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1601. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to develop, assemble, and operate the international space station; with an amendment (Rept. 104-210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 629. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the operation of certain visitor facilities associated with, but outside the boundaries of, Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado (Rept. 104-211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PACKARD: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 1854. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-212). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 204. Resolution providing