

I want to thank everyone in the delegation who has supported this project, and urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 19, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

YEAS—395

Abercrombie	Cox	Gunderson
Ackerman	Coyne	Gutierrez
Allard	Cramer	Gutknecht
Andrews	Crane	Hall (OH)
Archer	Crapo	Hall (TX)
Armey	Creameans	Hamilton
Bachus	Cummings	Hansen
Baesler	Cunningham	Harman
Baker (CA)	Danner	Hastert
Baker (LA)	Davis	Hastings (WA)
Baldacci	Deal	Hayworth
Ballenger	DeFazio	Hefley
Barcia	DeLauro	Hefner
Barr	DeLay	Hilleary
Barrett (NE)	Dellums	Hilliard
Bartlett	Deutsch	Hinchey
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Bass	Dickey	Hoke
Bateman	Dicks	Holden
Becerra	Dingell	Horn
Bentsen	Dixon	Hostettler
Bereuter	Doggett	Houghton
Bevill	Doolley	Hoyer
Bilbray	Doolittle	Hunter
Bilirakis	Dornan	Hutchinson
Bishop	Doyle	Hyde
Bliley	Dreier	Inglis
Blumenauer	Duncan	Istook
Blute	Dunn	Jackson (IL)
Boehlert	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Boehner	Ehlers	(TX)
Bonilla	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Bonior	Engel	Johnson (SD)
Bono	English	Johnson, E. B.
Borski	Ensign	Johnson, Sam
Boucher	Eshoo	Jones
Brewster	Evans	Kanjorski
Browder	Everett	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Ewing	Kasich
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kelly
Brownback	Fattah	Kennedy (MA)
Bryant (TN)	Fawell	Kennedy (RI)
Bryant (TX)	Fields (LA)	Kennelly
Bunn	Flake	Kildee
Bunning	Flanagan	Kim
Burr	Foglietta	King
Burton	Foley	Kingston
Buyer	Forbes	Klecza
Callahan	Ford	Klink
Calvert	Fowler	Knollenberg
Camp	Fox	Kolbe
Campbell	Franks (CT)	LaFalce
Canady	Franks (NJ)	LaHood
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Lantos
Castle	Frisa	Largent
Chabot	Frost	Latham
Chambliss	Funderburk	LaTourette
Chapman	Galleghy	Laughlin
Chenoweth	Gejdenson	Lazio
Christensen	Gekas	Leach
Chrysler	Gephardt	Levin
Clay	Geren	Lewis (CA)
Clayton	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Clement	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Clinger	Gilman	Lightfoot
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Lincoln
Coble	Goodlatte	Linder
Coburn	Goodling	Lipinski
Coleman	Gordon	Livingston
Collins (GA)	Goss	LoBiondo
Combest	Graham	Lofgren
Condit	Green (TX)	Longley
Conyers	Greene (UT)	Lowe
Costello	Greenwood	Lucas

Luther	Payne (VA)
Maloney	Pelosi
Manton	Peterson (MN)
Manzullo	Petri
Martinez	Pickett
Martini	Pombo
Mascara	Pomeroy
Matsui	Porter
McCarthy	Portman
McCollum	Poshard
McCrery	Pryce
McDade	Quillen
McDermott	Quinn
McHale	Radanovich
McHugh	Rahall
McInnis	Ramstad
McIntosh	Rangel
McKeon	Reed
McKinney	Regula
McNulty	Richardson
Meehan	Riggs
Meek	Rivers
Menendez	Roberts
Metcalfe	Roemer
Meyers	Rogers
Mica	Rohrabacher
Millender-	Ros-Lehtinen
McDonald	Rose
Miller (CA)	Roth
Miller (FL)	Roukema
Minge	Roybal-Allard
Mink	Rush
Moakley	Sabo
Mollinari	Salmon
Mollohan	Sanders
Montgomery	Sawyer
Moorhead	Saxton
Moran	Scarborough
Morella	Schaefer
Murtha	Schiff
Myers	Schroeder
Myrick	Schumer
Nadler	Scott
Nethercutt	Seastrand
Ney	Serrano
Norwood	Shadegg
Nussle	Shaw
Oberstar	Shays
Obey	Shuster
Ortiz	Sisisky
Orton	Skaggs
Owens	Skeen
Oxley	Skelton
Packard	Slaughter
Pallone	Smith (MI)
Parker	Smith (NJ)
Pastor	Smith (TX)
Paxon	Smith (WA)
Payne (NJ)	Solomon

NAYS—19

Barrett (WI)	Hoekstra	Royce
Beilenson	Jacobs	Sanford
Berman	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Cooley	Markey	Stockman
Filner	Neal	Stump
Frank (MA)	Neumann	
Hancock	Olver	

NOT VOTING—19

Brown (CA)	Fields (TX)	Hergert
Collins (IL)	Furse	Jefferson
Collins (MI)	Ganske	Johnston
Cubin	Gibbons	Peterson (FL)
de la Garza	Hastings (FL)	Torkildsen
Durbin	Hayes	
Fazio	Heineman	

□ 1351

Messrs. NEAL of Massachusetts, BARRETT of Wisconsin, HOEKSTRA, and MARKEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STEARNS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1080. An act to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide additional investment funds for the Thrift Savings Plan, to permit employees to gain additional liquidity in their Thrift Savings Accounts, and for other purposes;

S. 1965. An act to prevent the illegal manufacturing and use of methamphetamine;

S. 2085. An act to authorize the Capital Guide Service to accept voluntary services; and

S. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to the persecution of Christians worldwide.

"DEAR COLLEAGUE" LETTER FROM THE PAST APPLICABLE TO THE PRESENT

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read from a "Dear Colleague" that was signed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] who just spoke, as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] just a few years ago.

Quote,

As the Ethics Committee prepares its recommendations to the full House, it should release only the information which the committee agrees is relevant and necessary to support its findings. To ask a Member, any Member, to also respond in the court of public opinion to allegations, rumors and innuendo not deemed worthy of charge by the Committee would be totally unfair and a perversion of the process. Especially in a time of press sensationalism.

Public release of material not germane to formal Committee action would be similar to the process used during the Joe McCarthy era: Ignore the discipline of due process and firm evidence, and dump unproven allegations out in public and let the ensuing publicity destroy the person's reputation and career.

Signed, RICHARD GEPHARDT, PAT SCHROEDER, HAROLD VOLKMER, JOHN LEWIS, JOHN DINGELL, MARTIN FROST, et cetera.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 1986.

Re: Wright case raises crucial fairness issue

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Calls by some Members of this House for release of all gathered background material on Speaker Wright—no matter how irrelevant to specific recommendations of the Ethics Committee—threatens every Member of Congress. And it should offend every Member who values this institution and fair play.

We all support the ability and the obligation of the Ethics Committee to take a close, hard look at all responsibly made charges formally brought against any House Member. But, every Member, from the newest freshman up to the Speaker, is entitled to protection and fair treatment at the conclusion of the internal inquiry.

This requires that only supporting material on those charges the Committee decides to proceed on should be released. Releasing

the other material—unsubstantiated charges, rumors, innuendo and speculation—on Speaker Wright would be a terrible precedent for the House, threatens all Members and makes a mockery of fair play.

The Outside Counsel has followed every lead, pursued every rumor, and reported on each to the Committee. Appropriately so.

But as the Ethics Committee prepares its recommendations to the full House, it should release only the information which the Committee agrees is relevant and necessary to support its findings. To ask a Member, any Member, to also respond in the court of public opinion to allegations, rumors and innuendo not deemed worthy of charge by the Committee would be totally unfair and a perversion of due process. Especially in a time of press sensationalism.

Consider this: More than 70 Members of Congress were investigated in the outside counsel's inquiry into the sex/drugs page scandal in 1983, of which only two Members were eventually proceeded against. Would it have been fair to release unedited, unsubstantiated or inconsequential allegations that the Committee considered against the other 68 Members?

For the Ethics Committee to release raw material not deemed by the Committee to be worthy of formal action sets the stage for the ruin of any Member's career—possibly triggered by the political or personal animosity of any other Member or outside group.

Public release of material not germane to formal Committee action in the Wright case would be similar to the process used during the Joe McCarthy era: Ignore the discipline of due process and firm evidence, and dump unproven allegations out in public and let the ensuing publicity destroy the person's reputation and career.

Is that the procedure we want the House to adopt? Is that what this institution and our Ethics Committee stand for? We hope not.

We hope the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct will adhere to its distinguished history of fairness in the matter of releasing unsubstantiated, uncharged items. Fairness to all Members requires the same treatment now.

DAVE NAGLE.
JIM MOODY.
ROBERT T. MATSUI.

Below is a list of 100 Democrats who signed a "Dear Colleague" letter asking for the suppression of information in the Wright inquiry.

THESE MEMBERS DID NOT WANT FULL DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION ON SPEAKER WRIGHT'S ETHICS

Alexander, Bill; Andrews, Michael; Bilbray, James; Borski, Robert; Brennan, Joseph; Brooks, Jack; Brown, George; Bryant, John; Bustamante, Albert; Campbell, Ben; Nighthorse; Cardin, Benjamin; Frost, Martin; Garcia, Robert; Gejdenson, Sam; Gephardt, Richard; Gibbons, Sam; Glickman, Dan; Gordon, Bart; Harris, Claude; Hawkins, Augustine; Hayes, Charles; Hayes, James; Hefner, W.C. (Bill); Hughes, William; Jenkins, Ed; Jones, Ben.

Kaptur, Marcy; Kennedy, Joseph; Kennelly, Barbara; Kostmayer, Peter; Laughlin, Greg; Leath, Marvin; Lehman, Richard; Leland, Mickey; Levine, Mel; Lewis, John; Lowey, Nita; Luken, Thomas; McCloskey,

Frank; McDermott, James; Manton, Thomas; Mavroules, Nicholas; Mfume, Kweisi; Moakley, Joe; Neal, Richard; Oberstar, James; Olin, Jim; Ortiz, Solomon; Owens, Major; Owens, Wayne; Payne, Donald; Pease, Donald; Penny, Timothy; Perkins, Carl; Pickle, J.J.; Rangel, Charles; Richardson, Bill; Rosentkowski, Dan; Roybal, Edward; Sabo, Martin; Savage, Gus; Sawyer, Thomas; Scheuer, James; Schroeder, Patricia; Slaughter, Louise; Staggers, Harley; Stenholm, Charles; Synar, Mike; Tallon, Robin; Tauzin, W.J. (Billy); Thomas, Robert; Unsoeld, Jolene; Volkmer, Harold; Williams, Pat; Wilson, Charles; Wise, Robert.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. HANSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WELDON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REVIEW OF TODAY'S HEARING IN THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, or this afternoon, to review a hearing that was held this morning in the House Committee on National Security. I think that this should be of concern to every Member of this body. The hearing this morning, which lasted for approximately 3 hours, had before us Secretary Perry; Secretary of Defense, General Shalikashvili, Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Gen. Wayne Downing, director of the Downing Assessment Task Force. General Downing is the author of the report that was done following the attack that resulted in the deaths of 19 of our troops in that housing complex in Saudi Arabia just a few short months ago.

Mr. Speaker, this hearing today was important because it revealed some concerns that I raised that I think should be the concern of every Member of this institution. During the discussion by General Downing of his assessment of the attack on the barracks in Saudi Arabia, he made some very critical comments about the Pentagon and the Defense Department and what we should have done and could have done to better protect our troops.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, one of the suggestions that he made was that the Pentagon needed to provide more focus on the operation in the Middle East in terms of protecting our pilots and the enforcement of the no-fly zone for the Iraqis. It was because we did not have it as a separate line item in the budget where we could provide adequate resources, where we could have had the backup materials and equipment in place to better support the command officer in that theater. When he made that comment and that suggestion, I was taken aback, Mr. Speaker, because exactly 1 year ago the House Committee on National Security included as a part of our defense authorization bill a very specific requirement addressing that very concern because a year ago we felt the same thing. We felt there was not enough focus within the Pentagon in terms of prioritizing resources for the Middle Eastern operation. We asked for that, and even though the Pentagon certified to us just a few short weeks ago that they were doing that, in fact they in fact had not done that.

So here we were recommending something that now after the fact we find out perhaps helped cause the loss of life in that barracks.