

and signed by the President, a clean emergency bill to deal with these natural disasters and with our peacekeepers' needs in Bosnia, no reason at all why that should not have been passed by the Congress and signed into law by the time we went home for our Memorial Day long weekend, and the 10 days that we, as Members of Congress, spent in our districts.

However, on May 23, we recessed. There was an attempt by the majority to adjourn, but instead, that was denied by a relatively wise majority that day, a majority of the Members, and we instead recessed for those 10 days, leaving those hundreds of thousands of families without having been dealt with fairly for the disasters that they had undergone.

Then it took us the whole next week after we came back until June 5, late last week, when we finally passed the emergency legislation, and even then, the majority did not send it to the President. Even then, they held it over the weekend until the beginning of this week, when they knew that they had added provisions to the legislation that the President had said very clearly change the balances of powers that were extraneous to any emergencies that would force a veto, and so early this week he vetoed the legislation.

Why did the Republican majority follow this kind of strange procedure in this legislation? Well, they had a major environmental rider in the legislation which was to the conversion of certain claimed rights-of-way, conversion of rights-of-way to paved highways across National Parks and Public Lands and military installations. That legislation, that rider by itself, could never have passed this Congress, could never have passed either branch of the Congress, yet it was put into this bill and it was not even an emergency.

Then they had a census rider in there that the President said that he would have to veto which would have removed the procedure for sampling that has been used in each of the last two censuses under a Democratic President, under a Republican President, that procedure for sampling of our population that gives us the most accurate possible census at the lowest possible cost.

Now, why was that? Well, it turns out that there seemed to be some belief that it was an advantage, it would be an advantage to the Democratic Party. Well, that is not really the case. It is not at all clear who would be advantaged. The only thing happening here was that by adding that rider, we end up with a higher cost census, a less accurate census, and one that is very difficult to get done at all. So that rider was put on.

Then the third and probably the most critical item among the riders was that to impose a distinct power shift in the constitutional powers in dealing with budgets between the Congress and the presidency. For those reasons it was vetoed, and for those reasons the clean

bill should be passed by this Congress and sent back to the President so he can sign it.

EUROPEAN SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about a very important issue and that is NATO. On April 4, 1949, the United Nations, Canada and 10 European governments signed the North Atlantic Treaty creating NATO. It was established to deter potential Soviet aggression in Europe and provide for the collective self-defense of the alliance.

Since then, NATO has reshaped its military strategy fundamentally in the wake of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty, the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, and the massive cuts in U.S. short-range nuclear forces towards power projection with more mobile forces and away from an armored positional force in Central Europe.

During the December 1994 NATO summit, the U.S. expressed its interest in expanding NATO in order to, one, strengthen nations that share our U.S. belief in democracy; two, continue the development of free market economies open to U.S. investment and trade; and, three, secure allies willing to share in cooperative efforts on a range of global issues; and finally, four, preserve a Europe free from domination by any single power.

I believe that the enlargement of NATO will enhance stability by providing NATO's security guarantee for candidate states working to construct viable democracies and free market systems, Mr. Speaker. I call for my colleagues tomorrow to support the European Security Act, which will help to expand NATO. H.R. 1758 declares that the door to membership in NATO should remain open to all emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe, and expresses the sense of Congress that the Baltic Nations and Romania should not be admitted to NATO, and declares that Congress will not approve international agreements that accord second-class status to any new NATO members.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill declares that the door to NATO membership should not close in the first round of NATO enlargement this summer. Aspiring members who may be left out of the first round must be assured they will be considered for NATO membership in the future. This particular measure provides that Romania, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania shall each be designated as eligible to receive assistance under the NATO Participation Act of 1994.

So I urge my colleagues to give careful attention to this legislation when it is debated on the floor, because I believe it is of interest not only to Amer-

icans, but to all of those who live in the countries that have been designated as those who will be positive for NATO and positive for world peace.

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

[Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

STOP THE BATTLE OF THE BULGE IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to talk about the battle of the bulge, or maybe it is a battle with the bulge. That is the emergency supplemental appropriations legislation that the Republicans seem to think will play politics with the lives of thousands and thousands and thousands of citizens in the Dakotas, Minnesota, and California, and 29 other States ravaged by flooding and other natural disasters.

Coming from the State of Texas, we well know the tragedy of natural disasters, whether it is hurricanes or floods or tornadoes. Most States in this Nation have had their share. Therefore, it seems much more than a crisis, but a literal shame that the Republicans have decided to play politics with a simple act, and that is, show them the money and get them the money. That is the call, and that is what we need to be doing in the U.S. Congress.

It is interesting that I stand here on June 10, 1997, for it was on March 19, 1997, that the President sent to this Congress, almost 3 months ago, the need for emergency disaster assistance and urged this Congress to act promptly. There is no hardness or difficulty to this legislative act. It is simply to pass an emergency supplemental appropriations bill that will provide \$5.8 billion of much-needed assistance to people hard-hit and hit in the pocketbook, if you will.

In addition, it included \$1.8 billion for the Department of Defense in related efforts for our peacekeeping needs in Bosnia and Southwest Asia. But yet, rather than send a clean supplemental appropriations bill, this Congress decided to load it down with ill-advised and unnecessary pieces of legislation.

For example, rather than emphasizing the need of those individuals over and over again by passing this clean supplemental appropriations bill, we would find in this particular legislative package the battle of the bulge. We would find elimination of the ability to use sampling in the census.

Someone might ask, why is that relevant? Why are we even having that in legislation without full discussion and

understanding whether that is a positive or a negative? Frankly, that is a good question, because in fact it has been clearly shown that sampling is an accepted method of creating the census. Politics again, allegations that sampling benefits one group over the other, Democrats versus Republicans, and yet the real question is providing the dollars for those who are in need in the Dakotas and Minnesota, California, and 29 other States.

What else is in here? Questions under the Department of Justice, issues dealing with the environment. One would wonder why that was in there, and other matters that are extraneous to the actual needs of these citizens.

I would simply say that time is now overdue for clearly responding to the President's veto. He is serious. But more important, he cares about those, and we care about those who are in need of money to pursue the cleanup, the rebuilding, the rebuilding of lives and families. All we have to do is simply respond to the President's request, simple request coming 3 months ago: Pass a clean emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Stop taking away the ounce of prevention program, a program that helps communities work together to eliminate crime. Stop taking away money from the peacekeepers, the men and women in Bosnia who have given their lives for this country. Stop interfering with the environment by trying to undercut an environmental process with the Department of the Interior. Stop interfering with the Department of Defense with the dual-use technologies. All of these issues are in an emergency supplemental bill when all we want is the money for these people to rebuild their communities.

I would simply say it is time now to stop the politics and act quickly, swiftly, certainly more so than we have done over these last 3 months. Bring back a clean emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Let us deal with the people forthrightly in those areas that are in need, and then, if we must, have legislative discussions and hearings relevant to these other aspects of this bill, but let us stop the battle of the bulge, cut the fat and get down to the bottom line, serve the people who are in need and pass the emergency supplemental appropriations bill.

DISASTERS ARE NOT PARTISAN

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the staff who are putting in long hours here once again. We appreciate you very much.

Mr. Speaker, on March 1, we had a 260-mile squawk of tornadoes come through Arkansas. By the weatherman's count, there were approximately 24 different tornadoes that came out of the same storm front and caused tre-

mendous damage through that 260 miles. There were over 20 deaths; the majority of them were in my district. For those that did not die and did not lose family members, their life too was severely affected by the storm, and as many of us do who are elected officials in those type of events, we go out there and try and learn and walk with our constituents through their tragedies.

I do not need to go into great detail about those stories. I have talked with policemen who found bodies, I have talked with family members who found family members. I cannot describe house after house after house of damage.

Any of us who have seen those kinds of storms, we know that those storms are not partisan issues. We know that those victims were not only Democrats or only Republicans or only Independents or only black or only white; we know that they were Americans undergoing great tragedy.

□ 2030

I do not see this issue of the supplemental appropriations being a partisan one. I know that Republicans and Democrats together care about the tornado victims in Arkansas, they care about the flood victims in the northern United States.

The issue is not about who cares the most. We all care about what happens to our fellow Americans. The issue is really to me a more mundane one: How do we do the people's business; how do we in this Chamber, how do we freshmen, just completing our first term, just a few months into our first term, how do we do the people's business?

Frankly, my constituents back home are confused by how we are doing the people's business when it comes to this storm. They see in the paper the words "supplemental appropriations"; and I am a freshman, I hear that phrase, and it sounds like some new type of nutritional drink for athletes: supplemental appropriations.

Then I explain to them that is emergency, emergency money for troops overseas, emergency money for storm victims. Then they want to know, why is there such controversy over emergency dollars that we all agree on? And I do not have a good answer. As a new Member, I am still learning.

Let me tell the Members one of my observations here in the last few months. To me it seems there is a difference between compromise and common ground. We elected officials, we always talk about politics being the art of compromise. Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps in emergencies we ought not to be looking for the compromise. Compromises can take weeks and months to achieve. Perhaps we should be looking for the common ground: Find those things that we all agree on, whether we are Democrat or Republican, whether we are in Congress or in the executive branch and are the President. Find those things we all agree on and let us pass those cleanly without this extraneous material.

Mr. Speaker, I ask support tonight that we pass a clean appropriations bill, take out things on which we are having fights, take out those things that have nothing to do with emergencies, such as how to conduct the census. It does not make sense to the people of Arkansas that we are dealing with a very controversial issue, how do we do the census, when we are trying to provide emergency dollars for our troops in Bosnia, when we are trying to provide emergency dollars for storm victims throughout this country.

Tomorrow I hope we will vote on a clean supplemental appropriations bill. I hope we will vote for one without extraneous material. I hope we will conduct the people's business and find the common ground that the people of Arkansas and the people of this country want.

PASS A CLEAN SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOB SCHAFER of Colorado). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year our country faced the disaster of floods and tornadoes that ravaged homes and businesses all across our Nation. In my district in California, the Russian River flooded our communities not once but twice this year. The damage was devastating. It devastated homes, businesses, agricultural lands, and the environment. It played havoc on the tourism industry at the Russian River.

However, Mr. Speaker, in the Congress today we have a disaster of our own. This time the disaster has been caused by the flood of partisan game-playing and a tornado of political maneuvering by the majority party.

It has been over 2 months since the President requested emergency aid for flood victims. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to hold disaster relief funds hostage. They have loaded down this supplemental appropriations bill with pet political projects and extraneous provisions and stopped this bill dead in the water.

Mr. Speaker, the consequences of this delay are enormous. Disaster victims across America cannot reconstruct their businesses, their homes, their lives. They cannot clear their fields for new crops. They cannot get on with the job of rebuilding their lives and their environments.

Speaking of victims and their lives, and about what this game is doing to them, the mothers and babies who rely on WIC, the women, infants, and children program, cannot wait any longer. They have to know whether they are going to be thrown off of that program. Without the \$76 million in supplemental funds in this bill, more moms and children will be denied critical nutritional assistance, and fewer infants and children will get the nutritional