

CONGRATULATIONS TO HON. BILL REDMOND ON HIS ELECTION TO CONGRESS

(Mr. SKEEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, the vote is in and the people have spoken in New Mexico's Third Congressional District, and they are sending another Republican to Congress. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Los Alamos, NM, BILL REDMOND, for winning New Mexico's special election held yesterday in northern New Mexico.

Mr. REDMOND will be an excellent Member of the House of Representatives and will support many of the principles our majority party stands for: lower taxes, a balanced Federal budget, a strong national defense, family values and a get-tough attitude on crime.

Mr. REDMOND won his election by being honest with the people about his views and concerns on the important issues facing New Mexicans and all Americans. BILL REDMOND, we look forward to working with you throughout the remainder of the 105th Congress. Congratulations and thanks to all of the Republicans that helped make this come about.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 146 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 146

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and an amendment striking lines 8 through 17 on page 24 shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 3, line 1, through line 9; page 10, line 3, through line 15; page 25, line 1, through line 21; page 26,

line 8, through line 15; and page 33, line 14, through page 34, line 19. Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment printed in part 2 of the report may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendments printed in part 2 of the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 146 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1469, which is the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1997, under an open rule. In fact, this rule may be described as an "open-plus" rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, and it waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule further provides that the amendment printed in the rule and the Riggs amendment relating to the WIC program, printed in part 1 of the Committee on Rules report, shall be considered as adopted when the rule passes.

All points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with

clause 2, which prohibits the unauthorized or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill, or clause 6, prohibiting a reappropriations in a general appropriations bill, of rule XXI, are waived except as specified in the rule itself.

These exceptions relate to those legislative and unauthorized provisions contained in the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations which were objected to by the authorizing committee of jurisdiction. In an effort to be as fair as possible to all Members and to respect the committee system, the Committee on Rules followed its standard protocol of leaving any provision to which an authorized committee objection was raised subject to a point of order. Specifically, this rule leaves the following unprotected:

Provisions relating to enrollments in the Conservation Reserve Program; provisions establishing exemptions to the Endangered Species Act for disaster areas; language changing existing procurement rules with respect to currency paper; and unauthorized parking garage and rescissions of contract authority from the transportation trust funds.

□ 1045

The rule also waives all points of order against each amendment printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. It provides that these amendments may only be offered in the order specified, shall be debatable for the time specified in this report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall be considered as having been read, shall be offered only by the Member designated in the report, and shall not be subject to further amendment or a demand for a division of the question.

Once these nine amendments have been considered by the House, the rule also provides for consideration of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The rule grants priority in recognition to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration if otherwise consistent with House rules.

The rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce the vote to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

The rule waives points of order against all amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI, prohibiting nonemergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1469 is an important bill for this country, particularly parts of the country. It seeks to provide needed disaster relief for thousands and thousands of families around

the country, particularly in the upper Midwest, where floods, fires and other disasters have literally decimated homes, livestock and lives. I know that those Members who have not been able to visit there have witnessed it on television and certainly read about it in the newspapers.

Furthermore, the bill provides needed supplemental funding to protect and equip our Nation's 8,000 troops in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, despite these laudable goals, I am personally disappointed that the Senate version of this emergency spending bill has been loaded up with extras, like a Christmas tree, many nonemergency items which may threaten the enactment of these important funds for families and for Bosnia. While the bill before us today also has some nonemergency items, the open process under which we will consider the bill today will provide the whole House with the opportunity to fully and openly debate these important issues.

After hearing testimony up in the Committee on Rules yesterday for 4 hours from over 50 witnesses, the Committee on Rules has presented the House what I would describe as a very fair and open rule that allows 9 additional amendments to be offered to the bill, in addition to any amendment any Member of the House may wish to offer under the regular amendment process.

In this light, I urge my colleagues to support this important rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a bill originally designed to provide flood relief to the people of the Midwest who have lost their homes, who have lost their businesses and have lost personal memorabilia.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Midwesterners who are waiting for this flood relief are not going to get it, at least not yet. Because, Mr. Speaker, despite opposition from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, despite a veto threat from our administration, my Republican colleagues have decided to attach a poison provision to this bill that effectively says, "Stop us before we shut the Government down again." This provision says that our Republican colleagues do not think that they can keep the Government open this year any better than they did last year.

This provision does not belong in emergency disaster relief legislation, Mr. Speaker. The people of North Dakota, the people of Minnesota who have suffered floods and fires, some of their stories really belong in the book of Job. They deserve the Federal relief

that every single one of us wants to give them, and my Republican colleagues should not put politics in the way of helping them put their lives back together.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to dooming flood relief, this bill first helps, then hurts, mothers and small children who need nutrition assistance. Last night my Republican colleagues changed their mind and agreed to rewrite the bill to include full funding for WIC nutrition programs this year. But, Mr. Speaker, it stops there. This bill could end up cutting 500,000 women and children from that same program next year. I am glad to see my Republican colleagues did away with their proposal to cut 180,000 women and children from the WIC nutrition program this year, but next year we will have even more American children and more pregnant women who badly need this nutrition assistance, and my Republican colleagues will not let them get it.

In the Committee on Rules yesterday afternoon, they joined us in restoring this year's funding for this very important program that supplies pregnant women and young children with milk, eggs, cereal, formula, et cetera. But by allowing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] to offer his amendment, my Republican colleagues will be locking in WIC and education funding at last year's level, which will cut one-half million women and small children from this program next year.

Mr. Speaker, it will also keep 86,000 children from Head Start, 360,000 students from Pell grants for college or job training, and 71,000 fewer adults from adult education.

Mr. Speaker, education is the American people's No. 1 priority. I think my Republican colleagues are making a big mistake by restricting its funding. We were not sent here to take bottles away from babies and Head Start away from toddlers, even if it is not until next year.

In terms of this rule, we are in a bad position. This rule is attached to a self-executing temporary WIC funding measure, and I hope that we will be able to reverse the course in time for next year.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, when, oh when, oh when will we stop playing politics on the floor of this Chamber?

Mr. MOAKLEY. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. SOLOMON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress was criticized for shutting down Government. In an attempt to try to be responsible and to try to work with the President of the United States, we are incorporating into this legislation today a continuing resolution. I am no fan of continuing resolutions. As a matter of fact, what this means is that Congress and the President have not

done their jobs when we finally get around to having to have a continuing resolution. If Congress did its job, we would pass the 13 appropriation bills funding all branches of Government and that would be the end of it. But the truth of the matter is that last year when the President and the Congress could not agree, the Government was shut down. This is an attempt to keep the Government open. That is exactly what it is.

Just to explain that, we have 13 appropriation bills that provide for the funding of this Government of ours. If one of those or two of them or three of them are not signed into law by the beginning of the fiscal year 1998, which is this September 30, it means that there will be a continuing resolution that will provide for the funding of those branches of Government for which we could not reach agreement. That is exactly what a continuing resolution is. It means that come September 30 if we have not agreed, we are not going to shut down the Department of Transportation or the Defense Department or any other department. That is all this does.

When we held this hearing yesterday in the Committee on Rules, we had good Members from the Republican side and from the Democratic side. We had the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN], who has 72,000 Federal employees coming up and asking us for a continuing resolution. We had the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], who represents another huge number of public employees coming and asking for the same thing. We had Republicans like the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] asking for the same thing. This is an attempt to keep this Government moving should we not have reached agreement on all these issues. We ought to have less posturing around here and let us get down to the business of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS].

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time, and I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this modified open rule. The rule provides for consideration of this legislation, which as we have heard is extremely important, in a timely manner and without restricting the right of Members to have their say in the process. That is obviously a delicate balance but I am very pleased with the final product we bring to the body to vote on, and I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman, for his leadership on this.

Mr. Speaker, this bill continues the tradition begun in the last Congress of

paying for the supplementals. While commonsense by the standards of most Americans, the idea of actually paying for new emergency spending was foreign to past Congresses. Before the new majority, the old practice was charge it and send the bill to the kids. That was the wrong thing to do. This is the right thing to do, and I commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman, and his committee for making the very hard choices necessary to keep our word with the American people.

Finally, we must acknowledge the Americans who have been dealt such a severe blow from the floods. Yesterday I met with the mayor of Grand Forks and other local officials in that area who are working overtime to put their lives back together, and the lives of the people they represent.

They did not ask for any special treatment or sympathy. They just want a fair disaster hand right now to help them rebuild their communities, which are obviously devastated. They actually have a different view than our committee on how best to deliver the money, and this rule accommodates them by allowing the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] to offer his amendment, I suspect helped by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

As a Floridian, I know the terrible personal tragedy that comes with a flood, hurricane, or other natural disasters. We have them, too. With this bill, we have assumed our responsibility to our friends in the Midwest while not forgetting the American taxpayer. This is a good bill, it is a good rule, it is going to be fair and open, and I urge its adoption.

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

I just want to reiterate and I question my dear friend from New York when he says he is working with the President on this. The President has said in a letter he sent to the Committee on Rules that he will veto this if the CR is in the bill. The CR is in the bill. This is not cooperating with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Here we go again.

Mr. Speaker, we hear on the majority side of the aisle in their press conferences that they are all for bipartisan cooperation with the President, all for trying to work things out and being constructive. But then they bring a rule and a proposition to the floor which invites and indeed guarantees a White House veto. What this does in my view is to give the back of the hand to the President. It rejects cooperation with the House Democrats on a wide range of issues, and it virtually assures weeks and weeks of delay in getting needed assistance to the people who have been the victims of floods and natural disasters all over the country.

The rule does a number of things which I think Members ought to know about. First of all, it has a self-executing rule on WIC so that after more than a month of the majority party trying to cut in half the administration's request for WIC, it now has a self-executing provision in the rule that guarantees that there will not even be any debate on WIC, in order to cover their tracks on the issue, I guess. At least that is the way it appears to me.

Then they have a provision on the FEC. The administration originally requested \$1.6 million for the FEC so the FEC could pursue campaign finance violations investigations and also to provide for an upgrade of the FEC computer system.

□ 1100

First the committee itself said, "Oh, no, no. No money for investigations. You can only use money for computers." Then the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] announced that she wanted to offer an amendment to restore the ability of the FEC to pursue these congressional finance investigations. And so what did they do? Rather than have a debate on the issue, they have deep-sixed the whole thing because in this, if my colleagues vote for this rule, they will be automatically knocking out all of the additional funding for the FEC. Nice, nice job.

Then they have amendments that they are putting out that are guaranteed to produce a veto. First of all, the CR amendment that is being proposed does nothing but turn every single remaining appropriated program in the budget into an entitlement, that is all it does, and it becomes the Bureaucracy Supremacy Act of 1997. It guarantees that there will be no further choices by Congress. It absolutely eliminates the pressure for compromise between the two parties. It guarantees status-quo Government across the board. That is some leadership.

Then they have a provision being offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York which again virtually guarantees a veto. We, under a time limit of 10 minutes, are asked to consider his amendment that would totally reorder our national strategy on dealing with weapons of mass destruction in the Soviet Union, and based on 5 minutes of arguments on each side we are supposed to throw into the junk heap the Nunn-Lugar legislation which has, at the cost of less than one B-2 bomber, helped us to get rid of some 4,500 nuclear weapons within the former Soviet Union.

Tell me whether or not it is responsible for this country to make that kind of major decision on the basis of 5 minutes' token debate on each side of the question. I think it is laughable.

Next they propose an amendment which would in the view of the Pentagon endanger the security of American troops in Bosnia by sending a specific date for a pullout, congressionally

mandated. All of us might like to see the troops out by that date, but I see no sense in advertising to every potential adversary in Bosnia exactly what the date is, after which they can behave like the irresponsible characters that so many of them behaved like before the American presence there.

It has a number of provisions which, far from helping the situation, make matters worse in terms of our ability to get needed aid to the States who need it. The gentleman from New York said, "When is politics going to stop being played on this floor"; indeed that is the question that ought to be asked. This rule is chock full of politics. These amendments are chock full of politics. It seems to me if there is a desire on the majority side of the aisle for bipartisan cooperation that a good number of these amendments that the administration itself has defined as poison pens would simply not be offered.

Mr. Speaker, the way to get together on a deal is to get together on a deal. This CR amendment, simply it is the old saw of someone crying out in the wilderness, "Please stop me before I kill again." We do not need this CR provision in order to stop the Government from being shut down. We need a new attitude on the part of this Congress; that is all we need.

I would urge opposition to this rule, and I would urge opposition to the bill itself so long as it contains these egregious provisions. If my colleagues vote for this proposal, they will be slowing down the delivery of needed relief to those areas of the country who have disasters, they will be slowing down the assurance that we need to get to those folks who we are trying to help by restoring Federal support for needy immigrants for the 1-month bridge that is needed until the new budget agreement takes care of the problem.

So I would urge Members who are interested in bipartisan cooperation to vote against this rule, vote against this bill, have the Committee on Rules go back up and bring us a rule that is truly bipartisan, not one designed to create further confrontation with the White House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman doth protest too much. He knows that this is an open rule, and to stand up and to ask people to vote against an open rule I just think is wrong, but the gentleman is entitled to his opinion.

But let me just say this. Where is the Democratic leadership here today? I want them on the floor, and I want them to tell me and this side of the aisle that they are opposed to a continuing resolution when I am on this floor, and say it now, and also say that they have got the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] and they have got the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN]. I would think that they would want to come over here and protect the 100,000 Federal employees and hear the

opposition from their side of the aisle opposing this continuing resolution. I just think this is outrageous.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, just briefly.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out his leadership is not on the floor. Where are they? It would be nice if they were providing some help in getting us together rather than pulling us apart again.

Mr. SOLOMON. I would say to the gentleman I am a part of the Republican leadership, and we are here represented. Let us get the gentleman's side over here as well.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for incorporating full funding for the WIC program in this proposal, and we are doing the right thing here. This should not be a partisan issue, and with the full funding I think Congress is saying no, we are not going to take food out of the mouths of little babies and WIC is off limits.

I would also like to say with the concerns of some of my Republican colleagues, please do not be penny-wise and pound-foolish. WIC is a program that works, and it works in the longer term and actually saves Federal money.

I will have more to say in the general debate, but I do appreciate the fact that the committee has taken this out of the partisan position and given bipartisan support for this very essential program.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and want to extend my thanks to Chairman SOLOMON and the Republican leadership for their attention to funding for the Women, Infants, and Children Program. This rule does the right thing by bringing the WIC Program to full funding.

This should not be a partisan issue and with this full funding, Congress is saying: "No. We are not going to take food out of the mouths of little babies. WIC is off-limits."

The Congress cut funding for WIC last year significantly—\$150 million. The Department of Agriculture estimates that full funding for the program requires \$76 million. This rule provides that figure in this supplemental.

This self-executing amendment would draw on NASA funding—the national aeronautical facilities account—to offset the \$38 million. We are rescinding spending for our space agency to ensure that our children are provided for here on Earth.

I would like to address the fiscal concerns that I know will be raised by some of my Republican colleagues.

Don't be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The WIC Program is a program that works and, in the longer term, actually saves Federal money. For every \$1 used in the prenatal segment of the WIC Program, Medicaid saves untold moneys and gives healthy productive lives to these children that cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

WIC works. It reduces the instances of infant mortality, low birth weight, malnutrition, and the myriad other problems of impoverished children. The WIC Program also provides valuable health care counseling for expectant mothers for both mothers and children.

In recent months Time and Newsweek magazines have written feature articles on the importance of the years from birth to age three. These articles validate long-standing research based on up-to-date studies of prenatal and early childhood development. WIC funding is a big part of the future development of these infants. Let's not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

This \$38 million for the WIC Program is truly an investment. A wise investment, at that.

Without this \$38 million, we could see another 180,000 women and children dropped from the program.

Mr. Speaker, don't we ever learn? This is the wealthiest Nation in the world and yet, children still go to bed hungry.

Again, WIC should be fully funded and should be off limits. Only, then will we preserve food for hungry babies.

I want to extend my thanks to several of my colleagues who were instrumental in restoring full funding for WIC.

MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio has been a longtime champion of the WIC Program. FRANK RIGGS of California is the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee and we will be working closely to reform and protect WIC when we reauthorize.

Together with JACK QUINN of New York and many other colleagues, the WIC Program wins today. That means women and children—and the taxpayers—win today.

I urge support of the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MOAKLEY], for the time, and I want to start by commending the gentlewoman from Ohio, [Ms. MARCY KAPTUR], and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], for working so hard on trying to restore the money for the women, infants and children program that is such a wise investment for this country.

I do have some deep concerns about this rule, Mr. Speaker. I believe that through the self-executing aspect that we will not be able to debate this WIC Program for as long or as thoroughly as we probably should. So I would encourage my colleagues on both the Democratic side and the Republican side to oppose this rule.

I would say about the WIC Program, however, that as I joined in special orders and 1-minutes to say that the Republicans through cutting \$38 million of this program in the Committee on Appropriations, finally they have come around, better late than never. This is

one of the best bipartisan Government programs ever created. It is an investment in our children, it is an investment in our families, it is an investment in balancing the budget. To have cut \$38 million from this program would probably cost the taxpayers about \$120 million later on through Social Security disability payments that would have robbed from children through all kinds of social costs and welfare costs. Finally, after many mistakes, we have restored this money.

Why is this a great investment? Because milk prices are up, the caseload is up for children and for women, and we have problems in terms of making sure that we get resources to these women in their efforts to make sure they deliver healthy babies.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very, very important that we get this \$38 million restored. I encourage bipartisan support for the WIC Program. However, I do have concerns with the self-executing part of the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just cannot believe what I am hearing here, because to defeat this rule would slow down this process, and they are going to prevent these moneys from going to people that need it desperately, and they need it today, not next week, next month.

We are about to adjourn for an entire week coming up here after this coming week, and if my colleagues defeat this rule, there is no way to get this back on the floor and even deal with this issue.

Second, if my colleagues vote against the rule, they are voting against increasing WIC funding by \$38 million. They better think about that. Those funds are needed.

To speak more eloquently to that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], someone whose constituents are suffering by the day, by the hour, and they want action on this bill.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding, and indeed it is the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] that I care so deeply about.

I am speaking in favor of this rule. In doing so I understand I am at odds with people in my own caucus whom I deeply respect. It does not happen often, particularly on ruled debates, but I think it is important to remember that at the heart of this bill is disaster relief for people who desperately need it. I do not think there is a group in the country that is as desperately in need of the relief in this bill as those in the district I represent, the State of North Dakota, and particularly the region of Grand Forks, ND.

No one can remember when a city of 50,000 has gone entirely under water, but that is the circumstance, tragically, that happened to us when the Red River, which has a flood stage of 28 feet, finally crested at 54 feet, almost double the flood stage.

We need the relief that the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] offers to this package. It is allowed under the rule. Frankly, it concerns me that non-disaster relief amendments are also pending, and throughout the afternoon I intend to vote against each and every extraneous matter that might impede this bill. But let us address it amendment by amendment. Let us not take this whole package off the floor and put it away for another day.

Let me tell my colleagues exactly what is at issue. We have in North Dakota homeowners that face enormous costs of repair to their home before they can even move back in: \$20,000 \$30,000 \$40,000. Their homes are in the floodway. If they throw that kind of investment back into their home, they may have to cash out and move their home in a year because of the arrangements being made to make sure this flood never happens again.

Only by the passage of the Thune amendment and package of the disaster supplemental bill in its ultimate enactment do we get back the ability for people in Grand Forks to buy those homes, get them out of the floodway, give these people the means they have to room their lives. That is why, as the chairman suggested, it is important to move this disaster supplemental bill forward, it is important to move it immediately, it is important it be considered today, which is why the rule must pass so we can get under way with getting relief to people who need it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman who just left the microphone. We should take prompt action on it. But the Republican action of putting the CR in the bill, which is going to guarantee a Presidential veto, is not the way to put prompt action on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

(Mr. MARTINEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, while I am pleased that the Committee on Rules realizes the importance of providing much needed additional WIC funding, I am disturbed by the politics of it. I am the ranking member on the committee that has jurisdiction over this program, and more than that, I visited several WIC programs in my district, and I know full well the value of this program to the women and children. Fortunately, the leadership of the Clinton administration and my Democratic colleagues have convinced the House to provide the extremely additional funding needed. However, I am extremely dismayed by the partisan bickering that kept us until the 11th hour to be convinced of the importance of adequate funding. Had my colleagues known the possibility of an amendment being offered by the distinguished

Member from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] has been discussed for over a week and this issue has received much attention since an amendment was defeated along party lines in the Committee on Appropriations.

□ 1115

I ask, why is it that it has taken the majority so long to see the importance of ensuring that the WIC Program can serve a full case load, and now the Members from the other side are supporting it. But I am troubled by the obvious partisan politics being played with the Nation's children and mothers.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], who really is the sponsor of the WIC Program, but her amendment was not allowed and the Republicans put some other person's name on the WIC bill, and the gentlewoman actually is the one that we look to for leadership regarding the WIC legislation.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], my distinguished colleague, for yielding me this time.

I wish to say that I rise in opposition to this rule and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule.

As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, let me point out to my colleagues that the only reason that the bill appears the way it does this morning is that the Republican majority has been embarrassed, embarrassed into including WIC funding to serve the current level of recipients. Over 180,000 women and children were going to be eliminated from this program, based on the votes taken on the record at the subcommittee level and the full committee level.

I am usually not this partisan, but boy, this morning I am. They are so embarrassed at what has happened at the subcommittee level and the full committee level, they have hidden, attempted to hide their voting record and their handiwork inside this bill through a self-executing rule that will not permit us even to talk about WIC on this floor.

Now, let me set the record straight as to who has been fighting for America's pregnant women and children. At the subcommittee level, not one Republican voted for WIC support at a level to serve current beneficiaries. Every single Republican voted to cut over 180,000 women and children from that program this year. Every single Democrat voted to protect pregnant women and vulnerable children in need of decent nutrition. My colleagues can look back at the voting record at the subcommittee level.

Then at the full committee level of appropriations, of 34 Republicans out of a 60-member committee, only 2, only 2 voted to protect America's at-risk

women and children. Only 2 out of 34. All Democrats voted to protect America's women and children.

So the Republican Party, fearing a backlash, as they should, have tried to cover their tracks inside this rule, and how have they done this? They have muzzled the debate process through the self-executing rule and have moved funds from NASA accounts, if anybody here cares about NASA, into the WIC Program, but nobody has had a chance to even think about or debate at the subcommittee or full committee level where that money is supposed to come from. If it is coming from the wind tunnel projects, how is that going to affect our NASA exports, which is one area where we really do have a positive trade balance.

In any case, I just wanted to set the record straight this morning and say we understand what is going on. We understand what is going on, and we understand the games they are playing, and my colleagues should be embarrassed.

I just have to say I am sorry that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my friend and the chairman of the Committee on Rules, had to be strong-armed into this by the red-faced members of his own party. I am proud to be a Democrat this morning. I am proud to have been a party that fought for America's women and children at every single level.

I also have to say, because I do not think she could say it for herself, I really think if anybody's name in the Republican Party should be associated with the WIC Program, it should be the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA]. Hers should have been the lead name because she was the one that circulated the letter on the Republican side of the aisle. I do not want to get her into trouble, but she should not be a second-stringer on this, she should be right up here with me today. It is too bad that a member of the Republican Party has to be handled that way.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question and against the rule. We should be able to debate the WIC Program on the floor of this Congress.

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

I really take exception to what my good friend, and she is a good friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] said about this amendment, because she and I work so closely together on so many issues when it really means family values, and I am a little surprised.

Let me just say this. I have the amendment of the gentlewoman that she filed with us, and it is the identical amendment that the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, they both filed the amendment. The amendment of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] was a second

amendment, I believe, that she had filed, and so we incorporated, self-executed into the rule exactly what she is asking for.

I do not think we need to talk about pride of authorship here, we need to get the job done. That is what I am attempting to do, is to recognize everybody in this effort. I commend her for all of her hard work on it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio, whom I have great respect for.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, it is mutual.

I understand what has happened here. In a way it is laughable, but in a way it is truly sad, because I remember the debates in subcommittee, I remember the debates in full committee, and I have to say that the amendment that we submitted was very different in terms of where we took the initial funding. We were trying to be somewhat flexible when we came before the committee. We feel that we were hijacked in the process, but I really feel that the name of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] should be on there.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, this is the Kaptur amendment and I would be glad to submit it for the RECORD so that everybody could see it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, for an additional explanation because he has done outstanding, yeoman work on this WIC Program and other programs that affect our families.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding me this time.

As I listened to the teeth-gnashing coming from the other side of the aisle, I am reminded of one of Ronald Reagan's favorite sayings: There is no limit to what an individual can accomplish in life, provided they do not mind who gets the credit.

Let me say at the outset, I served on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in the last Congress. I am fully aware of the concerns associated with the administration of the WIC Program. There are questions on the part of Members on both sides of the aisle regarding why this program needs a \$100 million carryover from 1 fiscal year to the next; why this program has spin forward and spinback provisions in the law; why the administration has now requested a \$100 million contingency fund in their current budget proposal pending before Congress for this program, again, given the fact that it already has an estimated \$100 million carryover.

However, the time and place to debate these concerns, and perhaps make structural reforms to the program, is when we take up the authorization of WIC this fall in the authorizing Sub-

committee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, which I chair, not in the context of a supplemental appropriation.

So the reason that I offered my amendment, which is made self-executing under this rule, is to put back the \$38 million which the administration claims they need to serve current enrollees in the program, with the provision that we will look at all of these policy issues in the fall again when we take up the reauthorization of WIC and the other child nutrition programs.

That is where I am coming from. This is not some sort of partisan rivalry. I do not understand why we have to turn this into yet another partisan food fight in the Congress. There is bipartisan support for the WIC Program, there has been historically for the WIC Program over the years. Members of both parties are concerned about reducing the number of low weight births and the number of birth defects associated with inadequate nutrition during pregnancy.

So again, I take issue with what the gentlewoman has said, I thank the Committee on Rules for making my amendment self-executing, and I urge support of the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the outstanding gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just point out that the gentleman from California who just addressed this House never appeared before the subcommittee. The gentleman said he served on the Committee on Appropriations before.

When the WIC issue was being hotly debated in the subcommittee, the gentleman never walked in the door. When we were debating this in the full committee, the gentleman never made his appearance. And when his colleague from his side of the aisle circulated the letter on WIC, he never signed the letter saying that he supported the current level, a level of funding to support current recipients. So it seems to me the gentleman truly is a Johnny-come-lately to the battle.

As far as holding hearings this fall, the problem is the people being cut off today, not next fall. That is why we need the supplemental appropriation bill passed with that money in there. Waiting until next fall does not solve the current problem we are having, which goes to prove the gentleman really does not understand the program to begin with and what this fight is all about.

I think to ice out one of your colleagues who has fought this hard on the issue is truly a disgrace to the institution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not the gentlewoman's words are a violation in regards to the Johnny-come-lately comments and so on, questioning the motives of the Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not respond to that specific

parliamentary inquiry at this time. Does the gentleman make a point of order?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I make that a point of order, the same comment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman making a point of order that her words be taken down?

Mr. MCINNIS. No. I will withdraw the point of order.

Is it my understanding that the Chair will not take a parliamentary inquiry at this point in time, or the Chair will accept a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not respond specifically to a parliamentary inquiry as to whether her words were out of order.

Mr. MCINNIS. But in general?

Mr. Speaker, let me ask, in general, is it in order to engage in personalities on the House floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rule is that Members may not engage in personalities in debate.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Along with the gentlewoman from Florida, Mrs. CARRIE MEEK, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. PATRICK KENNEDY, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CLAY SHAW, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON, and many others, we have been working on a bipartisan amendment to extend SSI benefits until September 30, and we are glad to see it in this bill.

The Supplemental Security Income program, SSI, is designed to help the poor who are elderly, disabled, or blind. These folks who receive SSI now but are not U.S. citizens, even though they are U.S. residents, would normally be receiving their last SSI check very soon.

August 22 is to be the last date of their availability for this very needed benefit. Now with this bipartisan amendment which is included in this bill, these poor, sick, elderly, law-abiding, legal U.S. residents will get an extension of this assistance.

Through the leadership of the Republican Senator of New York, AL D'AMATO, the Senate passed this SSI extension last week with an overwhelming vote of 89 in favor and only 11 against. On the House side, with the leadership of the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CLAY SHAW, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. JERRY SOLOMON, these poor residents will also now get the same extension.

This will give the Social Security Administration and other Federal agencies the time to implement changes in the benefits that we hope to be making soon, if we are successful in passing the balanced budget amendment and the plan which will restore Federal benefits for all legal U.S. residents who get now SSI benefits.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative and a resident of the 18th District of Florida, I encounter on a daily basis constituents who are legal residents who have resided in this country for many years, who have paid their taxes, many of whom served this country, whose children and grandchildren were born in this country, and who live in fear, constant fear of that August 22 date when their Social Security supplemental benefits, for many of them their basic sustenance, will be eliminated.

How, then, do we justify this elimination of these benefits to those who are eligible? Congress is going to do the right thing to vote for the people, protect the people, and this bill does exactly that.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise against this rule. The Republican National Committee ought to be sending roses this morning to the Republican leadership of the House. The \$1.7 million in emergency funding requested by the Federal Election Commission to conduct investigations has somehow disappeared. The only nonpartisan group that should be looking into these alleged abuses has just lost the funding it needs to get the job done.

On the other hand, the Republican-controlled Committee on Government Reform and Oversight just received \$6 million to carry out its partisan probe. Now they have tied the hands of the only nonpartisan agency empowered to conduct an investigation and to find abusers.

This is not their first stunt. Just last week the Committee on Appropriations actually granted the money, but tied it up by specifying it could only be used to buy computers, like the computers would just do the work themselves. Now the funding has just disappeared. First they give, then they limit, and now they take it away.

I say to the Republican leadership, why are they doing this? Why are they taking the funding away from the one nonpartisan group empowered to conduct investigations?

I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the fine and patient gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1990, while our fellow young Americans were being amassed in the deserts of Saudi Arabia, musket in hand, prepared to do battle when Desert Storm was about to erupt, the Government of the United States shut down. I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] to recall with me, if he will, that here we are in Desert Shield, young Americans poised to do battle,

and the Government of the United States shuts down. A Democrat Congress and a Republican President failed to agree on a budget and the Government shut down, while our young American colleagues, fellow citizens, are ready to do battle in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, it is disgraceful to contemplate even the possibility of the Government of the United States shutting down. It was organized and set into motion in 1789, and it was built to last forever. So long as time shall last, this Government of ours should never shut down. Yet, the people who oppose this rule actually favor the possibility of the Government shutting down. That is appalling to me.

The CR that is part of the rule on which we are now passing consideration would guarantee that no shutdown would occur because of lack of will on the part of the Congress and the President to negotiate and agree to a final budget.

Mr. Speaker, I ask every Member to consider this as a good government bill. This is one that guarantees the soul of our country remaining intact during a time of inability of the Members of Congress and the President of the United States to agree on a joint budget. This is not a partisan effort. We have had dozens of people contact us from both sides of the aisle, most notably the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and others who are interested in making sure we have a smooth transition when there is an impasse in budget negotiations, so we would never have the fallacy, the tragedy, the shame of the Government of the United States shutting down.

I urge support of the rule, and particularly of the CR amendment, which I will be offering.

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

Mr. Speaker, in answering the gentleman who just left the microphone, under the Democrats I think the Government shut down one day. Under the Republicans it shut down for 6 months. Government shutdowns can be averted by negotiation, but when one party does not want to negotiate, that is when the Government shuts down. I do not think that this is necessary in this vehicle. If they want to talk about it and discuss it, I think there are other vehicles that can be addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning as a supporter of a fully funded WIC program, and want to commend our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], for her passion and leadership on this issue.

I had hoped also this morning to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], but he has been called away from the floor, so I will make my point now and hope that he will get back a bit later and be able to make his point.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is the deficit reduction lockbox, which, sadly, is not in order under this rule. A lockbox, as my colleagues know, assures that amendments cutting spending from appropriations bills are translated into savings, not reallocated to other spending. To quote from a current movie, "Show me the money,"—lockbox shows us the savings.

The House has on three occasions overwhelmingly passed the deficit lockbox, twice as amendments to appropriations bills and once as a free-standing bill. Regrettably, the other body failed to match our efforts and this measure died with the adjournment of the 104th Congress. If lockbox has been enacted during the fiscal year 1997 appropriations process, almost \$1 billion in spending could have been locked away for deficit reduction.

The lockbox is a very simple mechanism, and will help restore fiscal responsibility to this body. I regret that the Committee on Rules could not make it in order as an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill, but I hope that the chairman and the full committee will work with us, a bipartisan group of Members, to make it a regular part of the appropriations process, starting with the first appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I just felt compelled to come down to the well one more time and clarify for our listeners, and especially, of course, for our colleagues who will be making a decision on the rule here momentarily, just, again, the background behind my appearance before the Committee on Rules to offer my amendment to add an additional \$38 million for funding for the Women, Infants, and Children Program during the current fiscal year, and why that was made self-executing under the rule.

I want people to understand, and I cannot believe the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is actually suggesting that the chairman of an authorizing subcommittee cannot engage constructively with an issue like that. What kind of precedent would that create in the House? What kind of sour grapes have we heard down here? There is a majority party, there is a minority party.

I suspect if the gentlewoman, who has served in the Congress for a number of years, goes back and searches her memory she might just recall a precedent when the Democrat Party as the majority party allowed a Member of the majority party who demonstrated an interest in this issue to take the lead.

That was not intended to exclude other parties. We made an effort. We reached out to the gentlewoman. We reached out to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN] as well to make our efforts bipartisan. So how do bipartisan efforts ultimately get reduced down to another political food fight down here on the House floor, with people squabbling over who gets credit and one colleague referring to another colleague as a Johnny-come-lately.

Let me not stoop to that level. Let me offer the gentlewoman the opportunity to testify before our subcommittee this fall when we take up the reauthorization of WIC and the child nutrition program, so that together, in the best spirit and tradition of bipartisanship, we can address the concerns regarding the management of the program.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I would be delighted to appear before the gentleman's subcommittee. I thought it was very curious that when we were holding hearings on the WIC Program the gentleman did not appear before our committee, when 180,000 women were cut from the program by the gentleman's party.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that yesterday the Committee on Rules heard testimony from three Democrats who are in support of the automatic continuing resolution, talking about an amendment. One of them spoke very eloquently, I thought, on its effectiveness at the State level, and we should keep that in mind.

Second of all, I think the key issue here is to get assistance to the women and children that need it, and not spend our very valuable time on this House floor arguing about the pride of authorship, which is exactly what I think has occurred on the other side of the aisle. I think it is best to step over that, and let us discuss the rule and let us pass the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to revisit the issue raised by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] on the Crapo-Harman-Foley amendment for lockbox. Clearly, when I came to this Congress I had made an attempt to save money for the taxpayers from a wasteful program in this Chamber. We saved \$25 million on one issue, but that money then became freed up for spending in another boondoggle program, so all of my work and effort in saving the tax dollars was swept away in one fell swoop by a person seeing free-up capital.

The lockbox, much like a savings account, would allow us to earmark that

money for deficit reduction. The gentlewoman from California, Ms. HARMAN, myself, and the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, have had very, very good meetings with the gentleman from New York, Chairman SOLOMON, and others who agree with us on the premise of a lockbox, but now it is time to enact this mechanism to save dollars for the taxpayers, just like American families who decide they want a nice vacation. They forego expenditures and save that money up in an account, so at the end they can move forward in their life. Lockbox will provide fiscal sanity and integrity for the U.S. Congress.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 6¾ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that I will take the full time. But let me simply observe, we have had a budget deal announced by the President of the United States and the leadership of this Congress. That has been met with varying degrees by enthusiasm by different Members of Congress, and yet, whether we are for or against that budget deal, I would hope that every responsible Member would like to see a bipartisan attitude develop for the consideration of that and all others that we deal with this year.

□ 1145

It seems to me that a very important place to start with that bipartisan attitude is on this bill. I do not think we further that cause when this House inserts into this legislation provisions which they know the White House has already announced are poison pills.

I do not much care which party gets credit for some of these provisions that we are going to be debating in the bill today. I do not think that either party gains or loses when we provide aid to regions of the country that are in distress. I think the country gains, and I think those regions gain.

There is no partisan approach to disaster relief, and I personally was happy to see that there will be an amendment offered that tries to restore community development block grant funding to the disaster package which this Congress is going to support. I supported that proposition in the committee. We were stopped from, we were asked by the majority in the committee not to provide an amendment at that time. They promised they would keep an open mind during the process to see whether or not a consensus could develop around it, and that has happened. So the Thune amendment is going to be offered, and I think Members will see bipartisan support for that amendment and a number of others.

I think it is especially dangerous for the House to insert totally extraneous

material, including an amendment which would virtually trash the program which has enabled us to eliminate 4,500 nuclear weapons that were formerly existent in the former Soviet Union. I do not see any reason on God's green Earth why we ought to do that, especially on the basis of 5 minutes of discussion on both sides. That is simply too serious a matter to be handled in such a cavalier and thoughtless fashion.

I also think that it is going to do nothing but delay this proposition when we add to that the CR provision which the White House has already indicated it is going to veto. And I do not think it was fair at all in the way the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] was treated on the WIC amendment. I find it interesting that some of the same folks who originally said that we were being disingenuous when we produced the numbers that indicated that we needed the full funding for WIC, those are some of the same Members who are now saying, "oh, gee whiz, we have to support this through a self-executing rule."

I would also point out that this bill is not going to be paid for. When it left the committee, it was at least paid for on the budget authority side, but because of actions taken in the Committee on Rules, which they had a perfect right to take, this bill, in fact, will not be paid for on either the outlay side or the budget authority side as it leaves the House. I do not think that helps in getting aid to the areas of the country who most need it.

I very regretfully urge that we vote against the rule so that the Committee on Rules can bring us a better rule which will deal with the WIC problem, which will deal with the immigrant problem, which will deal with the other disaster problems, but which will be stripped of most of the extraneous material that can only slow this much-needed proposal down.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

I would say there are natural disasters and there are human disasters. Certainly a human disaster is one when we cut WIC programs that affect thousands of children and thousands of expectant mothers. I would just say to the Committee on Rules chairman and Members on the Republican side, why did they not allow a bipartisan amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] to share the credit, to allow debate rather than having a self-executing rule which will gag debate and limit the credit.

I am delighted that the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is going to help us later on in the fall, but we have an immediate problem right now with

caseload and milk prices and a freeze on disability benefits for children. The problem is right now. I hope in a bipartisan way we would give credit where credit is due to the Members that have worked so hard on this.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply note that this rule also denies to the Republican chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the right to offer a very thoughtful and fair-minded substitute on the amendment to be offered on Bosnia. I think that alone is a very good reason to turn down this rule.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and urge Members to vote no on the rule; among other reasons, because it has a self-executing procedure that denies us an opportunity to debate WIC.

It is not a bipartisan effort. It does not allow us to fully consider what is being done in the bill to tap NASA funds and shift those dollars to other places. I find it amusing but sad that there are some who are trying to hold this baby close to their breast but they were nowhere to be seen when the babies were dying in subcommittee and full committee.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just say again, there has been a lot of conversation about the WIC Program in here. I will just say one more time to my very good friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], and she is a good friend, that we have taken her fallback position which takes the funding, the increased funding for WIC, and pays for it out of NASA funds. Here is the amendment. This is an identical amendment to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. We tried to self-execute into this rule the names of both the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] to make it bipartisan. Now there is some complaint about it. Nevertheless, it is in the bill.

Second, let us talk about this continuing resolution for a moment, because again we all know that the Government was shut down 2 years ago and the American public were upset over that. This is an attempt to make sure that that does not happen again.

If the President has changed his mind and he does not care about the Government being shut down, he can veto this supplemental bill. If he does, the bill will come back and no doubt we will take the continuing resolution out. Then it will be the responsibility of the President if the Government is shut down. I do not know how much more fair we can be than this.

Let me just say that the rule is an open rule. It is an open rule, plus we have made amendments in order, some of which may be offered, and some may not. I understand now that the Bosnia amendment may not even be offered,

and it may be postponed and dealt with in the defense authorization bill. If that happens, I am opposed to that, but nevertheless, if that is the consensus viewpoint, then we would not offer the Bosnia amendment. And we would deal with that in coming weeks when the defense authorization bill comes up.

Other than that, this is a totally open rule. It means that any Member of Congress on either side of the aisle can come and offer amendments to cut. They can offer amendments to add. They can offer amendments to cut and offset, but they are not being deprived in any way. That is why Members of Congress should come over, for one reason and one reason only, they should come over and vote for this rule, because it will expedite these moneys going into these areas.

I can guarantee my colleagues that 13 Republicans from the State of New York are going to vote to help those people in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota that have been deprived, that have been hurt by this flooding, because we know that sometime the shoe may be on the other foot and we may be needing to ask for help, too, just as South Carolina was when there was a hurricane that went through, just as California was helped when they had the earthquakes. We need to help each other.

Having said that, I would like every Member to come over to the floor and vote for this rule, which increases funding for WIC by \$38 million, which is exactly what the President requested. We put it into the rule at his request. Come over here and vote to give these people this aid.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rulemaking in order the fiscal year 1997 emergency supplemental appropriations bill. I must oppose it because this rule does not protect section 601 of the committee-passed bill.

For nearly 117 years, Crane & Co. has been awarded the contract to provide the Bureau of Engraving and Printing its currency paper. I certainly do not hold Crane & Co. at fault for that.

However, in fiscal year 1988, a provision of law was added that required the Department of Treasury to purchase currency paper only from American-owned firms and that the paper be manufactured in the United States. The report language accompanying the fiscal year 1988 continuing resolution stated that the company must be 90 percent owned by American citizens—a provision that essentially guaranteed that the family-owned Crane & Co. in Dalton, MA, would be the only company that could, under interpretation of this report language, compete for the currency paper contract. This provision would not allow American-owned companies that are public to compete because it is possible there may be greater than 10 percent foreign interest in the stock.

During the fiscal years 1995 and 1996 hearing cycles, the Treasury Subcommittee heard from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing that the 1988 report language limited competition for the procurement of paper and increased costs to the taxpayer. So, in report language

which accompanied the fiscal year 1996 appropriation for Treasury, Congress promoted competition for the procurement of currency paper by clarifying that American-owned should include companies that are over 50 percent American-owned.

However, the Treasury Department, in a clear attempt to politicize this issue, caved into Massachusetts interests and determined that 1996 report language does not supersede 1988 report language. I ask my colleagues to think about the implications of this Treasury General Counsel decision which says subsequent report language cannot alter earlier report language—a decision that states when Congress gives agencies direction through report language, the administration does not have to abide by that direction.

Thus, we find it necessary to include section 601 of this bill to enforce the 1996 congressional intent through binding bill language.

I am outraged that this rule does not protect section 601 and will allow only one company to compete for the procurement of currency paper. All American-owned companies—not just Crane & Co.

My colleagues should know that the Treasury Department Inspector General has been conducting an audit of contracts between Crane & Co. and the BEP for over 5 years. Not until this week did Crane open up its financial books to the IG who is trying to determine if the taxpayer is getting the best value on procurement of currency paper. We have reason to believe that the profit margin for Crane & Co. is as high as 20 percent—far exceeding the normal rate for Government contracts. In 1996, Crane & Co. agreed to a \$9.7 million settlement with the BEP over unallowable costs which it had charged against previous contracts. This settlement—by itself—should be proof that competition is needed to ensure the best price to taxpayers.

There are more reasons why section 601 should be protected in this rule, but I am confident that this matter will ultimately be resolved in favor of competition between American-owned businesses, and in favor of taxpayers.

I want my colleagues to know that, although this issue seems to have died with the supplemental, it won't be dead for long. I fully intend to pursue open competition among American-owned companies for the production of our Nation's currency and I will not stop until I have succeeded.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that is important here is that the bill provides the full \$76 million needed for the WIC Program to avoid cutting off mothers, infants, and children in the current fiscal year. This was done by a Rules Committee amendment that added \$38 million to the original \$38 million reported out of Committee—the very proposal that my Ohio colleague, Congresswoman KAPTUR, and our colleague from New Jersey, Congresswoman ROUKEMA, vigorously fought for over the past 2 months, with stiff resistance until this welcome change of heart on the issue. Due credit should go to Representative KAPTUR and Representative ROUKEMA for their hard work on WIC in this bill, and their strong support for WIC throughout the process. I thank them for ensuring that mothers and children are not thrown off the program and put at nutritional risk during the very time when other assistance is being scaled back.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 229, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—193

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Paul
Archer	Goodling	Paxon
Armey	Goss	Pease
Bachus	Greenwood	Peterson (MN)
Baker	Gutierrez	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Hansen	Petri
Barcia	Hastert	Pomeroy
Barrett (NE)	Hastings (WA)	Porter
Bartlett	Hayworth	Portman
Barton	Hefley	Pryce (OH)
Bateman	Herger	Quinn
Bereuter	Hobson	Ramstad
Berry	Hoekstra	Regula
Bilbray	Horn	Riggs
Billrakis	Hostettler	Riley
Bliley	Houghton	Rogers
Boehlert	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonilla	Inglis	Roukema
Bono	Istook	Royce
Bryant	Jenkins	Ryun
Bunning	Johnson (CT)	Salmon
Burr	Johnson, Sam	Sanford
Burton	Kasich	Saxton
Callahan	Kelly	Scarborough
Calvert	Kim	Schaefer, Dan
Campbell	Klug	Schaffer, Bob
Canady	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	LaHood	Shadegg
Coble	Largent	Shaw
Coburn	Latham	Shimkus
Combest	LaTourette	Shuster
Cook	Lazio	Skeen
Cox	Leach	Smith (MI)
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crapo	Lewis (KY)	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Linder	Smith (TX)
Davis (VA)	Livingston	Smith, Linda
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Snowbarger
Dickey	Lucas	Solomon
Dingell	Manzullo	Spence
Dreier	McCollum	Stearns
Duncan	McCrery	Stump
Dunn	McDade	Sununu
Ehlers	McHugh	Talent
Emerson	McInnis	Tauzin
English	McIntyre	Taylor (NC)
Ensign	McKeon	Thomas
Everett	Meek	Thornberry
Ewing	Metcalfe	Thune
Fawell	Mica	Trafficant
Foley	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Forbes	Minge	Wamp
Fowler	Molinari	Watkins
Fox	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)
Franks (NJ)	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Weller
Gallely	Nethercutt	White
Ganske	Neumann	Whitfield
Gekas	Ney	Wolf
Gibbons	Northup	Wynn
Gilchrest	Nussle	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Olver	Young (FL)
Gillman	Oxley	
Goode	Packard	

NAYS—229

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich
Ackerman	Bass	Blumenauer
Allen	Becerra	Blunt
Baessler	Bentsen	Bonior
Baldacci	Berman	Borski
Barr	Bishop	Boswell

Boucher	Hill	Pallone
Boyd	Hilleary	Pappas
Brady	Hilliard	Parker
Brown (CA)	Hinchee	Pascrell
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Pastor
Brown (OH)	Hookey	Payne
Camp	Hoyer	Pelosi
Capps	Hulshof	Pickering
Cardin	Hutchinson	Pickett
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Pitts
Castle	Jackson-Lee	Pombo
Chambliss	(TX)	Poshard
Chenoweth	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Christensen	John	Radanovich
Clay	Johnson (WI)	Rahall
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clement	Jones	Reyes
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rivers
Collins	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Condit	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Rogan
Cooksey	Kennelly	Rothman
Costello	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Coyne	Kilpatrick	Rush
Cramer	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Cubin	King (NY)	Sanchez
Cummings	Kingston	Sanders
Danner	Klecza	Sandlin
Davis (FL)	Klink	Sawyer
Davis (IL)	Kolbe	Schumer
Deal	Kucinich	Scott
DeFazio	LaFalce	Serrano
Delahunt	Lampson	Sessions
DeLauro	Lantos	Shays
DeLay	Levin	Sherman
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Deutsch	Lipinski	Skaggs
Dicks	Lofgren	Slaughter
Dixon	Lowey	Smith, Adam
Doggett	Luther	Snyder
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Souder
Doolittle	Maloney (NY)	Spratt
Doyle	Manton	Stabenow
Edwards	Markey	Stenholm
Ehrlich	Martinez	Stokes
Engel	Mascara	Strickland
Eshoo	Matsui	Stupak
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Farr	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	McGovern	Thompson
Fazio	McIntosh	Thurman
Filner	McKinney	Tiahrt
Foglietta	McNulty	Tierney
Ford	Meehan	Torres
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Towns
Frost	Millender	Turner
Furse	McDonald	Upton
Gedjenson	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Gephardt	Mink	Vento
Gonzalez	Moakley	Visclosky
Gordon	Mollohan	Waters
Graham	Moran (VA)	Watt (NC)
Granger	Murtha	Waxman
Green	Nadler	Weldon (PA)
Gutknecht	Neal	Wexler
Hall (OH)	Norwood	Weygand
Hall (TX)	Oberstar	Wicker
Hamilton	Obey	Wise
Harman	Ortiz	Woolsey
Hastings (FL)	Owens	Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Flake	Schiff
Buyer	Hefner	Skelton
Cannon	Holden	Stark
DeGette	McHale	

□ 1216

Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Messrs. PICKERING, SESSIONS, CHRISTENSEN, DAVIS of Florida, ROGAN, MCINTOSH, Ms. GRANGER, and Messrs. NORWOOD, BRADY, GONZALEZ, and PARKER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COX of California and Mr. HERGER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was not agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment to advise the body that I have made a decision about the schedule. What I would like to ask our Members to do in consideration of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to have an opportunity to bring their team together, that we would spend the next hour entertaining 5-minute special orders, which I expect will be entertaining, and allow them time to prepare to return to the floor and complete the very important work on the housing bill, perhaps even to have that bill completed today.

With the indulgence of all of our Members, I would ask, then, that we go ahead, retire to 5-minute special orders for 1 hour and at that point we can bring that very important work to the floor.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, would my distinguished colleague from Texas tell us when he expects the supplemental to come back to the floor in the form of a rule?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. BONIOR. I did it as nicely as I could.

Mr. ARMEY. Nearly as nice as the gentleman appreciated his inquiry.

We will, of course, be discussing the supplemental and the rule with the Committee on Rules. We would, of course, try to bring that back as soon as possible. I will see what advice I can give to the body later in the day.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members agree, then, we will retire to 5-minute special orders for 1 hour, at which time we will bring up the housing bill again.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 148) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 148

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and that they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Small Business:

Ruben Hinojosa of Texas;

Marion Berry of Arkansas.

To the Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Ciro Rodriguez of Texas.

The resolution was agreed to.