

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I deeply believe we have to do much better in the antidrug area, much better. I have spent, I think, more time in my district on this issue than any other, working with coalitions. If any issue needs a bipartisan approach, it is this one. This bill violates that, violates it. It extends the office tenure for only a couple of years. General McCaffrey does not support this bill. We should be working with him. Goals are set without relationship to what the office thinks is realistic. Let us not make this into a political football. Let us work together on this issue. Give us a chance to debate this on the floor with amendments, where we can improve it.

I urge a no vote, not so that we stop this bill but so that we can amend it, debate it, and pass it with the seriousness this problem deeply deserves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2610, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2610, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2204, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 265 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 265

*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. 2204) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amend-

ment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 7 or rule XVI or section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be fifteen minutes. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House of any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 265 is an open rule providing for the consideration of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1997. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the activities and the programs of the Coast Guard for fiscal years 1998 and 1999.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation. The rule also contains a minor waiver of the Budget Act, waiving section 401 of the Budget Act of 1974 against consideration of the bill.

Section 401 prohibits consideration of legislation providing new entitlement authority which becomes effective during the current fiscal year. This waiver is needed because the bill removes the cap on severance pay for Coast Guard and warrant officers. The provision is meant to conform the Coast Guard with the other services; no other Coast

Guard officer or other service's warrant officer has a cap on severance pay.

The rule also makes in order the Committee on Transportation's amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be considered as read.

There are two minor waivers needed for the committee substitute. The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI relating to germaneness, and section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The germaneness waiver is needed for an amendment adopted during full committee consideration of the bill which recognizes the community of Grand Haven, MI as Coast Guard City, U.S.A., and the budget waiver is needed because the committee substitute retains the severance pay cap removal that is in the original bill.

Further, the Chair, Madam Speaker, is authorized to grant priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition, the rule allows for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole 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, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The Coast Guard is the primary Federal agency with maritime authority for the United States. It is a complex organization of ships, aircraft, boats, and shore stations. Title 14 of the United States Code provides that the Coast Guard is at all times an armed force of the United States.

I believe the Coast Guard has a very difficult task in carrying out its main missions of law enforcement, maritime safety, marine environmental protection, and national security. An average day for the Coast Guard includes, among other things, saving 32 lives, assisting 308 people, saving \$8 million in property value, conducting 142 search and rescue missions, responding to 34 oil or hazardous chemical spills, conducting 128 maritime law enforcement boardings, identifying 97 violations of law, seizing 84 pounds of marijuana, and 148 pounds of cocaine. That is an average day for the Coast Guard.

The Committee on Rules hearing on this bill I think was extremely cordial. It was bipartisan. I am told that that is an accurate reflection, Madam Speaker, of the manner in which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure handled the legislation, as well.

The bill was reported to the House by voice vote, as was the rule. I would like to commend both the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT], for their hard work on the bill.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 265, I believe, is a fair rule. It is completely open. I would urge its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this very noncontroversial bill and this open rule. As Members know, the Coast Guard was established in 1915. Today 82 years later, the Coast Guard is still protecting people at sea and enforcing U.S. law. It is a great organization and it is well worth funding.

Today's bill authorizes \$3.9 billion for the Coast Guard's operation this year, which is the President's request plan plus an additional \$70 million for drug interdiction activities.

The 37,000 members of the U.S. Coast Guard provide this Nation with invaluable maritime service for everything from search and rescue to drug interdiction, and this \$3.9 billion, Madam Speaker, will support their good work.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], ranking member, for putting together a truly bipartisan bill which should pass this House with very little opposition.

Madam Speaker, I have heard very few complaints on either side of the aisle about the bill, which will provide for marine safety, waterway safety, and maritime safety. This bill will also clarify the rules about oilspill liability and provides \$5.5 million for the new ports and waterways safety system which is replacing the vessel traffic service 2,000 program.

Madam Speaker, this bill also provides funds for drug interdiction, ice breaking on the Great Lakes, repairs of buoys, and operation or removal of bridges that impede boat traffic.

Madam Speaker, this bill will enable the Coast Guard to continue its great work, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] a member of the Committee on Rules and chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I want to speak briefly on the subject of the Coast Guard because it is an agency of great importance and great concern to the quality of life of our Nation and particularly to the people in Florida.

The Coast Guard is very well known for the good work it does. It is a wonderful agency. In times of war, the

Coast Guard plays an integral role in the defense of our country. In times of peace, it has got so many missions it is hard to account for them all, but basically the safety of our boaters up and down our coastlines, well-being of our fisheries, providing for navigational aids, and emergency assistance. Those types of things are well understood and necessary, and they do a good job on it.

Madam Speaker, less well known, and the reason I wanted to speak today, is the vital role that the Coast Guard plays in the war on drugs. In a recent congressional hearing we heard about the reemergence of Florida as a drug transshipment route. We are sorry to hear it. This is not good news, and it is something that demands an immediate response.

I was encouraged to hear of the greater coordination we have now among the Coast Guard, the DEA, and our Customs folks in dealing with this problem. If we are going to be effective, we need to have everybody working from the same page in the war on drugs. It is certainly not going to be enough to settle for a stalemate in the war on drugs. We just had that debate, and we are not going to settle for a stalemate. We are going to need to get serious about winning that war, and the Coast Guard is going to be a major player in that.

The Coast Guard does fight in the frontlines in the war on drugs, and for that reason this particular bill is very important. I commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very fair and open rule and get on with the business of making this in order.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule because it does not allow for the consideration of campaign finance reform on the House floor. I ask my colleagues to vote to defeat the previous question so that the Committee on Rules can make in order the consideration of a debate on campaign finance reform.

Madam Speaker, I do not oppose this bill and would not otherwise oppose this rule. But I do not believe that we should move forward with other legislation without a commitment on campaign finance reform by this House.

My colleagues and members of the public who have been watching the House floor in the past month or two by now are familiar with the problem. The Republican leadership in this House, Speaker GINGRICH and Majority Leader ARMEY, refuse to allow us to debate and to vote on campaign finance reform legislation. Apparently, they like the system the way they have it and they refuse to allow us to consider bills to reduce the amount of money spent on campaigns.

Because of their refusal to allow debate on campaign finance reform, we are forced to take extraordinary measures. We are forced to do what we are doing today, to debate campaign finance reform on a rule dealing with the Coast Guard. But the nature of campaign finance reform is such that we must act. If we do nothing, simply let the current system continue. And we know that that system is repugnant to the American people, and, in fact, threatens the public interest and our Democratic institutions.

And with each passing day that the Republican leadership blocks reform, the influence of money over legislation, over elections, over what committee Members sit on or are allowed to serve on, every decision made in Washington grows worse and worse. Money, politics, and influence becomes tighter and tightly controlled.

This week, for example, it is reported that the Senate Republican leaders gathered to discuss their legislative agenda for 1998. A normal meeting. One would expect them to plan ahead. It was reported that one of the key issues for the Senate Republican leaders would be whether or not to design a legislative agenda that would stand a chance of winning approval by the President or whether to use next year to raise issues that would galvanize the core Republican constituencies, even if they stood no chance of approval.

Madam Speaker, foremost in the minds of that group was to use this legislative agenda for the purpose of generating money for the Republican Party. Now, that is a little bit different. Now we are not just talking about issues; we are talking about whether or not the agenda can be used to raise money, as if to erase any question over the influence that fundraising is to have on setting the agenda.

The meeting reportedly was held at the Republican fundraising offices here in Washington. Here is what was reported by Congressional Quarterly Monday morning. Quote, "A prime topic of discussion is whether to devote the early months of 1998 to legislative priorities that have no chance of winning President Clinton's signature, but would energize the GOP's conservative base as the primary season begins and Senate incumbents try to beef up their bankrolls for the fall."

They try to beef up their bankrolls? We are going to use the Senate floor and the Senate agenda and the time of the Senate and the House and the people's Congress, to beef up the bankrolls of Republican Members of the Senate? That is why the Senate majority leader, that is why Mr. MCCONNELL, the Senator from Kentucky, went there. They went there to decide how to put together an agenda that would allow the Republican Senators to raise money? That is what the House of Representatives and the Senate has come to? We are not talking about doing the people's business; we are talking about doing the business of people who give

money in large chunks to the Republican Party?

Madam Speaker, that is why we need campaign finance reform. That is why we are having to debate this issue on a bill dealing with the Coast Guard, because the Republican leadership in either House will not allow this debate to take place.

I find it rather interesting that the same people who were in the meeting talking about setting the agenda to raise campaign money for Republican Senators were the same Senators who engineered the defeat of the McCain-Feingold bill, a bipartisan bill to reform this system. These same leaders in the Senate engineered the defeat of that legislation over the last 2 weeks.

Madam Speaker, we are here to tell our colleagues that campaign finance reform is not dead either in the House or in the Senate. We are going to continue to pursue the Republican majority in the House and in the Senate to give us a vote, to give us the debate on this issue.

If necessary, we will resort to a discharge petition. We will have to force them. We will have to get a bipartisan coalition in this House, 218 signatures to force this leadership to give us a debate. What we are asking for is a debate and a vote on campaign finance reform.

That is what the House of Representatives is supposed to be about. That is what the Congress is supposed to be about. It is about the people's House. The people have spoken now in opinion poll after opinion poll. They are disgusted. They are disgusted with the way that elections are financed in this country. They are disgusted with the fact that now soft money means access. It not only means access to the White House; it means access to committee chairmen who are making multibillion dollar decisions about telecommunications, about energy deregulation, about clear air, about global warming. It is all about access. And if a contributor can write a \$100,000 check, they can get it and the rest of the American public cannot.

Madam Speaker, that is why we are forced to debate this, but we are not going to let the people who engineer on one day the death of campaign finance reform and then run downtown to the Republican headquarters and talk about using the people's legislative body as a fundraising tool. We thought it was bad enough the other day when the Republicans sent out a letter and said for \$10,000 a contributor could have lunch, breakfast, or dinner with the 10 most important Senators who are interested in meeting for \$10,000. It is more than about ham and eggs. It is about the legislative agenda. Now they have gone from sending out letters to designing the legislative agenda for the purposes of fundraising.

Madam Speaker, I thought that if making a phone call is a problem, what about designing an entire agenda and using the Senate of the United States

for the purposes of raising money and doing it with forethought? That is why we need campaign finance reform.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The Chair must caution the Member against improper references to the Senate or its members.

Mr. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, if my time has not expired, the problem is when I look at the polling numbers, if I said "the Senate majority leader" no one in the country knows who I am talking about.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must refrain from such references.

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

Madam Speaker, we have brought to the floor a rule that is completely open, that permits all amendments. While we were in the minority it was very rare to get the majority, then the Democrats, to permit an open rule so that all amendments could be introduced, on a subject, by the way, as important as the Coast Guard, where the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], ranking member of the Committee on Rules, admitted that that function is a primary function of national security and law enforcement.

So, Madam Speaker, we come to the floor today with a totally open rule to permit any and all amendments from any Member of this House on a subject as critical to the national security of the United States as the authorization of the Coast Guard and what are we confronted with? We are confronted with what we just heard. No one could ever accuse the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] of lack of imagination, because even on a bill as necessary to the national security as this one, even on a rule totally open, which permits amendment by any Member of this House, we have heard what we have heard today on an issue that has nothing to do with the Coast Guard.

Madam Speaker, I remind all our distinguished Members that we are debating an open rule to authorize that critically important organism of this country, institution of this country, which is the Coast Guard. That is what we are on today, Madam Speaker. I do not want to get confused. We are not going to let ourselves get confused by these arguments which seek to confuse, apparently, people who are not Members of this House and they will not get confused either. We are bringing an open rule permitting all debate on this critically important piece of legislation to this country.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Madam Speaker, I am going to make reference to the pre-

vious speaker, the gentleman from California, saying that the leadership of both Houses of Congress are discussing at this time anything else, discussing the issue of campaign finance reform when they should be discussing the issues of the Nation.

I want to say emphatically that the issue that the leadership has been discussing in recent times are the issues of what the Coast Guard needs in the Arctic Ocean in February. They are discussing how the Coast Guard has more influence and can more effectively deal with the pollution problems of the coastal waters of the United States and the inland seas of the United States. The leadership of both Houses is discussing the major problem of cargo ships bringing in enslaved immigrants by criminal thugs and how they can get to the shores of the United States and perform more effectively their criminal activity.

□ 1645

And how does the Coast Guard, made up of very young men and women, stop that? We are talking about a whole range of issues that deal with the Coast Guard. The leadership of both Houses of Congress are talking about welfare reform. They are talking about IRS reform. They are talking about how to improve agricultural practices. They are talking about a lot of things.

Last, Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the gentleman from California, when we are talking about campaign finance reform, each and every Member of this House, as individuals, as representatives of their district, have always the option of how they are going to run their campaign and how they are going to raise their money. So if the gentleman from California does not like the present legal system of the way campaigns are funded, he can simply do what he wants. He could stop taking PAC money. He could stop taking money from anybody from his district. He could do what he wants.

Each of us, as Members of this House, should tell our constituents, this is what I am going to do as a person, regardless of what Congress can or cannot do, I am going to stop taking all money except for those people who can vote for me. I will stop taking PAC money. I will stop taking money from outside of my district. I will stop taking special interest money. I will stop accepting soft dollars into my district. I will only take money from someone who is registered in my district to vote in my district, regardless of what the Congress does.

The leadership of this Congress has been talking about issues relating to the American people and, I might add, in the last 2 or 3 years, doing a fine job. I would remind the American people that sometimes the rhetoric on the floor would make a Shakespearean play look pretty dull, but look through the rhetoric at some of the details. We are talking about how to protect the coastal waters of the United States.