

in Communist China, that weapons to our enemies, our real enemies, terrorists of Iran, Iraq, Syria, and North Korea cease now, that they quit supplying areas like Bosnia that can be used against our troops, that they quit shipping in weapons to nations close to the United States like Mexico, that the human rights violations be moved on, not thwarted in the United Nations with threats to other countries. And that is another reason, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations should be and must be changed.

The Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, was correct in his recent trip to Asia and China. He said that perhaps one of the first signs that China can make is how the handling of the turn-over of Hong Kong to the Communist Chinese looks. The next step should be its policy toward Taiwan as a free nation. And yes, I think that our State Department and our President need to focus on the trade deficit, not only with China but other countries as well.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] said, its utilization of children, we are not talking teenagers, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about 5- and 6- and 7-year-olds working 14 hours a day just to survive for a handful of rice. And then guess what? Those products come to this country, but our businesses out of business because we cannot meet that labor cost.

We need to take a look at Long Beach and the biodiversity that the interest groups are currently looking at, including the Audubon Society, Mr. Speaker.

I would be happy to sum up by saying that I will not object to Long Beach having COSCO or other nations as a tenant, but, Mr. Speaker, let us not give them control and complete access of a former national security base, not with the record of COSCO, not with the current threat from the Chinese Communists who just increased their defense by 30 percent and bought 250 SU-27's, which are better than our F-14 and F-15 Strike Eagles, our aircraft, and not with the current China shipping arms to our enemies.

Let us be tough. Let us talk softly and carry a big stick, Mr. Speaker. But when the time comes, I would ask the President, the State Department, and this body to be able to speak with a strong voice and be willing to use that stick. And God bless America.

PRIDE IN THE SPEAKER

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on an issue that is not only important to me but also I think very important to this Chamber and also very important to the people of America.

I could not help but take note of the statements of our previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] on the problems that we are having right now with China, with the influence peddling.

Of course, Mr. CUNNINGHAM brought up some very good points but also some very disturbing points about possible influence that Communist Chinese have been seeking in the United States of America.

We, of course, have been reading with horror over the past few weeks some of the concerns about investigations of people looking into scandals on whether this White House actually sold access to the Communist Chinese. That is something that we all have to be paying very close attention to, especially in this body, because of the constitutional role that we play, the oversight that we play. Nothing has been proven yet. I think that is very important to say. But at the same time the gentleman from California brings up some very good points and some points that we have to be concerned about.

I do want to say that one of the things that has disturbed me over the past few months, as we have been talking about some of the scandals that have been arising concerning the dealings with China and concerning other scandals that have just been absolutely horrifying to me as a United States Representative and as an American and as a father, are some of these moral equivalency arguments that have been trotted out there.

At times we have been told that the possibility of selling access to China, the possibility of a lot of these other things that have been going on somehow is morally equivalent to what the Speaker was charged with earlier. I have been outraged for quite some time at that, because history will plainly show, and the Speaker's critics certainly know this even though they make disingenuous arguments, that there is no moral equivalency.

The Speaker submitted 50,000 documents to the Ethics Committee, told the truth in those documents, but the fact is that one of those 50,000 documents contradicted another statement that he had made in the document production to the Ethics Committee. Because of that, he agreed to a fine that today he decided to take care of.

Let me just say that I am here today to praise the Speaker of the House for what he decided to do in bringing, I believe, honor on this House. I can tell you right now, the Speaker and certainly others know that I have always spoken my mind when addressing the Speaker of the House.

Two weeks ago, I did it in a very, very public way, in a very public confrontation. And I even suggested that if things did not change regarding the direction of the House leadership, that we might have to look in new directions. I have been very pleased with what has been going on for the past few weeks, but I also have said that if

things go wrong again in the future, I will speak my mind again.

So tonight I come here not as a mindless cheerleader of the Speaker, not as a political lap dog or a party line parrot, but instead as a U.S. Congressman, as an American citizen, and as a father who is proud of what the Speaker of the House did today.

I believe in his actions today that his character really did shine through, and it is so difficult teaching my two boys about character when there seem to be so few people in public view that seem to be worthy of emulating. But when I teach my 9-year-old boy, Joey, and my 6-year-old boy, Andrew, about accountability and personal responsibility and stepping up to the plate and looking somebody in the eye and being straightforward with them and taking full accountability, I will give the example of what the Speaker of the House did today on April 17, 1997.

I wanted to read a release that talks about what he did. It said, in an example of accountability, NEWT GINGRICH announced that he will reimburse taxpayers in full, using \$300,000 of his own personal funds. In order to fulfill his promise, GINGRICH has secured a loan from Bob Dole to be repaid in full in a timely manner. The Speaker said, my wife and I, Marianne, decided that whatever the consequences, we had to do what was best, what was right, morally and spiritually. We had to put in perspective how our lives had been torn apart by the weight of this decision. We had to take into account the negative feelings that Americans have about Government, Congress, and scandals. We had to take into account the responsibility that the Speaker of the House has to a higher standard, and that is why we came to the conclusion of our own choice, without being forced, that I have the moral obligation to pay the \$300,000 out of personal funds and that any other step would simply be seen as one more politician shirking his duty and one more example of failing to do the right thing.

Now, let me just say that as a practical matter, I do disagree with what the Speaker did today. But let me qualify that. I disagree because of the precedent that it might set. But at the same time I am very proud that he recognized that it might set a bad precedent in the future and, therefore, he wants to bring about a resolution that would take care of that, but, more importantly, for he and his wife and his family's future, this could have some very devastating consequences. But he decided that at this point in history, that it was the best thing to do, not for himself, not for his party, but for the U.S. Congress and for America.

We do live in a very, very cynical age. I am absolutely horrified when I read accounts in the newspaper of how Americans believe that White Houses have always sold access to the Lincoln bedroom. I am absolutely shocked when I hear that Americans believe

that Presidents have always sold access to Air Force One and used it as a reward.

I am horrified when I hear that Americans actually believe that everybody does it, that everybody sells access, that everybody is willing to open themselves up to foreign influence, that everybody is willing to possibly change foreign policy based on money coming in.

That is not the case. No other administration has ever done things to the level that this administration has. And that is an undisputed fact.

□ 2030

I think that had to weigh heavily on the Speaker's mind, because when the Speaker of the House came forward and made his decision, it was not something he had to do.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, in fact, told him he could repay it any way he wanted to under certain guidelines, that it did not have to come out of personal funds.

In fact, if you look back to the history, the 200-year history of the House of Representatives, the fact that he was even fined for this mistake, for this technical error, and that is what it was, is unprecedented, has never occurred before, and the only time that someone is to pay based on a mistake is when that person made a financial gain because of ethical violation.

And not one person has been able to come forward with a straight face and say that the Speaker of the House gained one penny based on his attorney's technical error.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] yield for one moment?

The gentleman I think has mischaracterized the term "fine" with a voluntary payment, and the Speaker has stated that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct attempted to put a fine, that he would have fought it in court if it was a fine.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And I certainly do apologize for that. That is just like last year when we heard the radicals on the left talking about cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts, cuts and actually we were increasing spending on Medicare, increasing funding for school lunch programs, increasing funding on just about every program that you can increase funding on except for military programs. Of course, the leftists, the radicals called those cuts and in fact they were not cuts, and I made a similar mistake here because there was not a fine, the Speaker was simply going to reimburse the American taxpayers for the investigation.

Something else happened today, and it encouraged me, and this was that Senator Bob Dole stepped forward and decided that he wanted to help the Speaker out any way he could and offered to loan him the money with interest because that needed to be done for technical reasons. But Bob Dole, the former Senate majority leader, 1996

Republican Presidential nominee, issued this statement today.

I applaud the decision by the Speaker beginning to pay with personal funds and taking responsibility for his actions and making this difficult decision despite other options for payment. He has yet again shown himself to be a man of integrity. And let me tell you that is coming from a man of incredible integrity himself as a senior leader of the Republican Party. I am pleased that our highest ranking official has chosen to set an example of accountability and ethics for the Nation through his words and action. For that reason and many more NEWT is a friend, and I am pleased that I can be of assistance.

I consider this not only an opportunity to support a friend but a long-term investment for the future of our party that today we bring this story to a close. An ever united Republican Party moves forward with his positive vision for the next millennium, as articulated by one of our most effective leaders NEWT GINGRICH. It certainly was a great statement from a great man.

Today there was another statement from NRCC Chairman JOHN LINDER, who said that the Republican Party of the majority will now move forward. NEWT will lead us to our goals of balancing the budget, improving safety for our schools and communities, saving Medicare and providing tax relief for all Americans. But he ended with an ominous warning.

He said, knowing that the American people side with our ideas and our ideology, the Democrats will have nothing to do but fall back on vicious attacks.

I have got to say, unfortunately, before the ink was dried on that statement the vicious attacks began in this Chamber. I was disheartened to see that they decided since they could not attack the Speaker because the Speaker had not only abided by the law but had gone well beyond what the law required, that instead they would viciously smear the great name of Bob Dole.

They attacked an honorable man who fought in World War II and almost gave his life to free Europe from the Nazis. He left part of himself on the fields of Europe. He went on to fight through years of physical struggle and still, even through his physical struggle, served America for over 40 years.

In fact, this President himself gave Bob Dole the highest honor that the United States of America can give to any citizen. But he was savagely attacked today by desperate, vicious minorities who will do anything to seize power, the minority. The minority party has done it before. They will continue to do it.

It was interesting today, though, that the architect of the attack was none other than the man who a few years back said we will do anything we can do to destroy NEWT GINGRICH because we know that NEWT GINGRICH is

the nerve center of the Republican Party and the conservative movement. He said that himself, and he continues to prove just how desperate the Democratic Party, let me say the radicals in the Democratic Party are.

You see, over the last 2 years they have filed 81 ethics charges against the Speaker. Eighty have been dismissed. This one technical violation based on a mistake by the Speaker's attorney is the only ethics charge that he even had to acknowledge. Eighty out of eighty-one have been dismissed.

I have got to say if one ethics charge was filed against me or other Members of this Chamber, it would be devastating. I just cannot imagine going through week after week after week, 81 charges.

If that is not bad enough, the unions, radicals on the left and other organizations, spent over \$100 million vilifying this man, who they say is the nerve center of the conservative movement.

Mr. Speaker, I just cannot imagine what it would be like to have 81 ethics charges filed against me over 2 years, have \$100 million spent to personally try to destroy me, and how could I continue to fight.

I have got to tell you, everybody in our party has said that if that happened to any of us we probably would not have the stamina to go on. I do not know how anybody does it. He has been vilified in a way that no other American has been vilified in the past quarter century, and yet he continues.

From the first day, the gentleman from California I am sure can illuminate some facts on this, too, the first day the attacks began and they continued unabated. In fact, before he was even sworn in ever as Speaker, Time magazine ran a cover story and they had a cartoon of him dressed up as a Gingrich and the title was "The Gingrich that stole Christmas." Now, this was before he was even elected Speaker of the House, "The Gingrich that stole Christmas."

Do you know what is so frightening, what is so dangerous about what he said he wanted to do, that it would destroy the radical left's grip on power in Washington, DC. This is all about power because what did he say he wanted to do? He wanted to cut taxes for middle class Americans and what did that do? That took money out of Washington, DC, out of the hands of politicians, out of the hands of bureaucrats, out of the hands of Washington power brokers and returned it back to middle class families like mine, like yours, and like others. He wanted to pass a balanced budget amendment.

That was called radical. And yet, we are \$5.6 trillion in debt. That is the debt, my colleagues, that will be passed on to our children and our grandchildren, my boys, and your children.

These were not radical concepts. They were not radical concepts, unless you were a radical who believed that we could continue to tax Americans over 50 percent for every dollar that

they earned and you believed that a \$5.6 trillion debt was a debt that was sufficient enough to pass on to our children.

And you know, the Medicare demagoguery was the worst of all. The President's own task force said that Medicare would be bankrupt in 5 years.

The Speaker, I think, did an incredible job in trying to put together a plan that AARP and others could agree on; and yet, he was vilified, again, by attack ads, by Members on the left.

When you had the Washington Post saying it was a good idea, that the Democrats were engaged in demagoguery, you had the New Republic, which is usually a left wing magazine, saying that the Speaker was right, that he showed courage in trying to save Medicare, and you had Ted Koppel on "Nightline" run an entire show called "Mediscare," talking about how the President had proposed similar reforms a few years ago before the Speaker did.

And yet, the President turned around with the help of the unions and those on the left and savagely attacked the Speaker for trying to save Medicare for my father, who just had a double bypass operation, for my mother, for my grandparents, and for my other elderly friends and constituents.

I hope that this will end. I hope that we can move forward as a country, and I certainly hope that this horrible chapter is over in the life of the Speaker because he conducted himself very honorably today. And I can say today that I am very honored that we did elect him again as Speaker of the House.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] who I know has some comments on his dealings with the Speaker.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We have all worked for people that we respect and believe that have vision on both sides of the aisle. And I would like to state that we had our Republican Caucus just before the decision was made about the Speaker and before the Speaker made the decision to come forward to the body.

The Speaker's own legal advisors, the special prosecutor that looked into the allegations, came before the caucus and told the Speaker that if he wanted to fight every one of the allegations in that one ethics violation that he would win 100 percent, he could fight them and he would win because they had no basis.

And yet, the left leadership of the Democrat Party wanted its pound of flesh and, for them to give us a bipartisan agreement, had to have the extra pound of flesh and the Speaker had to agree to pay the \$300,000.

Knowing that he could win, why would not the Speaker do it? Because on both sides of the counsel, they told him, Mr. Speaker, you will win, but at what cost; and what the gentleman just covered, we would have been in the year of disruption, with the Democrats demagoguing, with the Democrats at-

tacking and partisan rhetoric, because they want the power here in Washington, DC.

And the Speaker's vision is what the gentleman from California was talking about and swore to destroy the Speaker because he was the leader of the Republican Party, the gentleman from Florida that did the same thing. And the leadership has sworn to destroy politically the Speaker, because he is so effective.

I would say to the gentleman, that is wrong; and I think the American people think it is wrong, too. But in the face of that, when you look at leadership, in the face of attending to the people's business of saving Medicare, of providing Medicaid, and balancing a budget and tax reform and revising Superfund, where 70 percent does not go to trial lawyers, and attending to this House and its functions, the Speaker elected not to disrupt the House, not to have this House disabled because of partisan attacks, and went through personal sacrifice.

As the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] said, how many of us could go through a \$300,000 voluntary settlement? That is a mansion in a lot of areas. It takes a long time. I could not pay cash for it, and it would be devastating.

So when we talk about leadership, I think it is important to see the Speaker's vision that even at the expense of his own personal family and Marianne, his beautiful wife, making those decisions right with the Speaker, and which he blessed today, I think it is important for the American people to see that.

I would also like to remind the Speaker here tonight that the gentleman from Missouri, the minority leader of the Democrat Party, had ethics violations that filed improper IRS returns that benefited him personally and was found to have ethics violations.

□ 2045

How did he pay his fine, quote? Out of his campaign funds. But yet the speaker choose not today do to that because the Speaker of the House should be held high, and he takes full responsibility. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is leadership. That is vision, and that is wisdom.

Today the gentleman had talked about the gentleman from California attacking the Speaker, the same gentleman that had vowed to destroy the Speaker only last year, and he said that he will do anything he can to remove the political strength of the Speaker.

Is that what the American people want on this body? I do not think so.

The same gentleman from California attacked then Bob Dole, as the gentleman mentioned. Is it not a shame that the gentleman from California will never ever reach the heights of the accomplishments or the values and the respect of the gentleman from Kansas,

Bob Dole, and neither will he ever lead this body or have the vision of the Speaker of the House today, NEWT GINGRICH.

And I think it is important to just let me go through real quickly, unless you have something you would like to talk about, I would like to go through just a few quick points and just mention them.

This is what the liberal left stands for in this body, the abolition of private property and land and application of all rents and lands to public purposes to be controlled by the Government. A good example: San Diego County, the Government owns over 54 percent. Many States have over 80 percent of it owned. A heavily progressive or graduated income tax. Abolishment of all rights of inheritance, i.e. the death tax. Confiscation of the property of all immigrants and rebels to centralize the credit in the hands of the government by means of national bank with State capital and exclusive monopoly; i.e., Medicare. The centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands to the State. The extension of factories, an instrument and production owned by the State bringing into cultivation waste lands and soil into government control. Equal obligation of all to work and the establishment of industrial armies, the unions. The abolition of the distinction between town and country, only the government. Free education for all, but yet controlled by the government. Class distinctions and class warfare to achieve it. Political power, property, properly so-called is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing the other.

I would State, Mr. Speaker, and to the gentleman that yielded his time, I am reading from the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his remarks on the Speaker, and certainly those final words do give us a moment to pause and consider that this is not a personality war, this is a war of ideas, war of ideas on who is going to control this country in the 21st century. It is going to be the Federal Government getting larger and larger, or are we going to finally go back to the ideals of Jefferson and Madison who said that the government that governs least governs best, or the ideals of Madison who said we have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government but on the capacity of the individual to govern himself, control himself and to sustain himself according to the Ten Commandments of God.

It is a war of ideas, a war that is being waged the way Americans wage wars, at the ballot box and in the halls of congress, and that is the genius of democracy that was passed to us from the Greeks and through the Romans, through the British empire up to the United States of America.

And today as I stood here, which is the epicenter of freedom, a center that will ring throughout the ages, and I saw the Speaker of the House today step forward and give a splendid example of personal responsibility, I was proud not only to be an American but to be a Member of this Chamber.

And I certainly was hoping that my children were watching on TV. It was a splendid speech. And the minority leader of the Senate, a Democrat, TOM DASCHLE, also applauded the speaker and said that he thought that the Speaker had done what he needed to do. And I also looked across the Chamber at my Democratic friends, and I saw several good Democrats who applauded the Speaker, who even gave him a standing ovation because they knew that, like I, that this was a moment that transcended mere politics, mere party labels, mere ideology, and instead, we were not looking at the leader of a political party but a man who was going to be a leader of a movement that will take us well into the next century.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 3 p.m., on account of official business in the district.

Mr. COSTELLO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of an illness in the family.

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), 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. GOSS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on April 23.

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

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, 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. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEVIN.
Ms. NORTON.
Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. DOYLE.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Mr. FOGLIETTA.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. EVANS.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mr. KILDEE.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
Mr. HILLIARD.
Mr. MARKEY.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. WEYGAND.
Mr. CAPPS.
Mr. ACKERMAN.

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

Mr. GILMAN in three instances.
Mr. FAWELL.
Mr. ENSIGN.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. MCKEON in two instances.
Mr. PAPPAS.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. COLLINS.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. FORBES.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. BAKER.
Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.
Mr. HANSEN.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. EVERETT.
Mr. HORN.

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

Mr. HILLEARY in two instances.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. SKAGGS.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Ms. FURSE.
Mr. THOMPSON.
Mr. KLINK.
Mr. LAZIO of New York.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1003. An act to clarify Federal law with respect to restricting the use of Federal funds in support of assisted suicide.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 52 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 21, 1997, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2851. A letter from the Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Defense Finance and Accounting Service [DFAS] is initiating a cost comparison of all Department of Defense [DOD] transportation accounting functions, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on National Security.

2852. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting notification that certain major defense acquisition programs have breached the unit cost by more than 25 percent, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2431(b)(3)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

2853. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Revisions to the Appointment of Members to the National Ocean Research Leadership Council"; to the Committee on National Security.

2854. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a food cost based basic allowance for subsistence for enlisted military personnel; to the Committee on National Security.

2855. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the U.S. participation in and appropriations for the U.S. contribution to the 11th replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2856. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize consent to and authorize appropriations for a U.S. contribution to the interest subsidy account of the successor to the enhanced structural adjustment facility of the International Monetary Fund, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2857. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to pay for the U.S. capital subscription as part of the eight general capital increase of the Inter-American Development Bank, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2858. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize U.S. participation in and appropriations for the U.S. contribution to the sixth replenishment of the resources of the Asian Development Fund, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2859. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the "Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Repeal Act"; to the Committee on Commerce.

2860. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule—Rulemaking To Amend Parts 1, 2, 21, and 25 of the Commission's Rules to Redesignate the 27.5-29.5 GHz Frequency Band, To Establish Rules and Policies for Local