

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, Americans are generous, compassionate, giving people. When disaster strikes, they respond by pitching in to do whatever is necessary to save lives and to reduce suffering. I saw this in my southern Ohio district as recent flood waters created disasters in 12 of my 14 counties. I was inspired by their efforts, proud to be their representative.

Tragically, this Congress has not followed the model set forth by those who have actually suffered these natural disasters in Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, North Dakota and other States and communities throughout this great Nation. It is almost beyond belief that we were sent home for a week's recess rather than staying here to pass the disaster relief bill. It is past time we stop playing games.

I call upon the Republican leadership of this House to remove the superfluous provisions from the disaster relief bill so that the people can get the help they need. This House needs mature, responsible leadership. The American people and the disaster victims deserve nothing less.

COMMEMORATING EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today we remember the victims of the Tiananmen Square massacre and those brave souls who so valiantly fought for human rights in China.

Eight years ago today the world was shocked to witness the brutal suppression of individual freedom and liberty in Tiananmen Square. A massacre which is still not acknowledged by the authoritarian leaders of China seared their memory. The images of that massacre are imprinted on our consciousness. Who can forget the image of the lone man before the tank?

We must not forget those who lost their lives for the cause of freedom. We must not forget those still imprisoned who have lost their liberty in pursuit of this basic human right. It is said that the most excruciating form of punishment that captors can inflict on their political prisoners is to tell them that no one remembers or cares about them or their cause, that they are forgotten. Every time we raise our voices, we give strength to the brave men and women, we keep hope and freedom alive.

The spirit of Tiananmen Square lives on. We remember the martyrs of the spring of 1989. We remember the advocates of democracy who languish in China's prison and labor camps. We remember Wei Jingsheng. We remember the lone man before the tank.

We are here today to show the world that the seeds of democracy sown in 1989 are still alive and that they will inevitably burst forth in a full flower-

ing. One day soon, the goddess of democracy will reign again in Tiananmen Square. But today we must all say to the rulers in Beijing, we shall never forget.

RELIEF FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, in Maine we have had floods and disasters, and this Government has responded very appropriately and very expeditiously. At a time now where the Dakotas and Minnesotas have been in disaster and declared disasters, Congress has been struggling in order to get adequate relief to the people left homeless and the thousands of people left without answers.

The very basic function of our Government is to be there for people in these very dark hours. I think it is totally irresponsible on the part of this Congress to have recessed while this job was not done. Paving roads on public lands, automatic continuing resolutions, and samplings of census and other extraneous material should not be added to this emergency appropriation.

There are thousands of people who are left homeless. There are many thousands of individuals and businesses that are looking for answers. Our Government should be there at this time, and we should not clutter it with unnecessary, unrelated extraneous materials. What we need is a clean supplemental appropriation measure and we need to pass it as soon as possible.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1757, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999, AND H.R. 1758, EUROPEAN SECURITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 159 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 159

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. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confirmed to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After the general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title of the bill 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. 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 on the bill and amendments thereto of final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After disposition of H.R. 1757 it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1758) to ensure that the enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) proceeds in a manner consistent with the United States interests, to strengthen relations between the United States and Russia, to preserve the prerogatives of the Congress with respect to certain arms control agreements, and for other purposes. The bill shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 1757, the Clerk shall—

(1) await the disposition of H.R. 1758 pursuant to section 2 of this resolution;

(2) add the text of H.R. 1758, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 1757;

(3) conform the title of H.R. 1757 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 1758 to the engrossment;

(4) assign appropriate designations to titles within the engrossment; and

(5) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 1758 to the engrossment of H.R. 1757, H.R. 1758 shall be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], 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, H.R. 159 provides for the consideration of two bills dealing with foreign policy reform. The first bill, H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1998 and 1999, is to be considered under an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule further provides for consideration of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule, considering the bill by title rather than by section, and each title shall be considered as read. Also, under this open rule, in

which any Member will be free to offer germane amendments, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole is allowed to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

In addition, this portion of the rule provides for one motion to recommit H.R. 1757, with or without instructions. The rule also provides, in section 2, Mr. Speaker, for consideration by the House of a second bill, H.R. 1758, the European Security Act of 1997, under a closed rule providing for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. Further, the rule provides for one motion to recommit H.R. 1758.

Finally, section 3 of the rule provides that in the engrossment of H.R. 1757, the Clerk shall await the disposition of H.R. 1758, pursuant to section 2 of the rule; the Clerk shall add the text of H.R. 1758, as passed by the House, as a new matter at the end of H.R. 1757; and make conforming and designation changes to the titles within engrossment.

Lastly, the rule provides that upon the addition of the text of H.R. 1758 to the engrossment of H.R. 1757, H.R. 1758 shall be laid on the table.

I would like to note that this rule is the best compromise available for dealing with the myriad of issues that are before us in foreign policy reform legislation in an orderly fashion. Our committee heard testimony from over two dozen Members on a variety of subjects, with a wide range of views, and their testimony was not in vain.

The State Department portion of H.R. 1486 is essentially H.R. 1757, the first bill provided for in this rule. The rule will enable any Member wishing to amend the reauthorization of the State Department the ability to do so under an open rule amending process. H.R. 1758 is essentially the amendment filed with the Committee on Rules back on May 13, when the committee announced that Members should submit amendments for a possible structured rule. Chairman GILMAN filed this language, which was amendment No. 85, which concerns NATO expansion, a critically important piece of legislation. Just as in the amendment filed by Chairman GILMAN, the bill is entitled the "European Security Act of 1997."

As for the portions of H.R. 1486 dealing with the remaining foreign policy issues, for which we also heard testimony on Tuesday, the Committee on Rules will meet in the near future to mark up and grant a rule to consider those important matters.

This rule, Mr. Speaker, is not without precedent. In the 103d Congress, the Committee on Rules split the issue and considered a State Department bill and a foreign aid bill, given the complex nature of the issues and the difficulty in passing these proposals. This was done under Chairman HAMILTON, and

both bills were considered under a structured rule.

I look forward to a vigorous debate on these bills and fully support the rule that makes them both possible. The State Department authorization bill, Mr. Speaker, contains very important reforms. It includes reporting requirements for title 4 under the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act. It makes sure that enforcement is actually carried out on that very important piece of legislation. It also has provisions to make extraordinarily difficult assistance for completion by the Cuban dictator of the nuclear powerplants that he is trying to complete in obvious contravention in the national security interests of the United States.

Obviously, the European Security Act of 1997 is also extraordinarily important, and I think that it is very, very appropriate that Congress is moving forward at this point on that very, very important and delicate piece of legislation. I would urge adoption of H.R. 159.

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

□ 1245

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, a funny thing happened in the Committee on Rules last night. For 3½ hours we took testimony on H.R. 1486, the Foreign Policy Reform Act. This reauthorized the State Department and related agencies. It also reauthorized foreign aid programs.

We heard from 29 witnesses which sparked serious discussion among the committee members. After all, the committee had announced that only a limited number of amendments would be made in order, and Members came ready to argue and debate their case.

But at 8:30 last night, at the conclusion of the hearing, H.R. 1486, the Foreign Policy Reform Act, disappeared. Instead, plopped on our desk was H.R. 1757, which is the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, which is a 185-page bill fresh from the printer, never before seen by anyone in the room. This, we were told, reauthorized the State Department and related agencies and might have included language similar to the original bill.

We also received fresh copies of H.R. 1758, which is the European Security Act of 1997, which contained the text of one of the previously submitted amendments to the Foreign Policy Reform Act, and the Committee on Rules had heard perhaps several seconds, maybe a minute or two of testimony on that amendment earlier in the day. But this also was a 16-page bill.

The Committee on Rules proceeded to vote on a rule making the two new bills in order.

I offered an amendment so that the House could bring up H.R. 1486, the Foreign Policy Reform Act, under an open rule. This is the bill we heard for 3½ hours. This is the bill that 29 witnesses testified on. This was the bill that we all expected to come to the floor today.

But on a straight party line record vote, the Republican majority defeated this amendment. Instead, they rammed through this bizarre process allowing a mystery bill and one amendment to move forward as two separate bills, one of them under a closed rule.

The vote on the rule was also approved on a party line record vote with the Democrats opposed. The foreign aid section of the original bill was gone, vanished. Maybe it was put on a shelf someplace or left in a desk. Most of the witnesses during the hearing had testified on the foreign aid section of the bill, and most of the 120 amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules amended that section.

I am not saying that the members of the Committee on Rules wasted our time taking testimony yesterday on a bill that had already been thrown out, nor am I saying that the 29 Members who testified wasted their time at a sham hearing. It is possible that a foreign aid authorization bill will at some point in this session come forward out of limbo and appear before the House. Then we will have not wasted our time. But I would not say that we should hold our breath.

Is it not ironic that this bill in which we authorize agencies that promote democracy is handled in such an undemocratic manner? This kind of procedure is unfair to the members of the Committee on Rules, it is unfair to the Members who testified, it is unfair to all House Members who are confronted with a new bill and have only hours to read it and prepare new amendments. Furthermore, it undermines the credibility of the Committee on Rules and the committee system.

If the Committee on Rules is going to report out bills that we have never seen, we do not need a Committee on Rules. Perhaps instead we should appoint a search committee to find what happened to the Foreign Policy Reform Act, and maybe some of the House Members who testified yesterday would like to serve on such a committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether H.R. 1757 is a good bill or not. It is pretty hard to absorb a 185-page bill overnight. But I do know that the process is not good. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, this vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote.

A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan.

It is a vote about what the House should be debating. The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for

those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

I include the following material in the RECORD at this point:

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual:

Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues:

Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear and I am sorry to hear my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], a member of the Committee on Rules, characterize this procedure as undemocratic. I want to just remind the gentleman of a pledge that I made on this floor on opening day 3 years ago, and that was that this Committee on Rules would be at least as fair and try to be more fair to the Democrats than we Republicans were treated when they were in the majority. We have tried to live up to that.

This procedure here today is almost an identical procedure that was used during the last years of the Democratic majority on this floor. Let me explain what has happened here. We had before us a combination bill, the State Department Authorization and Reorganization Act coupled with the foreign aid bill. That is the bill that came before the Committee on Rules.

It was obvious from the fact that 120 amendments were filed with the committee, 105 of them in opposition to the position taken on the foreign aid bill, and only 15 to the other section, the State Department bill, that this measure would never pass the House and would go down to defeat, and we would never have an opportunity to even discuss the State Department authorization portion of the bill or the European Security Act, which is a terribly, terribly important piece of legislation that we must give to the President of the United States in order to give him the strength to deal with our other NATO allies in opening the door to NATO expansion.

Therefore, it was the wisdom of the Committee on Rules that we would strip out the foreign aid bill, leaving it there for a future action by the Committee on Rules. In the meantime, all of the witnesses have appeared, they have testified on behalf of their amendments. They do not have to do this over again. When we are ready to put the foreign aid bill on the floor, all of those amendments will be considered in consultation with the Democrats and will appear on the floor of this House.

In the meantime, we now have an open rule on this floor right now so that any Member offering amendments and testifying yesterday will be able to offer those amendments today, including other amendments that they did not even file with the Committee on Rules. That is much more fair than what happened in 1993.

There is another portion to the rule which brings a bill to the floor that was an amendment to the measure pending before the Committee on Rules, and that was an amendment by

the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], which was the European Security Act.

In order to make sure that this is going to be a part of the bill that is sent to the Senate where we have opposition by, and I am not supposed to mention Members of the other body, but Senator KENNEDY, who absolutely opposes any kind of NATO expansion, the only way we can guarantee that we will give the President the opportunity to receive this European Security Act is to attach it to this bill. That is what we are going to do. We are going to have an up-or-down vote on the European Security Act.

Let me just briefly tell my colleagues what that is. Two years ago, this body by an overwhelming vote passed the NATO Participation Act which named four countries, they were Slovenia, Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic, to be able to receive some help in order for them to upgrade their military from out of the Russian influence and into the NATO influence, to communicate and interoperate, and this bill was passed overwhelmingly by this body.

This year, after consultation with President Clinton, I spoke to him for almost an hour on this before he went to Helsinki and before we went into the former Soviet republics, we agreed that the door would remain open to all of these former Soviet bloc countries who had made irreversible progress toward democracy, who had moved toward a free market economy with the privatization and capitalization of their industries, who supported human rights and the rule of law, and then were able to militarily participate. In order to keep that door open, that is why we have this bill on the floor today.

It expands those four countries to four more countries. They are Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Romania, all of which have made great progress and deserve to have the opportunity to join NATO. This bill will give them some additional funds in order to help them, again, communicate and interoperate with the NATO forces, and that is why we are here today.

It is totally fair. It is an open rule on every single amendment that wants to be offered germane to the State Department authorization bill, and an up-or-down vote on this important issue.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just in reaction to the chairman. We had 29 witnesses. We stayed here until, I do not know how late last night, maybe 8:30, a quarter to 9. There were 120 amendments offered. It was almost like pretty much a waste of time, because that bill for the most part, as the gentleman knows, is pretty much dead. That bill has about as much chance of passing, that foreign aid section of the bill, than a man in the Moon. I think everybody knows that. I think if I were the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and to have a bill that I had worked so

long on, so hard on, to have it be tangled up and confused and messed up and separated like this, I would be amazed. I would be jumping up and down.

The other section of the bill that the gentleman just talked about was 17 pages long. That was an amendment that was one amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. He had 20 amendments that he offered to his own bill yesterday in the Committee on Rules and he probably spoke less than a minute on that particular amendment. That amendment came back in the form of a bill, of which the gentleman now closes down, of which we are seeing for the first time. We have never seen it before. As a matter of fact, I do not even know that this whole bill put together is available. I have a copy, but I am on the Committee on Rules. I do not think it is available for Members to be able to actually logically amend it in a way in which we understand because this bill was put together last night. It is very difficult to be in the amending process on this particular bill now. If the gentleman talks to the parliamentarian, he will find that out.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, that amendment, the European Security Act, has been pending before the Committee on Rules and before every Member of this Congress since May 13, that is almost 20 days, for any Member to have read that amendment and to know exactly what it is. If the amendment were coming on the floor as a part of this bill, it would be limited as an amendment unamendable, and that is exactly what we are doing now.

I just think the gentleman protests too much. I believe he is going to vote for the European Security Act. It is a good bill, and this body will pass it overwhelmingly.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill has never had a hearing. It never had a hearing in the Committee on International Relations. It never had a hearing in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Neither have any of the other amendments that will be offered here today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. But it is a closed bill, the gentleman closed it, and all the other kinds of amendments and everything that was done yesterday was completely wiped out. We will probably never see that bill again.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distin-

guished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the rule on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. This bill is in essence Division B of H.R. 1486, the Foreign Policy Reform Act, that was before all of us as part of the overall Foreign Policy Reform Act. It is nothing new in this measure. It has just been divided now. It has been reported out of our Committee on International Relations on May 6, 1997, after a wide-open consideration process that extended over 3 days in which all of our members, both the majority and minority, took a very active part in debate. Division B of the bill was the subject of open consideration in the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, chaired by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

□ 1300

We have added a provision dealing with the State Department reorganization. Regrettably it has become necessary to divide the consideration of our reported bill into two bills. We had merely divided the original bill into two measures in order to expedite passage of this, and we are committed to bringing the foreign aid provision before this body within the next week or two.

The rule also makes in order consideration of the European Security Act, H.R. 1758.

My colleagues should be reminded that this is the 50th anniversary of the Marshall plan in which, under the leadership of Senator Arthur Vandenberg, the U.S. Congress made certain that we would not lose our focus on the outside world after the end of World War II. At the end of the cold war, we should follow the example of Senator Vandenberg and not take the isolationist impulse that seemed to take hold of our body politic after the end of World War I.

Our Speaker has noted that we are the only nation that can lead the world. Our President calls us the indispensable Nation. These are two ways of saying the same thing. We must take our place in the world in a constitutional democracy that requires law and resources. The House of Representatives must make the tough decisions required to provide both in the interests of our Nation.

Let me note that this bill, including the reorganization provisions that we plan to add, has been endorsed by former Secretaries of State Eagleburger, Secretary Baker, Secretary Shultz, Secretary Haig, and Secretary Kissinger, as well as former National Security Adviser General Scowcroft and Gen. Colin Powell.

This bill was developed in close consultation with the administration and

with the minority. It makes, or by the time the amending process concludes, will make several important reforms in our Nation's foreign policy. One of those key reforms includes carrying into effect the administration's announcement that it wants to merge two foreign affairs agencies into the State Department, which we are proposing by an amendment.

We have several items in the bill designed to pressure the Castro regime by helping to enforce the Libertad or Helms-Burton Act.

We also have a provision to begin the process of tightening up on abuses of diplomatic immunity, offered by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER]. Because of this provision, H.R. 1486 has even been endorsed by Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

We agreed to accommodate the administration's total funding request, although we added funds in some areas and did not provide full funding in others.

Mr. Speaker, I am requesting our colleagues to help us manage this open rule process by conferring with our staff about any amendments that anyone may wish to offer.

I will be offering an amendment to the bill to accommodate certain concerns of the Committee on Ways and Means. We did not make this change in the introduced bill because we wanted the introduced bill to mirror as fully as possible the bill that has been reported out by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] who is managing this rule and the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and these bills, H.R. 1757 and H.R. 1758, so that we may make a major impact in reforming our State Department.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to tell today whether I am participating in a session of the House of Representatives or a national seance. I mean this bill is going absolutely nowhere. It reminds me of the fellow who was so unlucky that he ran into accidents that started out to happen to somebody else. We do not even have a bill here.

The committee produced a bill; the Committee on Rules then ripped out the guts of it, which is the foreign aid authorization. It contains the unilateral partisan description of the administration's agreement on State Department reorganization, and then it also contains what I regard as an historically arrogant action on the part of the Congress and the West in expanding NATO the way it is expanding.

This bill is going absolutely nowhere, and so I am going to ask Members to vote against the previous question on the rule in hopes that if that previous

question goes down, we will be able to add a third bill for consideration by the House. That bill would be simply to see to it that we can take up the contents of the conference report which has been agreed to so far relating to the emergency supplemental items now before the Congress, stripping that conference product of the three extraneous partisan riders which are going to assure that that conference report will go to the same place that this bill is going to go: nowhere.

It just seems to me that since that conference report with those riders is going nowhere and the bill that this rule seeks to bring to the House is going to go nowhere, we ought to at least try to bring some degree of reality to the House floor. And I would seek to do that by simply bringing to the floor the contents of H.R. 1755 which would take all of the items that have been agreed to in conference on the emergency supplemental, minus those controversial partisan riders, and give the House an opportunity to pass that. At least then we would be doing something real for the sections of the country who need immediate relief because of the flooding which they have experienced.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that that is truly an emergency. Bringing this bill before us today represents absolutely no response whatsoever, no meaningful response to any serious problem. If we bring this rule down or bring the previous question down so that we can amend the rule, then at least we would be bringing something to the floor which would have some meaning for somebody. That might be a very rare occurrence, given what the legislative schedule is this week, but at least we could produce one piece of legislation which did something real for somebody somewhere, rather than this proposal which does nothing real for anyone anywhere.

I would urge that when the previous question vote comes that my colleagues vote against the previous question so that we can take into account the fact that we do have emergencies that need responding to, we do have emergency needs for accelerated crop planting, we do have emergency needs for livestock rehabilitation, we do have emergency needs for people to be able to plan with respect to housing funds to fix some of the damage done by these floods. It seems to me if the House is intending to bring two relatively unrelated bills to the floor, as they are planning today under this rule, we might as well add a third, because at least that third will do something for somebody.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to the balance of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is this slight imbalance in time, but I just point out the curiosity that our friends on the other side of the aisle now want to bring up, talking about something unrelated, the supplemental bill, but under a closed rule, at the same time that they are criticizing the fact that one of the measures we bring up under this rule is not open while the other one is.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time because of the imbalance at this time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY].

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be a member of the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules really is one of the few committees where we disagree without really being disagreeable. My good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I have worked together. We are personally friendly. We can disagree very much on the issues, and this is one of those times.

But, Mr. Speaker, what happened in the Committee on Rules last night makes me wonder if our Republican colleagues are really interested in bipartisanship, because last night, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules took a perfectly good bipartisan foreign authorization bill and threw it in the trash can, and in its place they gave us a closed rule for NATO expansion and an open rule for State Department authorization. So what once was a bill that had both Republican and Democratic support, not to mention the support of our President, has been chopped up and changed so that it no longer resembles the bill which we began last night.

Mr. Speaker, foreign aid is out, NATO expansion is closed, and hardly anything will be germane to the State Department authorization.

But the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman, says nothing is really changed.

Now that reminds me of the story of the tourist who went up to Mount Vernon and was looking around when a tour guide came up to him and showed him an ax and said, "This is the ax that George Washington used to chop down the cherry tree."

The tourist very excitedly, so close to history said, "Really, is this the real ax that chopped down the cherry tree?"

Tour guide said, "Absolutely." He said, "Well, we replaced the handle three, and the head two times, but this is the original ax."

Mr. Speaker, that was not the same ax, and this is not the same bill. It is not even close.

So if my colleagues think the process on this bill is bad, what is happening on the supplemental budget is worse.

Seventy-four days ago President Clinton sent disaster relief legislation

to this Congress. But despite the passage of over 2 months' time and despite the vote 2 weeks ago not to adjourn until the flood victims got their relief, despite the Red River's rising 25 feet above flood stage, despite the fires, despite the devastation, despite the loss of homes, the loss of businesses and irreplaceable personal property, my Republican colleagues refuse to do anything about it.

My Republican colleagues sent the House of Representatives on Memorial Day vacation while the people in North Dakota are still ringing out their clothes, struggling with these incredible losses. And it is not just North Dakota that will suffer. Mr. Speaker, the supplemental contains disaster relief for people in 33 other States.

So what are my Republican colleagues giving us today? Today, we are looking at a rewritten State Department bill. It is one week after the recess. Mr. Speaker, where is the supplemental? The flood victims are not the only people affected by the failure to pass the supplemental. Mr. Speaker, 360,000 small children and pregnant women will be cut from the WIC Program unless we pass emergency funds to keep that program going. And as we speak, our troops in Bosnia are running out of training money. In fact, they may have to cancel training altogether.

Now I know my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, agrees with me very strongly that our troops need to be ready, especially in the field, so I invite him to get some of his colleagues and vote with us to oppose the previous question, and, Mr. Speaker, any Member who believes that the North Dakotans have suffered enough, any Member who believes the American troops in the field should be as ready as they possibly can, any Member who believes that politics is a lot less important than food for pregnant women, small children, should join me in opposing the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, my Republican colleagues will have to stop playing games with peoples' lives and livelihood and the welfare of the American troops.

Mr. Speaker, early on the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said the Democrats did the exact same thing back in 1993. Not so. And I am reading from the statements of the House of Representatives, June 15, 1993. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] who handled the bill is speaking.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman Moakley of the Rules Committee as well as Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Charles Lee Hamilton and the ranking minority, Mr. Gilman, for agreeing to this unusual procedure. I want to especially commend the gentlewoman from Maine, Mrs. Snowe, the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on International Operations for insisting on the separate consideration for these two measures.

□ 1315

So Senator SNOWE is the one that insisted on this. This was not from the

Democrats. We were conceding. We were accommodating the Republican Members on this thing.

Also, following the statements of the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], he is saying that he wants to "especially commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], for taking the lead and insisting that we forge a fair and bipartisan structured rule. This is the second time this year this has been done by Chairman HAMILTON, and it speaks volumes about the character of the man."

"This rule was negotiated on a good-faith," still quoting the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], "basis between the majority and the minority in the Foreign Affairs Committee."

"Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that the rule adopted yesterday, as well as this rule, makes it possible to consider the State Department and the foreign aid issues as two separate bills, even though they were originally reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs as one bill. This is something our Republican leader felt very strongly about, as did I, and so did the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE]."

"So again, I want to thank Chairman HAMILTON and I want to thank Chairman MOAKLEY and the other Members on the Committee on Rules for agreeing to this request."

Now, a statement of Mr. SOLOMON. I now am quoting the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, my dear friend:

"I think it is evident from the provisions of this rule and the process that produced it, that this is a very fair and bipartisan rule, something that is a rarity when it comes to most restrictive rules in the House. I hope that other committees would follow this rule."

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to show that it is not the same bill as in 1993. In 1993 we acquiesced. We did what they wanted us to do. This was done because Bob Michel wanted it, because OLYMPIA SNOWE wanted it.

Today, we do not want this thing. This should never have happened. This is not democratic. I hope that my colleagues vote to defeat the previous question.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that it is truly disappointing that our friends on the other side of the aisle would put into question our commitment to the supplemental appropriations bill and the needs of the victims, when we are working as intensely as possible and will produce legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for his lead-

ership and being so generous since I regularly say nice things about both Republicans and Democrats, and obviously I was very kind when I had the thrill to manage that rule, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has pointed out.

Unfortunately, my dear friend from South Boston did not read further to find that there was in fact a second rule which in fact was very structured, limited the opportunity to provide amendments, and virtually everyone on this side of the aisle opposed that amendment. So I am very generous when they are open rules and when we have a very agreeable procedure, but when we were not treated fairly, obviously, it was not the same situation as we have today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, when the worst floods in 500 years swept through the Northern Plains 2 months ago, thousands of families stood their ground. They filled their sandbags around the clock, they did it in a brave, furious and ultimately a futile attempt to save their homes and their schools and their farms and their businesses.

This was a natural disaster of historic proportions. Neighborhoods were evacuated, city blocks went up in flames, entire towns were under water, people were forced to flee to higher ground, and they called out for help, to their neighbors, to their friends, to their Government.

And how has Congress answered them? It has done nothing. That was nearly 2 weeks ago, and they still are playing games. Why? Because the Republican leadership wants to saddle any disaster relief legislation with provisions completely unrelated to helping the victims of disaster, provisions that further their own political agenda, provisions, by the way, which would slash student aid, would deny veterans medical care, would devastate our national parks.

Now, the President has said he will veto any disaster relief bill that includes these extraneous killer provisions, and he is right. Congress should send him a clean bill that deals with disaster relief for the families in the 33 States that are running out of time and running out of patience and running out of hope.

What kind of leadership is it when politicians put their own personal agendas before the needs of flood victims? Have they forgotten that emergencies demand a rapid response, that emergencies require us to set aside our partisan differences? Now what if the Founding Fathers had sent Paul Revere on his midnight run but asked him to drag along an iron bathtub, pick up a kitchen sink on his way to Lexington?

Saddling this disaster relief bill with major extraneous bells and whistles

turns it into a legislative pack horse that will not make it out of the starting gate.

Why cannot the Republican leadership send the President a clean disaster relief bill that deals with that, disaster relief? It is time for the Republicans to quit holding flood victims hostage.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. This vote will be on whether or not we want to help those people who are suffering. Make no mistake about it, the previous question vote is the important vote on this provision. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and send a clean disaster relief bill to the President today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague and friend from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] to continue the debate on the Foreign Relations Authorization Act and the European Security Act rule.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida, [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], for yielding, and I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. SOLOMON], for giving me the time as well.

I rise to render my strong support for the rule of the bill before us, and I thank my colleague from Florida for once again making sure that everyone understands what it is that it is in front of us. The bill that is in front of us is related to the foreign relations authorization bill, State Department, as well as the NATO expansion bill. We are fully committed to making sure that we pass the supplemental, the disaster relief funds, and that will come very soon, as soon as that legislation is ready.

I thank my colleague for yielding me this time, because these bills before us today are certainly very important. They encompass a wide variety of legislative initiatives to increase the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. Under the leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], we made sure that we safeguarded U.S. national security priorities, that we cracked down on the Castro dictatorship, and that we protected the interests of American citizens.

One provision of this bill which accomplishes all of these objectives is a measure I introduced which sets reporting requirements on the implementation of title IV of the Helms-Burton law, the Libertad Act. This provision helps ensure that Helms-Burton will be actively enforced as Congress always intended by requiring regular official notification on the denial of visas to persons doing business with Castro, using property illegally stolen from U.S. American citizens. It ensures that those who act in total disregard for the security and foreign policy concerns of our country by engaging with a terrorist regime near our borders are held accountable for their actions, and it reaffirms the spirit and the rule of law of the Libertad Act.

It sends a clear message to those countries which place a greater value on profits from business with the Castro regime than on helping to free the Cuban people from their oppression and subjugation. The message is clear: It says foreign companies can continue to exploit U.S. property in Cuba, that is certainly their right. However, in doing so, they must pay a price, and that price is that they can risk their access to our U.S. markets. We cannot sit back and allow for the continued violation of U.S. property rights of U.S. citizens without taking action.

We must obey the law and Helms-Burton is the law. The administration must understand that Congress means business, that when we pass laws and when the President signs them, that we expect those laws to be implemented, fully implemented to their full extent. We must not jeopardize concrete tools for vague assurances from our trading partners. We must stand firm. No compromises should be allowed when American interests are at stake.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill and the rule related to it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the ranking minority member on the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this rule for one very simple reason: This is not the bill that was reported by the Committee on International Relations on May 9. We are considering today a bill not drafted by our committee, but it was a bill put together by the Committee on Rules.

In my view, this rule is offensive to the Committee on International Relations. It disregards totally the committee's work product. It is an extraordinary exercise of power, if not an usurpation of power by the Committee on Rules. It offends the orderly process of the House. It makes the authorization committee in this instance virtually irrelevant to the legislative process.

We all know that the Committee on Rules has a tough job, and if it does its job well, and it often does, the House works its will in a fair and democratic manner. What the Committee on Rules ought not to do is rewrite the bill. It ought not to ignore the committee product. It ought not to put on the floor of this House a bill never considered by the committee, yet that is exactly what has happened in this instance.

It has taken a bill reported out by the committee, stripped out the most important provision authorizing foreign assistance. It has taken an 80-page reorganization amendment, which was filed before the Committee on Rules but never considered by the Committee on International Relations, and made it a part of the text of this bill.

As part of the rule, it has made in order the European Security Act, a bill

that was never considered by the Committee on International Relations, upon which we have had no hearings in this Congress, which addresses the most important foreign policy issue of the next 12 months, the enlargement of NATO.

This process is an insult to the House Committee on International Relations. It is deeply offensive to anyone who cares about the orderly process of this institution. It torpedoed the committee, it sets aside the committee's expertise, and I object to it.

We had coming out of the committee a bipartisan product. I commended the chairman of the committee for the manner in which he handled that bill and for producing a bipartisan bill. It was a fair process that went forward. It produced a bill that had a very good chance of being signed into law, and I think it is correct to say that it is virtually nil, the possibility that this bill, newly drafted by the Committee on Rules, will become law. We are simply marking time.

If we adopt this rule, we will have taken a fair and an open process and replaced it with a process that is deeply flawed. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] for the time.

I rise in support of this open rule providing for consideration of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. I also strongly support the second bill brought up by the rule, the European Security Act, which will be combined with the State Department bill at the conclusion of the consideration of the two measures. These are not new items, these are things that have been much discussed in these Halls.

□ 1330

It has been 12 long years since the last international relations authorization legislation was signed into law. Think about that. What this means is that review and reform of the mechanisms used when the Government conducts its foreign policy and spends American taxpayers' dollars overseas are long, long overdue.

As many of my colleagues know from their own mail, this is something of a sore spot for many Americans who question the effectiveness of our foreign efforts and our foreign policy.

This is especially apparent when they look at the general lack of progress the White House has been making even in nearby countries like Haiti—where \$3 billion and 20,000 troops have made little tangible difference to most Haitians—and have perhaps moved that country backwards by increasing dependency on American handouts. Or countries like

Bosnia, where the administration has apparently made a commitment it cannot seem to extract itself—or our troops—from.

I understand the benefits of reasonable levels of well-managed and monitored foreign aid. These are benefits that are not measured by volumes of carefully staged photo ops. We need to streamline our foreign policy assets to reflect current priorities and the reality of our limited resources, to get more bang for the relatively few dollars we spend to protect and promote our interests abroad.

This legislation will in fact do that, doing away with three agencies, folding their non-duplicative functions into State, along with some functions of a fourth agency—USAID. It also addresses shifting American priorities. I am especially pleased that it places a priority on cracking down on Fidel Castro's regime and chokes off international assistance that could be used by Castro to complete the nuclear reactors at Juragua—an issue of grave concern to my southwest Florida district. Ultimately, H.R. 1757 should go a long way toward creating a leaner, more effective foreign policy apparatus—and one that reflects our changing priorities as we move ahead into the new millennium. H.R. 1757 should also give us concrete progress toward achieving the goal of eliminating fraud, waste, and abuse.

The second related bill this rule brings before us is H.R. 1758, the European Security Act, in conjunction with H.R. 1757. This legislation was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and several of my colleagues to consolidate the gains made by the United States and our European allies in freeing Europe from the grip of the cold war.

As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I am pleased to be able to say this act will take us beyond the first tranche of NATO expansion, bringing the security umbrella to those emerging democracies of Central and Eastern Europe that are striving to meet the requirements for membership.

I think anyone who is watching this issue closely knows that the White House's most recent foray in this policy area makes it more important than ever that the Congress weighs in—this legislation is the right message and it is being sent at the right time.

This is essentially an open rule. It does deserve support. H.R. 1757 should improve the way we do business overseas, and H.R. 1758 is eagerly anticipated and anxiously awaited by our friends, old and new, throughout Europe. A vote "yes" for this bill makes sense. A vote "yes" for this rule gets us to that point.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the majority is perpetuating as egregious a violation of the rules that ought to govern a democracy as I have ever seen. This outrage of telling us that we will have 1 hour with no amendments to debate the fundamental question of NATO policy is a disrespect for the rules that ought to govern beyond what I have ever seen.

I hope the gentleman from New York will be prepared to amend his earlier statement when he said, well, if it had come up as an amendment it would also not have been amendable. That is, of course, not remotely true. If the European Security Act had been offered as an amendment to the bill, a 17-page amendment, it would have been amendable. It would have been debatable without limit. It would have been subject to a motion for substitution.

The question of policy regarding NATO is of extraordinary importance. The gentleman from New York said, well, we have to provide some money for these Eastern European countries. Vote for this bill and we are committing billions of dollars from the American taxpayer to our European new allies. The whole question of burdensharing, the question of whether or not Americans ought to continue to subsidize Europe militarily in the absence of a military threat, we are being asked to vote on this with no amendments and only a half hour on either side.

It is absolutely unprecedented in my experience for a matter as central as the NATO policy, what kind of policy, nuclear policy, conventional arms policy, which countries join, that that is to be a closed rule, 1 hour, one bill, on this NATO question.

I understand the majority is somewhat at odds right now. There is an incoherence in their strategy. They are trying to fill time. But to take one of the central questions facing the world today, whether and on what terms we should expand NATO, how much the American taxpayer should contribute, what should be the rules and which nations should come in, and to do it unamendably, to bring that forward without an amendment, is, as I say, as great a disrespect for democratic process as I have ever seen. The majority ought to be ashamed of itself.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am again just surprised. When the NATO Participation Act passed this floor, as I recall, there were only 7 votes against it. I would predict that is what happens here again today, because this Congress, both Republican and Democrats alike, believe that we should be giving the people that were oppressed by this international, deadly, atheistic, communism for 50 years, they ought to have the opportunity of freedom, the same as we Americans desire. That is why we fought a World War, and a Second World War. That is why the American taxpayer footed the bill for a cold war that was extremely expensive. It is why Ronald Reagan called the Soviet empire the evil empire.

The truth of the matter is that we are going to give those people that right. We are going to enter into a treaty alliance that will say to them, if

your sovereign boundaries are threatened then we, the United States of America, will help you defend those sovereign boundaries. That is what this debate is all about.

I think the gentleman may be sticking up for Senator KENNEDY, who opposes the expansion of NATO, and we are not going to give him the chance to block this legislation. We are going to include it in this legislation, and force a vote on it over in the other body.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman tried to evade the point. The question is not whether we should debate it, but whether we should debate it in a closed rule with no amendments.

I am all for democracy in Eastern Europe. I am sorry the gentleman is not in favor of democracy here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 10 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, without any public discussion, a provision was inserted in this brew last night that would fundamentally alter American policy by repealing the Lautenberg amendment that has made it practical for Jews and Evangelical Christians emigrating from the former Soviet Union to receive refugee status in the United States.

The Lautenberg amendment recognizes a simple and straightforward fact: that there is still a great deal of religious persecution in the former Soviet Union; that anti-Semitism and religious persecution did not die with the Communist government; and that, if anything, with virulent nationalists and anti-Semites like Vladimir Zhirinovsky active and increasingly popular, the need to provide a safe haven is as great as ever.

Finally, even if some in this House are prepared to believe that the Lautenberg amendment is no longer needed, the Jews of the former Soviet Union are not. They are still trying to get out. There are about 40,000 applications on file and the Department of State estimates that two-thirds of them qualify; 2,000 new applications are received every month.

The Congressional Budget Office, after five contrary determinations, now says there is a cost to continuing the Lautenberg amendment. This is nonsense. We set a cap on refugee admissions every year. The Lautenberg amendment does not add a single number to that cap. It simply determines refugee admissions within the cap. So it is absurd to suggest there is any cost involved in this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also drops the entire foreign aid budget from the International Relations Committee's bill. This includes aid to Is-

rael. How can we vote to cut aid to Israel from this bill? The Israeli people are living under the gun. They have to face terrorism on their busses, on their streets, and in their schools. Israel is our only democratic ally in the region.

What sort of message does this send to Israel's many enemies? That the United States lacks the resolve to stand with our friends? That terrorism wins?

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a disgrace. It undercuts our basic values and our policies that have worked for our friends, our country, and our values.

Mr. Speaker, I also object to the inability to stage a real debate on NATO expansion, on where we should extend our guarantees and where not. If Hungary, why not Russia? Why not Ukraine? This House ought to debate that, and this rule ought to be defeated.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, obviously this debate has touched many different issues, because this is far-reaching legislation.

I would like to talk about an issue that was raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] which has played a role in leading me to strongly support both this rule and the legislation.

Earlier this year the American people were outraged when we saw a 16-year-old girl run over on the streets right here in Washington, D.C., up at Dupont Circle. The real tragedy came when we found that the driver turned out to be a drunken diplomat from the Republic of Georgia. Then we, of course, looked at what conceivably could have happened. Of course, what could have happened is diplomatic immunity could have been used, and the driver would have no responsibility whatsoever for killing this young 16-year-old girl.

The immediate gut reaction from me and most people looking at this is why do we have diplomatic immunity? Obviously, diplomatic immunity is very important because it is conceivable that in another country we could see a U.S. officer in fact framed and charged with some crime that they are not responsible for at all, so diplomatic immunity is very important. But modifying the diplomatic immunity laws as they exist is very important.

This provision includes some very important items which we brought about in a consensus which includes, as Chairman GILMAN pointed out, now the support of Mothers Against Drunk Driving and several other organizations that heretofore have not gotten involved in legislation like this.

What we call for is, first, a full accounting of the use of diplomatic immunity in the United States and in other countries, and, second and very

important, we call on the administration to proceed with negotiations to deal with a procedure that would allow the countries of origin to in fact have jurisdiction over the actions of one of their foreign service officers in another country.

It is a very important step in dealing with a critically important problem, and that is why I think it is important for us to move ahead with this rule, get this legislation forward. So many people have said the legislation is going nowhere, but I think that dealing with this problem of diplomatic immunity and the potential loss of life and looking at the other victims means that we should in fact move ahead with it.

I support this rule, Mr. Speaker, and support the underlying legislation, and hope that we will be able to proceed as expeditiously as possible in approving the previous question as well as the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I represent an area of Minnesota that was affected by the flooding this spring. I know that the Republicans and the Democrats alike have recognized the importance of having an effective disaster assistance package for those parts of this Nation, not just the Midwest but the entire Nation, that have suffered from disasters. This is not a partisan issue.

But what I find terribly ironic is that instead of completing the disaster assistance package for those fellow Americans who have suffered, we are turning to a foreign aid package, essentially, for folks in other countries.

This is not to say that we should not fulfill our responsibilities globally. But the problem is, when are we going to take up and address the needs of Americans? Will we do it without placing on that legislation enormously controversial matters, hijacking our domestic disaster assistance bill for yet other political agendas?

I would implore the leadership in this institution to immediately bring the disaster bill to this floor for a vote.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. Speaker, let us all be clear. There is nothing, nothing save the reorganization provision that has been added to this bill. This bill has been before all of us for several weeks. The only change that has been made is we divided it into two parts. We do fund the State Department and related organizations, and we did add the European Security Act. There have been no changes in the underlying bill.

To get involved now in a debate on disaster, the Disaster Act; while that is an important measure, it is certainly not germane to the measure that we have before us. I am urging my col-

leagues, vote for the previous question and vote for the rule. It is an important rule. It is an important bill with relation to our foreign policy.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, it has been 13 days since Congress recessed without taking action on the urgently needed disaster bill. Now, in its first action since coming back into session, it takes up the foreign aid bill. It was wrong of Congress to recess without taking action on the disaster bill, and it is wrong for us to commit taxpayer resources to help the others before we have committed those resources to helping our own.

□ 1345

To the flood victims I represent, this feels like Congress is trying to literally shove our nose in the muck and the filth left by the rampaging Red River. This is what the scene is like in Grand Forks, ND, today. Lives left on the lawn. Everything that river touched that river wrecked. We have hundreds of homes destroyed, hundreds more severely damaged and thousands of people not knowing where they are going to live, families separated now for 6 weeks, not knowing when they can get back together.

We have to take action on the disaster bill. It is not acceptable in any way, shape, or form to pass foreign aid before we take action on this bill.

Let us today vote down the rule, vote down the previous question motion that will be before us, and attach to this rule in consideration of this legislation the disaster bill so that none of us have to go home and face constituents like I will have to or my colleagues might have to someday that ask, why can we help everyone else and not help our own?

Mr. Speaker, it is time to help our own. They desperately need it. Defeat this rule and help our own.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman makes a very eloquent appeal with regard to disaster relief, we certainly want to support that relief. Let us get that conference committee moving.

But this is not foreign aid. This measure before us is the State Department authorization measure and not foreign aid. I just wanted to clarify the Record for the gentleman.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, to the families that have been apart for 6 weeks and have no place to live, it looks like foreign aid to us.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is a very important point of clarification, the one that the chairman of the Committee on International Relations has just made. This is not a

foreign aid bill. Yet the two measures before us are very important, not only the Foreign Policy Authorization Act but the bill wanted by the President of the United States, by the way, Mr. Speaker, to authorize the expansion of NATO.

It is a very serious matter before the Nation, one that relates directly to our foreign policy and to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GOODLATTE]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], I represented an area in New York State, the Adirondack Mountains, the Catskill Mountains, and the Hudson Valley.

So many times during the winter and spring we are faced with disaster. We have ice jams that cause irreparable damage. We rarely get any aid from the Federal Government. We generally try to take care of ourselves up there. But I sympathize with the gentleman. I want to do everything I can to expedite this supplemental bill. That is not the issue before us, but I will say to the gentleman that it is possible for the Committee on Rules today to go upstairs and waive the two-thirds rule so that should the conference continue into this evening and should they be able to file before midnight, we then would be able to hold a rules meeting tomorrow and bring that supplemental to the floor on the same day. We cannot do that under normal rules of the House.

I would just say to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], that he and I might get together a little bit later. We might consider that in trying to help those people in North Dakota and other areas.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues that this is a good bill. The fact is, if we pass this rule, we are going to go to an open debate process, any Member who filed amendments on the State Department authorization portion of the bill will have the opportunity, including those that did not take the time to file those amendments.

So let us get on with it. Let us pass the previous question. Let us pass the rule and then let us get onto this bill.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the heart of all of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands go out to our fellow Americans in the Midwest.

We, who have experienced some of the worse hurricane related disasters in recent years, know your pain.

That is why I rise today, to plead with my Republican colleagues, not to use your distress as a political football, not to make you pawns in the budget and census debate.

It is callous to say that there is no emergency. We have only been able to address the

immediate emergency response. Now we must provide the funding needed to help the people of North Dakota and South Dakota and other States to begin to recover—to rebuild their homes, to restart their businesses, to restore their farms, to begin to rebuild their lives.

This Congress cannot abandon our people in their time of great and dire need. We need a clean bill, and we need to vote to cast this lifeline to the flood victims now.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous questions so that Congress can provide the help so needed by Americans plagued by flooding and other disasters.

Congress should have approved the disaster assistance before leaving for a Memorial Day break. The bill would have provided approximately \$5.6 billion in disaster assistance for victims in 33 States. It also would have provided funds to support our troops in Bosnia and those enforcing the no-fly zone in Iraq. Instead, the Republican leadership loaded down the disaster bill with controversial provisions and then went home without doing their job to help Americans in need.

We had the chance before Memorial Day to pass a simple, clean bill, but the Republican leadership chose to make political points rather than help those in need. Now we are back, but instead of passing a clean disaster assistance bill, we are taking up the State Department authorization bill.

I certainly support our Nation's foreign policy efforts, but I believe we ought to take care of our own people first. Let's defeat the previous question so that we can quickly pass a non-controversial disaster assistance bill.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. 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 219, nays 204, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Bono	Collins
Archer	Brady	Combest
Armey	Bryant	Cook
Bachus	Bunning	Cooksey
Baker	Burr	Cox
Ballenger	Burton	Crane
Barr	Buyer	Crapo
Barrett (NE)	Callahan	Cubin
Bartlett	Calvert	Cunningham
Barton	Camp	Davis (VA)
Bass	Campbell	Deal
Bateman	Canady	DeLay
Bereuter	Cannon	Diaz-Balart
Bilbray	Castle	Dickey
Billirakis	Chabot	Doolittle
Bliley	Chambliss	Dreier
Blunt	Chenoweth	Duncan
Boehlert	Christensen	Dunn
Boehner	Coble	Ehlers
Bonilla	Coburn	Ehrlich

Emerson	Klug	Rogan
English	Knollenberg	Rogers
Ensign	Kolbe	Rohrabacher
Everett	LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
Ewing	Largent	Roukema
Fawell	Latham	Royce
Foley	LaTourette	Ryun
Forbes	Lazio	Salmon
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Sanford
Fox	Linder	Saxton
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Scarborough
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Schaefer, Dan
Gallegly	Lucas	Schaffer, Bob
Ganske	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Gekas	McCollum	Sessions
Gibbons	McCrery	Shadeegg
Gilchrist	McHugh	Shaw
Gillmor	McInnis	Shays
Gilman	McIntosh	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McKeon	Shuster
Goodling	Metcalf	Skeen
Goss	Mica	Smith (MI)
Graham	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Granger	Molinar	Smith (OR)
Greenwood	Moran (KS)	Smith (TX)
Hansen	Morella	Smith, Linda
Hastert	Myrick	Snowbarger
Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt	Solomon
Hayworth	Neumann	Souder
Hefley	Ney	Spence
Herger	Northup	Stearns
Hill	Norwood	Stump
Hilleary	Nussle	Sununu
Hobson	Oxley	Talent
Hoekstra	Packard	Tauzin
Horn	Pappas	Taylor (NC)
Hostettler	Parker	Thomas
Houghton	Paul	Thornberry
Hulshof	Paxon	Tiahrt
Hunter	Pease	Upton
Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)	Walsh
Hyde	Petri	Wamp
Inglis	Pitts	Watkins
Istook	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Jenkins	Porter	Weldon (FL)
Johnson (CT)	Portman	Weldon (PA)
Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)	Weller
Jones	Quinn	White
Kasich	Radanovich	Whitfield
Kelly	Redmond	Wicker
Kim	Regula	Wolf
King (NY)	Riggs	Young (AK)
Kingston	Riley	Young (FL)

NAYS—204

Abercrombie	Dingell	Kaptur
Ackerman	Dixon	Kennedy (MA)
Allen	Doggett	Kennedy (RI)
Baessler	Dooley	Kennelly
Baldacci	Doyle	Kildee
Barcia	Edwards	Kilpatrick
Barrett (WI)	Engel	Kind (WI)
Becerra	Eshoo	Kleczka
Bentsen	Etheridge	Klink
Berman	Evans	Kucinich
Berry	Fattah	LaFalce
Bishop	Fazio	Lampson
Blagojevich	Filner	Leach
Blumenauer	Flake	Levin
Bonior	Foglietta	Lewis (GA)
Borski	Ford	Lipinski
Boswell	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Boucher	Frost	Lowey
Boyd	Furse	Luther
Brown (CA)	Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)
Brown (FL)	Gephardt	Maloney (NY)
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Manton
Capps	Goode	Markey
Cardin	Gordon	Martinez
Carson	Green	Mascara
Clay	Gutierrez	Matsui
Clement	Gutknecht	McCarthy (MO)
Clyburn	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (NY)
Condit	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Conyers	Hamilton	McGovern
Costello	Harman	McHale
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Cramer	Hinchey	McKinney
Cummings	Hinojosa	McNulty
Danner	Holden	Meehan
Davis (FL)	Hooley	Meek
Davis (IL)	Hoyer	Menendez
DeFazio	Jackson (IL)	Millender
DeGette	Jackson-Lee	McDonald
DeLahunt	(TX)	Miller (CA)
DeLauro	John	Minge
Dellums	Johnson (WI)	Mink
Deutsch	Johnson, E.B.	Moakley
Dicks	Kanjorski	Mollohan

Moran (VA)	Roemer	Stupak
Murtha	Rothman	Tanner
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Tauscher
Neal	Rush	Taylor (MS)
Oberstar	Sabo	Thompson
Obey	Sanchez	Thune
Olver	Sanders	Thurman
Ortiz	Sandlin	Tierney
Owens	Sawyer	Torres
Pallone	Schumer	Towns
Pascarell	Scott	Trafigant
Pastor	Serrano	Turner
Payne	Sherman	Velazquez
Pelosi	Sisisky	Vento
Peterson (MN)	Skaggs	Visclosky
Pickett	Skelton	Waters
Pomeroy	Slaughter	Watt (NC)
Poshard	Smith, Adam	Waxman
Price (NC)	Snyder	Wexler
Rahall	Spratt	Weygand
Ramstad	Stabenow	Wise
Rangel	Stark	Woolsey
Reyes	Stenholm	Wynn
Rivers	Stokes	Yates
Rodriguez	Strickland	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Hilliard	McDade
Clayton	Jefferson	Pickering
Farr	Lantos	Schiff
Hefner	Lewis (CA)	

□ 1416

Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GONZALEZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Coble	Gilman
Archer	Coburn	Goodlatte
Armey	Collins	Goodling
Bachus	Combest	Goss
Baker	Cook	Graham
Ballenger	Cooksey	Granger
Barr	Cox	Greenwood
Barrett (NE)	Crane	Hansen
Bartlett	Crapo	Hastert
Barton	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Cunningham	Hayworth
Bateman	Davis (VA)	Hefley
Bereuter	Deal	Herger
Bilbray	DeLay	Hill
Billirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Bliley	Dickey	Hobson
Blunt	Doolittle	Hoekstra
Boehlert	Dreier	Horn
Boehner	Duncan	Hostettler
Bonilla	Ehlers	Houghton
Bono	Ehrlich	Hulshof
Boswell	Emerson	Hunter
Brady	English	Hutchinson
Bryant	Ensign	Hyde
Bunning	Everett	Inglis
Burr	Ewing	Istook
Burton	Fawell	Jenkins
Buyer	Foley	Johnson (CT)
Callahan	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Fowler	Jones
Camp	Fox	Kasich
Campbell	Franks (NJ)	Kelly
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Kim
Cannon	Gallegly	King (NY)
Castle	Ganske	Kingston
Chabot	Gekas	Klug
Chambliss	Gibbons	Knollenberg
Chenoweth	Gilchrist	Kolbe
Christensen	Gillmor	LaHood

Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul

NAYS—200

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse

Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez

Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner

Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman

Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews
Clayton
Dunn
Farr
Hefner

Hilliard
Jefferson
Lantos
Lewis (CA)
McDade

Pickering
Schiff
Yates

□ 1437

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight, June 4, 1997, to file a conference report on 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.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that this has been cleared by the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would simply say that the gentleman is correct. This motion is supported on this side of the aisle as well.

I would simply ask the gentleman if he could tell us when it is the intention of the majority side of the aisle to take this bill up on the floor?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I appreciate the gentleman giving me the opportunity to point out that within the next few minutes, we hope to wrap up the conference report and have it available for presentation to the Committee on Rules and to the House tomorrow afternoon. It would be my intention to bring it up so the House could pass it, and hopefully the Senate will do likewise tomorrow so that we could send it to the President tomorrow evening.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, let me simply say that I would have no objection to this procedure on this side of the aisle, although what I would greatly prefer is for us to strip out the irrelevant riders which are going to cause the President to veto this bill. I think it would be a much faster approach and the relief would be gotten to the portions of the country who need it if we

were immediately to strip those riders out that we know the President will veto the bill over. This way we are simply going to be back next week doing what we should have done straight and clean this week. But if that is the best we can do, it is the best that can be done.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1998 AND 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 159 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1757.

□ 1440

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1757) to consolidate international affairs agencies, to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. HANSEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1998 and 1999. The bill before the House today includes a basic reauthorization of the operations of the Department of State and related agencies and the consolidation of some of those foreign affairs agencies.

This bill is the product of significant oversight and a bipartisan effort. By way of this bill, support is provided for our Government's activities abroad, to include U.S. embassies, American citizen services, passport and visa issuance, and international broadcasting programs such as Radio Free Asia and broadcasting to Cuba. In addition, it funds United States-Mexico and United States-Canada commissions that are tasked with matters dealing with fisheries, with sewage disposal, and other border issues.

We included most of the administration's legislative requests. However, in