

Johnson said Tuesday, "I don't see that as contradictory of what I'm doing . . . I have every intent that this will be a full inquiry."

She also said that naming an outside counsel could get in the way of the committee making its own judgments.

"We need original source information where it's practical and where it's reasonable," she said. "I think we're going to do a better job than those who would have turned it over to someone."

Others have said that only an outside counsel could conduct a complete, impartial investigation.

Johnson disagreed with those who say the committee has established special rules for Gingrich, and she defended the committee's action in setting aside the ethics manual in the speaker's case.

"My job, as I perceive it, is not to fulfill some sort of generic expectation," she said. "My job is to provide just consideration of the complaints that come before us."

The ethics manual says that once the committee decides a complaint meets certain criteria, it may begin a formal inquiry. The panel then is to split into subcommittees—one to investigate the complaints and the other to hear sworn testimony and decide the validity of the complaints.

Instead, the committee has yet to vote to conduct a formal investigation while the full panel has taken sworn testimony from more than a dozen witnesses, including Gingrich and Murdoch.

Johnson said the committee's 1992 investigation of members who bounced checks on the now-defunct House Bank showed the ethics manual process to be an "utter and total disaster." McDermott served on the ethics sub, that recommended making public the names of only 24 members who abused their banking privileges.

But Johnson and three other committee Republicans objected that all those who wrote bad checks should be named. Eventually, Johnson's position prevailed. She said the bank investigation unfairly harmed the reputations of many members, adding, "I don't want a result like that."

Government watchdog groups that have recently joined the call for an outside counsel with unlimited authority to handle the Gingrich case include Common Cause, Public Citizen and the Congressional Accountability Project, a Ralph Nader organization.

A "YES" VOTE ON BOSNIA MEANS TROOP DEPLOYMENT

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we will be addressing the Defense appropriations bill on the floor of the House. While the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], and the chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], deserve praise for hitting the budget targets, we need to be aware of one other happening because of this bill. We need to be aware of the fact that this bill allows President Clinton by himself to deploy United States troops, young men and women, United States men and women, to Bosnia.

Make no mistake, a "yes" vote on the Defense appropriations bill means United States troops will be deployed into Bosnia. If we deploy United States troops in Bosnia, we, the United States, must be prepared to accept the

consequences. The Post this morning reports that the White House is now coming to ask for this deployment. If these troops are deployed, we must be prepared for our young men and women coming home in body bags, and we must be prepared for \$3 billion price tag that goes with the deployment of United States troops in Bosnia.

The Defense appropriations bill originally contained an amendment that would have required the President to come to Congress for a vote of confidence, for an acceptance of the expenditure of these funds prior to deploying troops into the Bosnian arena. If we vote yes on the Defense appropriations bill today, we must be prepared to accept the consequences.

I do not even wish to advocate a yes or no vote but, rather, I would encourage my colleagues to be prepared for the consequences of the votes they make, and the consequences clearly are our young people being returned in body bags and a \$3 billion expenditure.

EXTENDING AUTHORITIES UNDER MIDDLE EAST PEACE FACILITATION ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2404) to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until November 1, 1995, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object, and I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the committee, to explain his unanimous-consent order.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2404 temporarily extends the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994, which otherwise would have expired on October 1, 1995. That act was previously extended by Public Law 104-17 and by Public Law 104-22.

H.R. 2404 extends the act until November 1, 1995, and includes a transition provision to make certain that there is no lapse in the act's authority.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I do not intend to object, I simply want to note that I do not think it is helpful to Israel, to the Palestinians or to maintaining momentum in the peace process to have to come to this floor every 30 or 45 days to extend these authorities on a short-term basis. I hope that we will be able to make this the last short-term extension of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act and that we can instead fashion a provision that holds the parties to the Middle East peace process to the terms of the agree-

ments they have negotiated but which does not go beyond those terms.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is now the third time that we are renewing the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act. This, in my opinion, is not really the way to go about it. Each time we renew it, we say it is for a temporary moment until we can put the law together and pass a new Middle East Peace Facilitation Act and each time there is just a simple renewal.

I do not think this is a good process. We have had legislation introduced. I have introduced a bill. We have had no markups on the committee. We had one hearing last week, but we have not had any markups.

The Senate is moving ahead with its foreign ops bill. Senator HELMS and Senator PELL are putting together language. Quite frankly, I see no reason why we should cede our authority to the Senate. Why should the Senate language ultimately be the language that is adopted?

I think that this House has a very important role to play and, frankly, I think that our Committee on International Relations ought to put all the legislation that has been proposed at a hearing, talk about it, do a markup, have a markup of the bill, and we ought to come up with new MEPFA language. That is the way I think that we ought to proceed.

Yasser Arafat's feet must be held to the fire. I know there is a signing going on in the White House today. I intend to be there. All of us hope and pray for Middle East peace, but I think a just peace will only be a just peace if there is compliance on all sides, and that includes the PLO and it includes Mr. Arafat.

I believe that United States money should continue to flow for this process, if the Palestinians, if Mr. Arafat is keeping his pledges. If he does not, then I think the money ought to stop; only Mr. Arafat and the PLO can determine that.

So I do not think an automatic renewal is the way to go. I understand it is only for 30 days and I will not object to the 30 days, but I will be hard-pressed 30 days from now to come here and agree to another extension.

Again, I think that the peace process will only work and American money should only continue to flow if both sides are adhering to what they agreed. We do not have that now. The covenants are still in place, talking about the destruction of Israel, the PLO covenants, and Yasser Arafat's track record has been less than admirable. So I think that while we probably have no choice today, again, I think that our committee, and I would hope that the chairman, in fact, I wonder if the chairman would give a commitment that we would have a markup of my

bill and other bills that have been proposed and also perhaps that our committee can formulate a bill.

Again, I see no reason why this House has to cede its authority on this important sphere to the Senate. Why should the Senate foreign operations bill be the core to any new Middle East Peace Facilitation Act that is proposed?

While Senator HELMS and Senator PELL are putting together their language and doing a good job, I think we have an equal role to play, not simply a role of following the Senate.

So I am wondering if the chairman can give me assurances that we will indeed have a markup in this House and that this House will come up with its own bill and not simply rubberstamp the Senate version in the foreign ops bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the concerns of the gentleman from New York, we share those concerns. We will have an opportunity in the next 30 days to take a good, hard look at all of those problems. And hopefully our committee will be able to address some of the gentleman's concerns.

I thank the gentleman for raising this issue.

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

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

There was not objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 583(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), as amended Public Law 104-22, is amended by striking "October 1, 1995," and inserting "November 1, 1995,".

(b) CONSULTATION.—For purposes of any exercise of the authority provided in section 583(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) prior to October 5, 1995, the written policy justification dated June 1, 1995, and submitted to the Congress in accordance with section 583(b)(1) of such Act, and the consultations associated with such policy justification, shall be deemed to satisfy the requirements of section 583(b)(1) of such Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 230 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 230

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 108) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Dayton, OH [Mr. HALL]. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

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

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of House Joint Resolution 108, a continuing resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 through November 30, 1995. The rule provides for consideration of the joint resolution in the House, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, with 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of an historic effort to change the Washington culture of deficit spending by balancing the Federal budget over a 7-year period. For the first time in three decades, the majority in Congress is insisting that Federal spending not take priority over the future of our children. We are implementing a budget plan that sets priorities within the \$1.5 trillion Federal budget by slowing the rate of growth of most Federal programs while eliminating those that are clearly wasteful, duplicative, or unnecessary.

Balancing the budget is clearly not a simple job, especially when the President, sizable minorities in the House and Senate, and special interests that live off the fat of the bloated Federal Government stand in the way. The appropriations process is a central feature of that budget balancing struggle.

□ 1100

It is clear that the bills that meet the targets of the 7-year balanced budget plan will not be completed by October 1, the beginning of the new fiscal year. The continuing resolution that we are going to be considering here today gives Congress time to complete the regular appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, the administration supports House Joint Resolution 108, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday and both supported both the rule and the measure. This continuing resolution is a bipartisan compromise that was the result of a long, sincere, and tireless negotiating process.

While this continuing resolution is a responsible bill, there should be no mistake the fact he continuing resolutions will not replace the regular appropriations process. House Joint Resolution 108 provides the time we need to do the work we need, and that is it. It is a temporary stopgap, and it is a fiscally responsible stopgap.

The spending level incorporated in this continuing resolution is below the level in the House-passed balanced budget plan. It should be made clear that this continuing resolution does not attempt to impose major policy changes on the Federal Government. Those policy changes will be accomplished through the regular legislative process, an effort, even a struggle in some cases, that I look forward to. But they will not be implemented today.

Mr. Speaker, with the beginning of the new fiscal year rapidly approaching, it is important that we act quickly. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the resolution. It should be approved, sent to the other body for equally prompt and responsible consideration, and sent to the President for signature this weekend. Then we can get back to the critical work of balancing the Federal budget, saving the Medicare system from bankruptcy, ending welfare as we know it, and implementing a growth-oriented tax cut that will create more jobs and increase the take-home pay of American workers.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a comparison of the rules considered by the Committee on Rules during the 103d and 104th Congresses.