



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1996

No. 8

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GOODLING].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 23, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable WILLIAM F. GOODLING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to certain covered employing offices and covered employees and to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for 3 minutes.

KEEP THE CAPITAL IN BUSINESS

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to welcome my colleagues back from the short recess and to say they ought to be glad they were not here for the blizzard of 1996. We were snowed in, and I mean that quite literally.

For 4 days the Federal Government was shut down and this time this body had nothing to do with it, I am pleased to say. The District of Columbia was shut down as well. We do not mind if it is the snow. We do mind when the majority shuts us down.

I am pleased to believe, as I do, that there will not be another shutdown on Friday. I ask that the body recognize when a tool has run its course, and Federal workers I think would be grateful if we would move on with our business.

I do want to remind the body that the District budget is not yet passed, the appropriation is not yet out. Yet, we budgeted \$2.1 million for snow and one blizzard has used it all up, and more. We spent \$3.3 million.

I am grateful that the body approved a continuing resolution to last until September 30, but that allows the District only to spend its own money. We have only \$327 million of the \$712 million that we are due as payment in lieu of taxes. The absence of the cash money meant that the District could not plow the District of Columbia, and we had to call the Federal Government in because vendors would not contract with people who could not pay their bills.

I am pleased that the appropriations subcommittees in the Senate and the House have been working to solve their disagreement on vouchers. It is a disagreement among Republicans that is keeping our budget from coming through. That disagreement, I believe, could be solved and settled given the good faith, good work that has been ensuing during this recess.

I ask that the District get its full appropriation no later than Friday so that the District, 4 months late, can start its government up.

I also ask that the body be at pains not to allow this to happen again. As you know, the District is on its financial knees. Everything had happened to it, it seemed, but being put out of business, and it was put out of business for a week, when the Capital of the United States was shut down.

I ask this body, when the appropriation comes before it, to pass it speedily and to recognize that chief among your constitutional obligations is the obligation to let the Capital City of the United States engage in the business of running the Capital of the United States. Imagine how we look when the Congress looks as though it is not facilitating keeping the Capital of the United States in business. This would be the best way to start and end this week.

HOW BUDGET IS BALANCED A KEY QUESTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCULLUM. Mr. Speaker, I come today to address the budget impasse issue that has been on the minds of us and many Americans for quite some time. We are all very concerned, I know, about why we have not gotten to a balanced budget and what the skinny is on what is going to happen with respect to it.

I think that this needs to be put in perspective. President Clinton took 11 months and four offers before he got a budget proposal to Congress that was balanced according to the Congressional Budget Office, the only objective arbiter of such matters around here. It took him 11 months to do that.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H 739

I think it is also important to recognize that when he got there, that that budget was back-ended. What he sent to us has most of the savings that he has proposed to occur in the seventh year of this budget, after he has left office assuming that he would be re-elected President again this fall.

It is a good start. It was important to get him to put it on the table. But it was never the objective of the new Republican majority in Congress simply to get a balanced budget. How we balance the budget is just as important as getting a balanced budget. The manner we go about it is just as important as achieving a balanced budget.

When the President put his budget that was in balance for the first time on the table in December, it should have been the starting point, not the end point, for negotiations to get us to a product that we can all agree to and accept. It is not a dollar question alone by any stretch of the imagination. To that extent the President is right. This is a debate much more fundamental than that. Republicans in this new majority believe in reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government. We believe in taking programs wherever we can and sending them back to the States and local governments for them to carry out their responsibilities, for them to make the decisions in welfare, in Medicaid, in crime fighting and many other areas. Big government in Washington and the way liberal Democrats that have run this place for 40 years before we came to be the new majority obviously did not believe that. President Clinton's rhetoric for quite some time in his first election campaign and through the past 3 years or so would have led one to believe that he somewhat sympathized with this. But I want to make it perfectly clear from my observations that that is not the way at all he is conducting himself now. He is kicking in with the big-government liberals that have run this place all these years. I think there is no better illustration of this anywhere than what has been put on the table in the negotiations here in January.

The Republicans in the congressional leadership put on the table a Medicaid proposal that was supported by 68 Democrats in this House, written by them basically, and the President said "no" to that. The Republican leadership put on the table a Medicare proposal that had the endorsement of 47 Democrats, and the President said "no" to that. And the Republicans put on the table a welfare reform proposal that had passed the other body that only had nine Democrats dissenting on it and the President said "no" to that. He does not want the changes that are proposed in that. He does not want to send the responsibilities largely back to the States to handle the programs that we have been unable to handle effectively and efficiently up here all the years we have been here.

We cannot have a credible balanced budget without doing that. We cannot

have a credible balanced budget without addressing the two-thirds of Federal spending that are in entitlement programs. Yes, we proposed some substantive changes in Medicare. The President proposes to demagogue that issue instead of addressing those substantive issues. What we have proposed, as I said, have been endorsed by a lot of folks as positive common sense.

We would protect under Medicare all of those opportunities for anybody who is on Medicare now to stay in traditional Medicare. If one wanted to take choices and leave and go and do some other things that we might suggest, we propose that, but we would increase, not cut, Medicare spending. It would be increased by more than 50 percent over the 7 years in the proposal we have put on the table, and anybody who says otherwise to the contrary is telling something that is not true.

We would increase the spending on Medicaid by more than 50 percent as well. There is absolutely no truth to the argument that Republicans are out to gut or cut or do anything dastardly to Medicare or Medicaid or any of these other proposals. We simply want to allow the States the opportunity to make many of these decisions and we want to have fundamental reforms that give people choices about how they are going to handle and conduct their affairs with regard to their future years and retirement. But President Clinton and the liberal cronies that created big Federal Government spending do not want any part of that.

When the President is serious and ready to negotiate a true balanced budget deal over 7 years, not just the numbers within the CBO system, but that gets us and moves us in the direction of reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government, then I believe we will sit down and have some hope of getting to a balanced budget. Until and unless that occurs, it is apparent that he wants to please the big government interests in his party as he goes into the election this fall and he does not want to face the tough choices that are involved that would have to drive some wedges in that core base of his, and he wants to spend the time demagoguing the Medicare and Medicaid issues for his campaign purposes. He does not sound serious to me.

If he wants to get serious, it is time that he get serious over the substance of this matter instead of the way he has conducted it so far. Let us get a balanced budget, but how we do it is just as important as doing it.

DEMOCRATS SEEK FAIRNESS IN BUDGET DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, we do have a new majority. Let us see what they have brought us. Well, basically we

have had a year of acrimonious and bitter debate. We have had a costly and wasteful government shutdown and we still have a budget stalemate. Why?

Well, the dust has settled and it is abundantly clear that the problem is the same problem it has always been. The Republicans want to give a big tax break to the wealthy. The Republicans want to give a big tax break to wealthy Americans.

We will recall first they said, give us a 7-year balanced budget, 7 is a magic number. The President has agreed to that. They then said no, we have to have CBO audited numbers, CBO real numbers. The President has given them that. They said they wanted to protect children and the future of our society, future generations.

But when the President of the United States presented a balanced budget, balanced in 7 years with CBO real numbers, what did they do? They walked away from the table. Why did they walk away from the table? The gentleman from Florida said it is how we balance the budget.

Well, they wanted to include a big tax break for the wealthy. The President has said he will not go along with that. The President and Democrats are for a balanced budget, but we believe it should not just be a balanced budget, it should also be a fair budget.

In truth, in point of fact, we should not have any tax breaks in this budget. If we are serious about balancing the budget and eliminating the deficit, we do not need to be taking money out of the Treasury in the form of a tax break. But again the President has been willing to compromise, and he has offered modest tax relief for education deductions and for people with children under the age of 14 for the true middle class.

But that is not good enough for the Republican new majority. They want to give tax breaks to people who make over \$100,000 a year. Ladies and gentlemen, if their package goes through, half of the tax breaks, half of the \$245 billion in tax breaks will go to the richest 2 percent of Americans. The richest 2 percent of Americans will get half of the tax breaks. That is not a fair balanced budget.

Let us move on and talk about Medicaid, because that specifically hurts our seniors and our disabled citizens. Item No. 1, there was not a single public hearing on specifically Medicaid cuts. Many people do not understand and say, well, this is another, quote, entitlement program.

In point of fact, nearly 60 percent of Medicaid funds pay for acute and long-term care and services for elderly and people with disabilities; 60 percent to the elderly and people with disabilities. Thirty-five percent pays for long-term care. That means when your mother or father or aunt or uncle or grandparents have to go into a nursing home, Medicaid is paying for that. Medicaid pays 52 percent of the Nation's nursing home bill. Why? Because nursing home care

is very expensive, and Medicaid also pays for home services for the frail and the disabled.

□ 1245

They want to cut Medicaid. They want to cut Medicaid and then send it to the State and say States can do it.

Well, I have been in the State government for 10 years as a State senator. They cannot do it if they do not have the money. So shaving this money and sending down the so-called block grant is no solution, because the States, in fact, under their new program, would be able to cut their funds.

This is not a balanced budget, not morally. It is an accounting device. But we want a balanced budget both from an accounting standpoint and a morally balanced budget that is fair to all Americans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLING). With respect to a prior speaker, the Chair would remind the Member to refrain from reference to demagoguery of the President or other Members.

CASTRO'S CRACKDOWN ON DIS- SIDENTS AND INDEPENDENT JOURNALISTS DURING JANUARY CONGRESSIONAL VISITS TO CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, last week two Members of this House, a gentleman from Massachusetts and a gentleman from New Mexico, went to Cuba to meet with Castro. One told the press he was looking for flexibility on Castro's part to help him oppose the sanctions bill that the Congress is currently pursuing against the Cuban dictatorship. The other said he was seeking the release of some fugitives from American justice now in Cuba. I will now briefly outline some of the ways in which Castro reacted to these congressional visits and treated dissidents and independent journalists in Cuba just during these last few days.

JANUARY 14

Raul Rivero, Cuban poet and president of the independent Cuba Press agency, was arrested.

Juan Antonio Sanchez Rodriguez, another independent reporter, arrested in Pinar del Rio.

Jorge Adrian Ayala Corzo, president of the Democratic Renovation Party, was arrested.

Rafael Solano and Julio Martinez of the independent Havana Press were arrested.

JANUARY 15

Gladys Linares, Miguel Andres Palenque, Orlando Morejon were arrested.

Bernardo Fuentes, an independent journalist in Camaguey Province, was arrested.

Abel de Jesus Acosta, member of the Pro-Human Rights Party in Villa Clara Province, was arrested by State Security Lt. Boris Ruiz, his home ransacked and his motorcycle confiscated.

Jesus Zuniga, of the National Conciliacion Movement, was arrested.

The parents of Yndamiro Restano, were detained and interrogated for over 14 hours. Their son Yndamiro Restano, is the president of the Bureau of Independent Cuban Journalists who is out of Cuba on a visitor's permit due to a petition made to Castro by Dannielle Mitterand. They were told that if the bureau does not cease its work, they, as parents of Restano, will be faced with long-term detention and their son will be banned from returning.

JANUARY 16

The gentleman from Massachusetts arrived in Cuba. That day a meeting by the opposition umbrella grouping Concilio Cubano was disrupted in Havana by state security agents. Participants including Elizardo Sanchez and Marta Beatriz Roque were threatened with arrest.

Alberto Perera Martinez, vice-president of the Bloque Democratico Jose Marti was arrested.

Lazaro Gonzalez, president of the Pro-Human Rights Party, was detained and threatened.

JANUARY 17

The gentleman from New Mexico arrived in Cuba.

Jose Miranda Acosta, a political prisoner in a dungeon known as Kilo 5½ in Pinar del Rio was tortured by having water drops fall throughout the day and night into his cell. He has been sentenced to 15 years of confinement, without family visits, due to enemy propaganda. As a result of his imprisonment, he is practically blind and suffering from extreme malnutrition. Miranda has had his food poisoned in the past as punishment for a 72-day hunger strike in 1994, which he carried out to try to draw attention to his case.

JANUARY 18

Olance Noguerras, vice-president of the Bureau of Independent Cuban Reporters, was detained after asking a question at a press conference held by the gentleman from Massachusetts in Havana.

Eugenio Rodriguez Chaple, president of the Democratic Bloc Jose Marti, was run off the road and injured by state security while on his way to meet with French Embassy officials.

Leonel Morejon Almagro, Concilio Cubano member, was detained and told that his family would suffer serious consequences if he continued to participate in Concilio and that the Interior Minister Colome Ibarra was giving him his last chance.

JANUARY 19

Both Congressmen returned from Cuba.

That day, Roxana Valdivia, an independent journalist was questioned at

state security headquarters in Ciego de Avila and threatened with exile or prison for disseminating enemy propaganda.

During the days of the congressional visits, the thousands of Cuban prisoners of conscience continued suffering the same savage brutality that they continue to suffer to this very moment. Col. Enrique Labrada continues to receive electroshock torture at the Mazorra institution for the mentally ill. Labrada was sent there after staging a pro-democracy protest last year. The Reverend Orson Vila remains in prison for preaching the word of Christ. A 30-year-old writer, Carmen Arias, remains in a dungeon for sending a letter to Castro asking for free elections, as do Sergio Aguiar Cruz, Francisco Chaviano, Omar del Pozo, and thousands of others.

Upon his return one Congressman declared that Castro is very flexible.

The other Congressman said that he had gotten Castro to reduce the amount of dollars that Castro charges some Cubans who are leaving Cuba, and that that constitutes a humanitarian gesture.

Mr. Speaker, what will it take for the world to help Cuba free itself of its tyrant?

Imagine if this were happening in apartheid South Africa or Pinochet's Chile.

CONSIDER PRIORITIES DURING BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I was very surprised and disappointed when I saw that the Republican leadership walked away from the budget negotiations with the President about a week ago.

Frankly, I thought that the President went very far, maybe even too far, just before we adjourned 2 weeks ago when he not only agreed to a balanced budget, which we all support, but agreed to a 7-year budget, put it on the table, agreed to put forward a budget that was based on CBO estimates. The President essentially did everything the Republicans asked for as part of the negotiation and, instead of reacting and saying, OK, now we have a 7-year budget and it is CBO and it uses our numbers, instead of sitting down and saying now we can work out the differences over our priorities and still protect Medicare and Medicaid and the environment and education, instead they said, "No, that is not good enough. We are going to walk out. We don't want to have any negotiations." That is incredible.

We have gone on now for, I guess, about 6 months, and all during that time the Republican leadership has said that they supported the priorities of Medicare and Medicaid and also to

protect the environment and education, but now it is abundantly clear that is not really what they are all about. They are insisting on the level of tax cuts or tax breaks, mostly for wealthy individuals and for large corporations, that would make devastating cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. They are saying that, "We want to use those cuts to pay for a tax cut or tax breaks primarily for the wealthy Americans."

It really seems to me at that point there is not much more the President can do.

There was an article in the *Star Ledger*, which is the largest circulation daily in my home State of New Jersey that I just wanted to quote from briefly today in the time that I have left because I think it says it all.

It says that, "We need an agreement on a balanced budget, but we don't want a budget agreement at all costs," which is essentially what the Republican leadership is asking for, and I quote from the *Star Ledger*. It says, "The cost is too great if the budget agreement includes a tax cut benefiting mostly those in the upper income brackets, as this Republican one does. In fact, there is no reason for a tax cut at all. Balanced budgets and tax cuts are goals that work at cross purposes. The cost is too great if it means turning over Medicaid, medical care for the indigents, to the States. That would mean ending the right to medical care for those who can afford it least and are most vulnerable. It would be a great leap backward for this country. And the cost is too great if it means slashing Medicare to the point where the cost to the aged for their premiums becomes painful, which is what is proposed in this Republican budget. If there continues to be no national health care program, then some cost adjustments must be made in financing Medicare to prepare for the crush of retiring baby-boomers in the next century, but to include the overhaul in a political budget that is meant to work against aid for the indigent and the elderly is not the proper context. The cost is too great."

And that is what I would say to my colleagues on the other side. We would like a balanced budget, but we cannot have it at this great cost to our priorities.

AMERICA'S MOST TRAGIC MORAL FAILING OF THE MODERN ERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, 1 day after the 23d anniversary of *Roe versus Wade*, many people were up here to recognize this fact, to address one of the most important and divisive moral issues our Nation faces.

Abortion clearly stands as America's greatest and most tragic moral failing

of the modern era. In the last century America was called upon to address the moral blight of slavery. And we did it. Though the struggle was great and tore the country in two, good ultimately triumphed over evil and the scourge of slavery was banished from the land. In this century we face a different fight—the fight against what anyone with a moral conscience can only consider the taking of a human life. Will America rise to this new challenge? Will we come to our moral senses? Only time will tell.

But we can say this: Whatever happens, those who believe abortion is simply wrong will continue to take their case to the American people. Although the courts still consider abortion a legal right, that doesn't make it a moral right. And although any change in the legal status of abortion may still be a long way off, there are still measures we can take not to combat this crime against humanity.

It is my belief that political change in America only happens as a result of cultural change. Until we change America's culture—until America regains a commitment to the sanctity of human life—all our efforts will produce little change. We need to argue our case forcefully. We need to convince America by the power of our ideas and by the depth of our passion that abortion deserves no place in any society that would call itself civilized. We condemn Hitler for the slaughter of 6 million Jews. We condemn Stalin for the murder of 20 million Russians. We condemn Pol Pot for the extermination of 1 million Cambodians. But we raise nary a peep about the 1.5 million innocent children who are killed on our own shores every year. My colleagues, I ask you: Where is our conscience? Where is our shame?

Now our foes on the other side of this debate refuse to admit that what is at stake in abortion is a human life. No; they insist that abortion is just a medical procedure intended to terminate a pregnancy. The fetus to them is not life. It is not even potential life. It is merely a blob of tissue, or worse, a parasite that needs to be excised from the victimized mother. Abortion is solely about the so-called rights of the mother. The rights of the unborn child are never part of the equation, because for them the fetus has no rights.

But I have a question for the pro-abortion forces in this country: How can you be so sure? How do you know the fetus is merely human tissue with no claim to personhood? How do you know abortion is not, in fact, the taking of a human life? Their answer, of course, is that they just know. Never do they produce any evidence that the fetus is not a human life. They simply assume that the fetus is not life. And after all, what other choice do they have? The only way they can feel comfortable morally is to pretend what they advocate is the surgical equivalent of having a tooth pulled.

In his book "The Unaborted Societies," the moral philosopher Peter

Kreeft poses this analogy for abortion. Pretend you're a hunter going off into the woods with your friend, but you get separated. Now you're alone hunting for deer and you hear something rustle in the bushes in front of you. You can't see what it is, but you know something is there. What do you do? Do you shoot, hoping the noise is caused by a deer and not your friend? Or do you play it safe and hold your fire until you're sure that it's not your friend? My friends, the abortionist faces the same quandary every day of his life. He can't say for sure that the fetus is not human. But does he play it safe? No, he takes a chance that the fetus he is aborting is really a human being. He literally risks that he is a murderer.

We all know there are deep divisions within our society over abortion. But the one thing I hope we all can agree on is that it is morally risky at best to practice a procedure that even an abortionist must admit could be murder. But it is up to us, my colleagues, to make these arguments, to persuade the country that it is best to err on the side of caution when contemplating abortion. If we do not act, who will? If we do not speak up on behalf of the unborn, will they speak up for themselves?

But I have hope. I believe we are beginning to turn the corner. Congress, through the hard work of Representatives like CHRIS SMITH, BOB DORNAN, and HENRY HYDE, has finally succeeded in passing the first legislation ever that would prevent a particular abortion procedure from being used. I speak here of the so-called partial-birth abortion, a gruesome act whereby the fetus is delivered right to the base of the skull, at which point the abortionist plunges in a pair of surgical scissors to facilitate the evacuation of the brain. The baby, of course, is then fully delivered, but dead. In this act of barbarity, only 3 inches separates a legal abortion from murder. But of course, we all know it is murder anyway.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration has promised to veto this bill, despite bipartisan support. This is interesting, because even the President has said his goal is to make abortion safe, legal, and rare. Well, here was a chance to make it a little rarer, and what did he do? He promised a veto.

But I wonder something? Why does the President want abortion to be rare? If it is just a harmless medical procedure that improves the lives of women—as the President believes—then why should it be rare? In his world abortion is a good thing and therefore it should be plentiful. But the reality is that even the President knows the American people are uncomfortable with abortion. He knows that even if he sees nothing wrong with 1.5 million abortions, the majority of the American people do.

Fortunately, America's moral climate is changing. Americans never thought legal abortion would be used for anything other than extreme cases.

But now they realize they were sold a false bill of goods. Now they realize that abortion, far from being used to save the life of the mother, is little more than a convenient form of birth control for countless women. It is my contention that had Americans known that, they never would have consented to legalizing abortion in the first place.

Simply put, abortion detracts from our national greatness. As Alexis de Toqueville said in his pioneering study of American democracy more than 100 years ago: "America is great because America is good." If we lose our goodness, our greatness is sure to follow.

I think most Americans realize this, which is why abortion troubles them. But as with all great public debates, we must reinforce our truths again and again. Together, we can make a difference. So let's make a commitment, right here and right now, that we will labor to restore America to greatness by restoring it to goodness. And do we really have any other choice? Basic morality demands that we who possess the power to speak, stand up for the rights of those who lack the power to speak for themselves.

□ 1300

GOP MOVING THE GOAL POSTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, in November, House Budget Chairman JOHN KASICH said this about the budget negotiations: "Frankly, we don't ask for a lot. We ask for nothing more than a commitment to do this in a 7-year period. The priorities within that 7-year plan are negotiable."

The Republican leadership in both House and the Senate echoed Mr. KASICH's sentiments and asked President Clinton to produce a 7-year balanced budget using the economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office. That's all we want, they said, and then we can negotiate the details.

Well, the President has done his part. He has given Republicans a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers. But now, Republican leaders want to move the goal posts in the middle of the game. Now, Mr. KASICH and the Republican leadership in Congress say they will not negotiate on the budget priorities.

The budget negotiations do come down to a question of priorities. Democrats and the President want a balanced budget that protects Medicare, education and the environment, and includes a tax cut for middle-class families. The Republicans want deeper cuts in Medicare, education, and the environment to help pay for a larger tax break that goes primarily to upper-income families and large corporations. And they want a backroom deal on Medicare. That is wrong.

Yet, despite our differences, a balanced budget is in reach. Both sides of the aisle have produced plans that will get us there. We will never all agree on all the details. However, if we can produce a balanced budget that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment, it will pass this House, it will pass the other body and it will be signed into law by the President.

My Republican colleagues said that if the President gave them a 7-year CBO budget, they would negotiate. The President has done that. It's time for Republicans to keep your word and get back to the negotiating table.

For 220 years, this democracy has worked. Let's make it work again. Government shutdowns and threatened defaults on our debt—these tactics are an affront to democracy. It's time to put away the blackmail schemes and put America on the track to a balanced budget that protects our priorities: Medicare, education, environmental protection, and a tax cut for working middle-class families.

Thus far, this Congress has been the least productive Congress since 1933. Will that be the legacy of the 104th Congress? Or, will we rise above partisan politics and do what's right for the country?

FARM LEGISLATION FOR 1996 NEEDS TO BEGIN NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to talk about something that is basic to America and basic to this country, and something that we need to take action on, and that deals with farm legislation for 1996.

We need to take action now, because even while you may have been snowed in here in the Nation's capital and winter holds its grip across this Nation, it is but a few weeks until we will be going to the fields in my district in Illinois, and, yes, across the whole Nation. It is time that we take action.

Unfortunately, the farm bill for 1996 and the next 7 years, which contributed \$13 billion to deficit reduction, was vetoed by President Clinton when he vetoed the Balanced Budget Act. So since there has been no agreement with the President on a true balanced budget and it does not appear that one is going to happen, we have got to take care of agriculture policy, food policy for this Nation, just as we would our military policy if he had vetoed that bill also.

We need to do it in a bipartisan way. Agriculture and agricultural policy has, for the most part, always been a bipartisan effort. We need to do that, and I am sure that the gentleman from Kansas, Chairman ROBERTS, is working in that regard, and the gentleman from Texas, ranking member DE LA GARZA, is also very cooperative. But we are

late, and now is the time to take action; we cannot wait any longer, and be doing what is good for the country.

What are the options? Well, of course, if the President would agree to a balanced budget that this Congress could approve, we could put it in that act. As I said, that is not probably going to happen.

We could do it as an independent bill, or we could attach it to the next CR, which I feel certain will be passed, and we could pass it on to the President, and hopefully he would sign it.

Now, another option is to extend the farm policy that has been in effect up until October 1 of last year. But, see, that policy does not contain the reforms, the market orientation, that we had in the new bill. It is counterproductive to go back and extend old policy, which really decreases the amount of investment we are going to put into our food policy and our food programs in this country. It is tired old policy. It is time to retire it. We need to move on.

The final option is we could go back to a 1949 act, and that is not practical at all. Certainly legislation in 1949 does not now cover the needs of agriculture today.

Finally, on this issue, let me say that the Secretary of Agriculture is considering retiring some of the CRP ground, the Crop Reserve Program. This program has been very beneficial to the environment, and I think that we should ask the Secretary to go very slowly in releasing millions of acres of ground, some of which should not be put back into cropland, to be put into crops. We should not overreact the first time in two decades that we have decent commodity prices and farmers across this country have a chance to be profitable. As we move with the new farm bill out of government-controlled agriculture, let us not kill the goose before it has a chance to lay a golden egg. I would ask that the Secretary of Agriculture take the very limited option in reducing CRP ground, and let us follow the pattern and see what happens before we get into it too deeply.

GIVE FULL ATTENTION TO STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE TONIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am just here to hope that this body tonight can listen to what the President says and we can come together and not have another shutdown of the Government or not declare a default on the debt, which would be the first time in the history of this great Republic.

This House floor has all the ambience of downtown Sarajevo before the Dayton agreement. I do not know what we do, whether we load everybody off and send them to Dayton. Maybe there is something in the water that can get

them to come together. But if we could find the parties in the former Yugoslavia that could come together and put a peace together, why can we not get an agreement to get this body going?

Why are we talking about shutting down the Government because we cannot do the budget this year, and basically the reason is they say it is because they are arguing over numbers for 7 years from now, which in all honesty none of us can bind people to 7 years from now. We ought to be held accountable for this year. I think we will be held accountable for this year by the voters. I think they are getting very tired of this.

Every time the President looks up, they are shooting at his feet and asking him to tap dance a little more. You put out one thing, he meets it. You put out another thing, he meets it. You put out another thing, he meets it. Finally, you begin to say, This must not be for real. Fifty-plus hours? Criteria after criteria met? And every time you do it, someone says, Oh, well, one more thing before we think this is really real.

Now, I honestly think that if anyone thinks this is new, they are wrong. I have been here for 23 years, and we have had all sorts of disagreements between this body and between the person down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. We have had Republican presidents and Democratic Congresses and all sorts of different combinations in between and all sorts of polarizing incidents. But we have never let it get to this level, never.

This is one of the great things we pride ourselves in America on, is pragmatism. At the end of the day we can all say, OK, we didn't get 100 percent of what we wanted, but we moved the debate in a certain direction, and we will come back and fight again tomorrow. But we do not stop everything, and we do not default on the debt, and we do not throw ourselves on the floor and have tantrums.

So I really hope that all of us, on both sides of the aisle, give full attention tonight to this State of the Union, to this President, our only President of this great Nation, who is out here trying to chart a course to get us out of this century and into the next.

Mr. Speaker, I think the citizens deserve much better than what they got in the first half of this Congress. Let us clean up our act tonight and let us start tonight for this second Congress.

REMEMBERING PRIOR STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE STATEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for sharing her views here, and I think she does point up something upon which we

can all agree, and that is that fundamental to debate in a free society is the notion of disagreement, and it is the mission of all of us to achieve consensus. But the question comes, at what price?

Mr. Speaker, I bring you greetings from Arizona, the Grand Canyon State. I am here, Mr. Speaker, to use this time to address what is not a credibility gap, but instead a credibility canyon. Indeed, all members of the new majority, as well as members of the minority, welcome the President of the United States to this Chamber tonight, where he will stand at this podium and deliver his State of the Union Message.

To quote one pundit in this town, he said, "Heretofore most State of the Union Addresses by most chief executives have been forgivable." Well, at the danger of incurring the wrath of that pundit, Mr. Speaker, let us remember, let us remember the words of our President in his previous State of the Union Messages.

First dealing with the budget. Quoting now from his 1993 address:

The plan substantially reduces the Federal deficit honestly and credibly by using in the beginning the most conservative estimates of Government revenues, not as the executive branch has done so often in the past using the most optimistic ones.

Again from 1993:

This budget plan, by contrast, will by 1997 cut \$140 billion in that year alone from the deficit, a real spending cut, a real revenue increase, a real deficit reduction, using the independent numbers of the Congressional Budget Office.

Yet throughout last year, throughout 1995, President Clinton submitted to this body budget after budget after budget, but refused to use those objective numbers of the Congressional Budget Office. It was not until this new majority ultimately persuaded him to submit a CBO-scored budget to end the recent shutdown that he lived up to the above statements.

Most astonishingly, Mr. Speaker, from last year, quoting now the President of the United States who stood at this podium. "I certainly want to balance the budget."

Yet the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, as reflected in the record of this institution and through reports of the news media, President Clinton vetoed the first balanced budget submitted by the Congress in a quarter of a century.

Then to the topic of welfare reform. Quoting again from 1993's address:

Later this year, we will offer a plan to end welfare as we know it. I want to offer the people on welfare the education, the training, the child care, the healthcare they need to get back on their feet. But, say after 2 years, they must get back to work.

Then from 1994:

So we must also revolutionize our welfare system. We will say to teenagers, if you have a child out of wedlock, we will no longer give you a check to set up a separate household. We want families to stay together. We will provide the support, the job training, the child care you need, for up to 2 years. But after that anyone who can work, must.

Then from last year:

Nothing has done more to undermine our sense of common responsibility than our failed welfare system. Let this be the year to end welfare as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the President year after year has come to this House and addressed from this podium his willingness to end welfare as we know it, he did not support the welfare reform bill that had broad bipartisan support. Instead, he vetoed the welfare bill that Congress sent him.

Again from 1993:

This plan will give this country the toughest child support enforcement system it has ever had.

From 1994:

If we value responsibility, we cannot ignore the \$34 billion in child support absent parents ought to be paying to millions of parents who are taking care of their children.

Then from 1995:

If the parent is not paying child support, they should be forced to pay. We should suspend drivers licenses, track them across State lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the welfare reform bill that President Clinton vetoed would have required States to create a central case registry to track the status of all child support orders. The bill also gave the States the authority to suspend drivers, professional, occupational and recreational licenses of anyone whose child support payments are in arrears, all the things the President said he wanted to do last year.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I understand my time is short. The record is replete. Words mean something. Actions speak louder than words. Mr. President, keep your promises, join with the new majority, and let us help govern this Nation.

REPUBLICAN REVOLUTION IS PARALYZING THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, it is said one can tell one who wants to move on by those who argue last year's argument. My last colleague who spoke is regurgitating for us the arguments they will not let go.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans demanded a 7-year budget. The President has given them a 7-year budget. The Republicans demanded that any budget plan that is adopted be approved by the Congressional Budget Office using their numbers. Again, the President has agreed to that. The Republicans further insisted that there be a large tax cut as a part of their budget plan. Again, the President has offered a smaller tax cut but for working families.

Mr. Speaker, the President has gone a considerable distance to meet the demands of the Republican Party, and

yet they continue those same arguments. We just heard the litany go on. What is their argument, then, if he has done those essential things that they say they wanted?

Why not move on, as one of my colleagues suggested, to the farm bill? I can tell my colleagues that farmers in my State are uncertain as to what their future will hold. Democrats are simply insisting that the budget we pass hold fast to the principle that made this Nation strong; principles that Republicans and Democrats should indeed support. Democrats want to safeguard health care for seniors, for children, for poor families; to promote education for our future and to protect our environment.

Here we are again almost facing yet a third shutdown and threatening to default on our Nation's liability and debt; that we will not honor our obligation. What kind of governance is that? Is that being responsible?

Yes, we have made progress in the last few years. Unemployment is down, interest is indeed low, and inflation is stabilized. That is progress we all, Republicans and Democrats, should want to protect. Progress like that, however, will stop and our economy will suffer if we do not work together. Both Democrats and Republicans must come and work together to prevent a national default on our obligations.

I can tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, this Republican revolution is paralyzing this Nation and it will do great damage to this economy. It is now time for cool heads and rational minds and thoughtful persons to come together, to join together and revive what is important to Americans in this Nation.

NAFTA AND SOUTHWEST FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 3 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, January first marked the 2-year anniversary of NAFTA. As we begin the third year of tariff reductions and opening markets under this accord, it is appropriate to take a moment to assess our progress—so far reports show NAFTA has been a mixed bag: Mostly the news is positive; however, there are some serious problem areas that clearly need attention. In Florida, we are particularly concerned about the negative impact that import surges of tomatoes and other winter fruit and vegetables are having on southwest Florida's growers, the packing houses and the workers in these industries. This is a bi-partisan concern—and I am pleased that Senator BOB GRAHAM is working this issue in the Senate. On November 16, 1993, the President wrote a letter to the members of the Florida delegation, assuring us that he was committed to taking the necessary steps to ensure that the trade representative and the ITC would take prompt and effective

action to protect the United States vegetable industry against price-based import surges from Mexico. Now is the time for him to take that action because, unfortunately, it seems that the safeguards in NAFTA and the implementing language—the volume-based snapback provision, the automatic price monitoring and the expedited import relief procedures—have not lived up to our hopes. They are not working properly. I am currently drafting legislation calling on the President to live up to the promise he made and to protect our growers from potentially unfair Mexican trading practices. In the meantime, my colleagues in the Florida delegation and I will continue to work in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion to address the urgent needs of the Florida fruit and vegetable industries. To their credit the Department of Agriculture has been very forthcoming and willing to work with the Florida delegation and our growers.

Unfortunately, I have to say that the USTR could be more helpful. Of course, the administration and its officers can't fix all of the problems, some of that is our responsibility in Congress. In response to the very real needs of the tomato and fruit and vegetable industries in Florida, a series of bills have been introduced to address definitional problems faced by our growers when they attempted to seek relief through the section 202 process, to address the differences in enforced packing requirements between Mexican and domestic growers, and to create national country of origin labeling to allow consumers to make more informed decisions when they make their individual purchasing choices at the market. An invitation has been issued for U.S. Trade Representative Ambassador Kantor and Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman to brief Florida delegation members on the tomato and winter fruit and vegetable situation. I understand this meeting will take place tomorrow and I hope it will bring progress we need and look for. This is a critical issue for Florida and an important one for the Nation.

I think it is also a very critical one in terms of living up to the promises that have been made.

Those of us who felt NAFTA would be good for the United States of America want to be certain that we correct the sore spots that are there, if they are correctable. If not, we will have to excise those sore spots with legislation. In any event, once we see those sore spots, the time is now to move, and we have seen them and we must move.

WEST VIRGINIA DIGGING OUT FROM RECORD FLOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today West Virginia is digging out from a record

flood, just like your State of Pennsylvania, and like other areas of the mid-Atlantic. I want to report to Congress today on our efforts and to ask for assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this was a true bicoastal flood for our State, going from the Ohio River all the way to the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers, from border to border of our State. The Governor, during the weekend, declared 29 of our 55 counties in a state of emergency. Thousands have been driven from their homes or had their homes and jobs threatened. Water systems have been damaged, sewer systems have been compromised. Businesses in some cases have been wiped out, others will take a while to resume. Highways in some cases have been washed out.

From Friday night, beginning Friday night in the basement of the State capital and the State Office of Emergency Services office, I have tried to monitor and follow this flood as closely as possible. From Friday night, with the State OES personnel, to traveling with the Governor on Saturday to our hardest hit central West Virginia counties, to going Sunday night to Mason County to watch the Ohio River as it began its relentless rise, and then yesterday back across the State to Jefferson County where I watched the swollen Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers as they began to recede, I can testify about how awesome and how devastating this flood has been for many of our people.

Today and yesterday our staff has been fanning out across the hardest hit counties trying to bring immediate word about where people can get assistance and to assist in assessing the damage.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of this devastation, of course, we also see incredible acts of human spirit, and I just cannot speak highly enough or applaud loudly enough nor respect enough those thousands of volunteers across our State at every level: The hundreds of National Guard that were mobilized and responded. We do not know what it means, in a county that is still watching the flood waters recede, to see those National Guard uniforms come rolling in on those trucks bringing the promise of help.

The emergency service personnel at every level in the county and the State, the Red Cross, the sheriff and police departments, the highway department staffs, the Corps of Engineers, who control the many dams that prevented the damage from being far worse. All of them working long hours, Mr. Speaker. Long hours, of course, that did not start just with this flood, but started with the blizzard that began over 10 days before. Then the flood came and many of those volunteers and personnel are still working. Many individual acts of people rebuilding immediately their lives.

One question I have received, Mr. Speaker, time after time as I made my trip back across the flood-stricken

areas, "BOB, will funding be cut off next week for any of the vital activities?" I am confident that this Congress will not permit that to happen.

I am assured that the Federal Emergency Management Agency is taken care of financially, at least for the immediate future, but we must also remember the other flood recovery programs, the Small Business Administration's disaster recovery loans, the Economic Development Administration, which has been so active in economic recovery in the Midwest and many of our other devastated areas, the HUD, Housing and Urban Development programs, and so the many other programs, too. We must make sure and vow, Mr. Speaker, that no amount of partisan politics will stop these vital programs from going forward and that there will be no interruption in flood recovery.

Mr. Speaker, if I can report some positive things. Our death rate was nowhere near as high as 1985, even through the 1985 flood levels were reached in some communities. Some communities have been hit every bit as hard as 1985, but many, some in the Eastern Panhandle, saw far less damage. Sometimes the water did not crest at the predicted levels. In other cases flood prevention efforts such as dikes and levies have been installed. We are smarter in many of our areas now and we know to evacuate. We have a much more professional emergency services operation.

But there are also farther reaching flood implications. While many counties in the central part of our State did not see the 1985 flood levels, at the same time we had to deal with the Ohio River. Nine additional counties that were not affected, but did see record levels not seen since 1972 in Hurricane Agnes. So this time we are much more far-reaching in the flood devastation.

Mr. Speaker, one woman stood on her front porch pushing liquid mud down the steps with a broom. Behind her stood her sons and her neighbors helping her dig out. Tears ran down her face as she cried and quietly said, "I have lost my home and my job." Her home had been devastated for the second time in 10 years. Her workplace has been wiped out and her employer said he was not returning.

Mr. Speaker, she knows what she has to do. She will do the work. She is going to rebuild. She just asks that wherever this Congress and this Federal Government, her Federal Government, can help, it do so and we owe her that.

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, I know that you are in-

terested, like I am, in history and the historic significance of events as they occur. I know that the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, being a former history professor, is also interested in historic significance.

I say that because we can look back on the first session, and let us take a look at some of the historic significance that has occurred in this Congress, in the first session.

Well, one of the biggest things that is going to go down in the history books is that it is the first and only Congress, the first and only Congress led by the Republican majority, that closed down the Federal Government for a 6-day period in November, and a 21-day period in December of 1995 and January of 1996. Total of 27 days. Never in the history of this country has that ever occurred. That will be in the history books.

□ 1330

What was the total cost of that to our taxpayers by the Republican majority that says they want to save money, they want to cut out waste in Government? A waste of over \$1 billion. Not a million, folks. A billion. A waste of over \$1 billion. That is the historic significance. That is to the taxpayers. Now, it is all orchestrated by the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH.

Another historic significance. It is only the third time in the history of this country, over 200 years, that this House has gone 365 days, we opened up in January 3 or 4, if I remember, of 1995, we ended up January 3 of this year. Five minutes later we opened the second session. That has only happened three times. So we worked 365 days. We worked long hours. We had more votes in this House than at any time in the near past, from the 93d to the 104th Congress. More votes. But another historic significance. We did less legislation enacted into law than any other Congress in the first session since 1933.

So we did a lot here yelling and hollering, a lot of passing bills and sending them to the Senate and the Republicans over in the Senate, led by the majority leader from Kansas say, "No, we don't want that. That's too radical. We're not going to do that. That's too extreme." And as a result, we did almost nothing.

That leads me to right now. Let us look at today. There is nobody else here. There is not another Member on the floor. We are back after 2 weeks' vacation. Where is everybody? They are not here because they are not going to do anything today.

Members, what are we going to do today? Well, we are going to do a little Corrections Day bill. We are going to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to standards for constructed water conveyances. That is really important to the country.

We are going to award a Congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham. We are going to do a bill on Saddleback Mountain-Arizona; and

then we are going to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to Native Americans. That is what we are going to do today. That is really important.

We are not going to do welfare reform. We are not going to do line-time veto. We are not going to do any of those things. We probably will not do them the rest of this year.

What are we going to do tomorrow? Well, tomorrow we may do a continuing resolution, because the Republican majority under NEWT GINGRICH now tell us that they are not going to close down the Government anymore so we have to pass one because the Government will close down after January 26 if we do not. So we will do that. Everybody agrees on that. There will be no problem with that. It will take about a half an hour at the most. I do not know what the rest of the day we are going to do or what we are going to do Friday.

They tell me we may have a new conference report on the defense authorization bill and we may do that. Then they are telling me, and I hear through the grapevine, we may quit until sometime near the end of February.

Talk about a do-nothing Congress. I do not know, I think most of us should go ahead and send all of our pay back, because most of the Members have not done anything. I say to Speaker GINGRICH, that it is time to get things done. You want a balanced budget? You can have a balanced budget. You know you can have a balanced budget. Because the Democratic coalition budget is balanced in 7 years. By 2002 it is a balanced budget scored by CBO, the Congressional Budget Office. But it does not have your big tax cut in it, it does not have that \$245 billion for the wealthy.

That is why you will not do it. You really want the tax cut for the wealthy. You really do not want a balanced budget.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. GOODLING]. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Harold Bradley, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

With praise and adoration we offer this prayer, O God, in appreciation for all Your blessings to us and to all people. We are aware of our responsibilities to use Your blessings as good

stewards of Your divine purposes and to use Your gifts in ways that promote justice and equity to every person. May we work together as faithful custodians of the bounty of Your creation and reflect in our lives the beauty of all Your gifts. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MARKEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

CONTINUE ON THE PATH TO A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we are back and we have learned a lot. No. 1, you cannot negotiate with a "say anything, do nothing" President. It is clear that he is for big government, he is for higher taxes, and he is for more spending. The President condones wasteful spending in the Government.

We have "out of town" Brown, Secretary of Commerce, who has over-extended his travel budget. We have Secretary O'Leary, who is a congenital flier. We cannot keep her in town. But this is just the tip of the iceberg. We have massive wastes of Federal spending in our bureaucracy and we must downsize it.

Mr. Speaker, we are back, we are for a balanced budget, we are on track to get there. We are going to continue to keep pressure on the administration. We are going to reform Medicaid through block grants, we are going to preserve and protect Medicare, and we are going to try to give back to American families some of what they lost in the 1990 tax increase and in the 1993 tax increase. So we are working that hard and we are going to continue on that path. I appreciate my fellow colleagues who are going to join in that effort.

THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, welcome back. I am glad to welcome our folks back to the kinder and gentler Congress after that first 1-minute.

Mr. Speaker, if you think you remember hearing congressional Republicans saying all they wanted was a CBO-scored 7-year balanced budget, your memory is not failing you. Here is what they said:

Our House budget chairman. "Frankly, we don't ask for a lot. We ask for nothing more than a commitment to do this in a 7-year period."

Our colleague from Idaho. "We have no hidden agenda. The only thing we are asking for is a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers."

A colleague from New York. "All we have asked the President of the United States with all his tremendous resources at his hands to do likewise, to come up with those numbers reflecting his own priorities to balance the budget in 7 years using real numbers. That is all we have asked for."

Now they want more. They want their balanced budget bill. They want to include deep cuts in Medicare needs, education needs, and the environment in order to fund a massive tax break, or no bill at all.

The President sent a 7-year balanced budget 2 weeks ago with CBO numbers. But that is not good enough because that is not what their priorities are. They want to hurt seniors and hurt education funding.

HONEST NUMBERS TO BALANCE THE BUDGET IN 7 YEARS IS THE STARTING POINT

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, once again, I listened with interest to the remarks of my friend from Texas, and what a pity it is, ladies and gentlemen, that the minority is reduced to this, to chanting a seemingly mindless mantra, with no basis in fact, with selective use of quotation.

What this new majority always said is that the starting point was looking to find numbers, honest numbers, that begin to balance this budget in 7 years. That is the starting point. That is the parameters of the debate. But it is not a fait accompli. It is not sending us a budget that has all the savings in the last year and continues the culture of tax and spend and spend and tax some more.

What the American people want, Mr. Speaker, is this: A government that achieves an honest consensus, that saves not only the seniors of this generation, but generations yet unborn; a commonsense budget and set of priorities that preserves this great noble experiment in a constitutional republic and preserves this American dream.

That is the task before all of us, conservative and liberal, Republican and Democrat.

COURT-MARTIAL OF MICHAEL NEW IS WRONG

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Michael New is a decorated soldier, he loves his country. His bravery, patriotism, and devotion to duty have never been questioned. As we meet today, Michael New is being court-martialed, court-martialed for refusing to wear the blue beret and shoulder patch of the United Nations on a peacekeeping mission.

Michael New said, "I will only wear the uniform of my country, the United States of America." Bravo, Michael New. Michael New took an oath to the Constitution of the United States, not to the charter of the United Nations, and I cannot speak for the Congress, ladies and gentlemen, but if I could, I would tell all these politically correct bureaucrats to take their one world order hands off Michael New and leave him alone.

Mr. Speaker, there is something drastically wrong when a military hero is being court-martialed because he refuses to wear a foreign uniform. Think about it and beam me up.

FROM THE WHITE HOUSE ON TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, here is a quote from the White House yesterday. "But he"—meaning President Clinton—"will certainly acknowledge that tax relief, as he has been fighting for as President, is something that remains very important."

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that Clinton is now in the fourth year of his Presidency. If he has been fighting for tax relief, why don't the taxpayers have it?

Is it because in his first year as President, he pushed the largest tax increase in history on the backs of the American people?

Is it because when a middle-class, family tax relief bill was laid on his desk, he vetoed it?

Or is it because he didn't even start talking about tax cuts until Republicans became the majority in Congress?

Mr. Speaker, all the above help point out that Bill Clinton is a say-anything, do-nothing liberal President. He claims to be for the people, but his actions show that his policies are higher taxes, bigger government, and more spending.

THREE STRIKES AND YOU ARE OUT

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, radical Republicans in Congress are preparing again to take political hostages in order to force President Clinton to accept their extreme agenda.

If insanity consists of doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result, legislative lunacy is shutting down the Federal Government for a third time and expecting public support. Having learned nothing from the two Government shutdowns they manufactured last year, key Republican leaders are threatening to force yet another fiscal crisis unless they get a substantial share of their agenda. They're threatening to load up funding bills with extremist riders and let the United States go into default unless the President agrees to give massive tax breaks for the rich paid for by deep cuts in Medicare, education, and the environment.

Last fall, the Republicans launched their first fiscal strike, shutting down the Government for 5 days. In December, the GOP launched their second strike, shutting down the Government for 3 weeks. If there is another Government shutdown or a default, the American people have every right to go to the polls in November and tell the GOP: "Three Strikes and You're Out."

WELFARE STATE ENCOURAGING FAMILY BREAKDOWN

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as a candidate for President 4 years ago, Bill Clinton said that he would "end welfare as we know it."

Earlier this month, President Clinton vetoed a welfare bill that would have done exactly what candidate Clinton had promised.

Let us review some of the facts.

Almost \$5 trillion has been spent on the welfare state since LBJ launched the war on poverty.

Over half of the individuals receiving AFDC remain dependent on welfare for 10 or more years.

In 1973, the illegitimacy rate for AFDC mothers was 32 percent. Today, it is over 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the welfare state has become a system that encourages family breakdown and government dependence. It fails to hold absentee fathers accountable and traps young people in poverty. When given a chance to change this destructive system, Bill Clinton again proved that he is a say anything, do nothing liberal President.

TAXPAYER MONEY BEING WASTED

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if word were out this afternoon that a govern-

mental official had wasted \$150,000 of taxpayer money to further a political agenda, someone would surely be here denouncing it, and if the figure were instead \$1.5 billion, I am sure the line of speakers would be rather long. Were it \$150 million of wasted taxpayer money, there would be bills and resolutions filed and other extraordinary action.

But what we are dealing with this afternoon is not \$150,000 or \$150 million, but \$1.5 billion of the greatest waste of taxpayer money in the history of these United States. That is the cost of the two Gingrich government shutdowns, \$1.5 billion totally wasted, frivolously, to further a political agenda, and, in the word of the sponsor of this action, to pressure another political official into doing what they want; \$1.5 billion.

In all these budget negotiations, I have never seen a line item that should be there; \$1.5 billion Gingrich government wasteful spending for shutting down the Government. Are they going to take that out of Medicare or just add it to the Government deficit?

A LITTLE FRIENDLY ADVICE FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has not asked me for any advice, but if he were to ask in the spirit of bipartisanship, I would be happy to oblige. I would say, "Mr. President, you are about to give your State of the Union Address. You have got your hands full right now with a host of problems. You vetoed the Balanced Budget Act while keeping Hazel O'Leary, who uses taxpayer dollars to hire Madonna's plane, still on the job. You still have got people upset with you because you raised taxes, the biggest tax increase in American history. You have promised to end welfare as we know it, and then you vetoed welfare reform. And you have gone back on your word to cut taxes on the American people."

I would say, "Mr. President, you can still make things right with the American people. You can still keep those promises you have made and broken so many times. You can agree to balance the budget by restraining spending and cutting taxes on hard-working American families. If you do that, Mr. President, you would finally be keeping your word and you would make an awful lot of Americans happy."

For what it is worth, that is the advice I would give President Clinton.

FUND NASA NOW

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, what a difference a day makes.

Yesterday, NASA's Galileo spacecraft beamed back incredible images of Jupiter, our solar system's most intriguing planet. Today, however, Members are ready to allow NASA to be caught in the crossfire of another Government shutdown.

When I met last week with NASA contractors in my district, they told me that the failure to enact NASA's appropriation would cause devastation and hardship to the region's aerospace industry. Small contractors, who don't have the financial flexibility of their large counterparts, would be particularly hard-hit.

Thermal Electronics, Luna Defense Systems, RGA Labs, and Phoenix Engineering will all be forced to lay off—not furlough, but lay off—a substantial percentage of their workers unless we act in a bipartisan manner to immediately enact a NASA appropriation which funds the space station and key science initiatives like the mission to plant Earth.

If one adds in Hughes, TRW, Allied Signal, and Cal Tech's Jet Propulsion Lab, we are talking about the possibility of over 10,000 layoffs.

Mr. Speaker, we must find common ground and fund NASA now. Our future depends on it.

SHAMEFUL DEMAGOGUERY

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I was on a plane last week and a fellow citizen of Lakewood turned to me and he said:

You know, Martin, it seems to be the difference between the new Democrat and the old Democrat is that the new Democrats are talking a great game, a great wonderful conservative game, and then they turn around and do the same thing that all the old liberal Democrats did.

This was a fellow who grew up in Texas as a Democrat.

I think that is exactly right on the money, and exactly what we can expect tonight from the President's State of the Union Address. We are going to hear another fabulous address. But when it gets down to the nitty-gritty, when we actually present a balanced budget, when we can actually do the right thing, then we in fact get into the gutter and engage in the most mindless and really shameful demagoguery that we have heard around here in a long time.

Let me just give you one example, and that is the Medicare example. Our Medicare program would increase spending at 7.4 percent per pay for the next 7 years; the President's is around 7.6, 7.7 percent. Yet this is deep cuts in Medicare to pay for a tax cut for our rich friends? And with a straight face? It is just shameless.

□ 1415

TALK OF DEFAULT MORE RECKLESS THAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the only thing more reckless than a Government shutdown is talk of default, and I mean talk. Talk alone on this subject is playing with fire. Secretary Rubin is accused of bluffing. The real question is are we bluffing?

The market opened today down 50 points. It is beginning to level off. But I do not like this game of chicken and I hope my colleagues do not. We have maligned the Secretary, but I think we should thank him for finding magic money. They language he is using this time is quite different and quite definitive and he concludes by saying I will not sell the Nation's gold, and I will not withhold taxpayers' refunds.

Now we are into whether we will have a clean or dirty debt limit bill. This gets us into the mode from which we have just ascended. Please, no more "deja vu all over again," not with the Nation's full faith and credit.

PRESIDENT CLINTON LONG ON PROMISES, SHORT ON KEEPING THOSE PROMISES

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President will deliver the State of the Union Address, and I am sure we will all hear a great speech tonight, because he always does give a great speech. But the fact is that also, just as usual, he will be long on promises and short on keeping those promises.

For example, in last year's State of the Union, President Clinton said and I quote, "We ought to help people raise their incomes immediately by lowering their taxes," end quote. But in reality he vetoed a middle-class family tax relief package.

Another example from last year's State of the Union. The President again, quote, "Nothing is done more to undermine our sense of common responsibility than our failed welfare system. It rewards welfare over work; it undermines family values," end quote. But in reality he vetoed the welfare reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, once again, President Clinton will probably give us a speech long on promises but short on results, just reinforcing the fact that he is the say-anything and do-nothing liberal President.

PRESIDENT HAS AGREED TO A 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has agreed to a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers. The problem is that the Republicans do not want to protect the priorities that the President thinks are important, such as the environment, Medicare, Medicaid, and also education. I would like to pay particular attention to the environment.

The Republicans are saying they want this huge tax cut or tax break, yet they want to cut back on environmental enforcement. They do not want to properly fund the Superfund Program to clean up toxic waste sites. In my home State of New Jersey, we have 114 Superfund sites, and a lot of those sites are not being cleaned up now and will not be cleaned up if the Republicans do not agree to fully fund the Superfund Program, which they have not agreed to do so far.

The President has stood strong. He agreed on a balanced budget and he agreed on the Republican terms, but he wants to protect the environment and he wants to make sure the Superfund Program moves forward so that in States like New Jersey those toxic waste sites that pose a direct threat to the health of many Americans who live nearby, he wants to make sure that those sites are cleaned up, and I commend him for it.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS MUST REPRESENT THE CHILDREN

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, we have three primary objectives. One is to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget; the second is to save our trust funds from insolvency, and ultimate bankruptcy, particularly Medicare; and our third objective is to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state into what I would call a caring opportunity society.

Our country has grown into debt from \$430 billion since the Vietnam War to \$4,900 billion. That has got to end. Adults, Members of Congress, are elected by adults to represent the children, and that is what we are about to do.

PRESIDENT CHIRAC DISREGARDS HEALTH AND WELFARE OF SOUTH PACIFIC

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, sometime next week President Chirac of France will be visiting Washington to meet with our President, and I understand there may even be a chance that he will address a joint session of

the Congress. Mr. Speaker, give me a break. This is the man with tremendous arrogance and disregard for the concerns of some 170 nations.

He totally disregarded the concerns of the health and welfare of some 27 million men, women, and children who live in the nations of the Pacific. He disregarded and decided to break the moratorium and has already exploded five nuclear bombs in atolls in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, by my last count, President Chirac and his predecessors have already exploded 182 nuclear bombs in the atmosphere and in 2 Pacific atolls. One of these atolls is a timed nuclear bomb, the equivalent of several Chernobyls that the French Government has forced upon the lives of the Pacific people. Is this fair, Mr. Speaker?

Shame on you, President Chirac of France. Shame on you for doing this to the Pacific people.

REPUBLICANS HAVE WALKED AWAY FROM THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS TABLE

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, House Budget Chairman JOHN KASICH said in November about the budget negotiations, and I quote, "Frankly, we do not ask for a lot. We ask for nothing more than a commitment to do this in a 7-year period. The priorities within that 7-year plan are negotiable."

Well, the President did exactly that, but now the Republicans want to move the goalpost in the middle of the game. Now the Republican leadership says that they will not negotiate on the budget priorities. What they want to do is to have a backroom deal on deep cuts in Medicare for a tax break for the wealthiest Americans.

Where I come from a person's word is his or her bond. Mr. KASICH and other Members of the Republican majority gave their word that they would sit down and negotiate the details of the budget once the President produced a 7-year balanced budget. The President met the Republicans more than halfway, but instead of responding in kind, Republicans have walked away from the negotiating table, walking away from their promise to the President, but more importantly than that, walking away from their duty to the American people.

MEMORIAL TO ED WHITE, FORMER CHIEF CLERK TO REPORTERS OF DEBATES

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] to memorialize one of our staff who has passed away.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Congress is a busy place. Members interact with many workers. Sometimes we know them, but yet we do not know them. One of those individuals was a great worker here. Ed White. He was, in fact, the Chief Clerk to the reporters. He sat right at the first level of the dais there, right behind the Republican podium.

Ed has passed away. He served in Korea. He retired in 1993. He is from Boston, MA. While in the service they handed him a tank, but no one taught him how to operate it. He taught himself and operated that tank in defense of our great country.

Ed White leaves his beautiful wife, Patricia; two sons, Patrick and Teddy; and an awful lot of people who knew him here and cared deeply for him. There will be, in fact, a memorial mass, 2 p.m., Thursday, January 25, St. James Catholic Church, 103 North Spring St., Falls Church, VA, for all of us who remember Ed and want to give our best to the family, and God bless.

CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). This is the day for the call of the Corrections Calendar.

The Clerk will call the bill on the Corrections Calendar.

CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES REFORM ACT OF 1995

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2567) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to standards for constructed water conveyances.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2567

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES.

Section 303(c)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(C) STANDARDS FOR CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES.—

"(i) RELEVANT FACTORS.—If a State exercised jurisdiction over constructed water conveyances in establishing standards under this section, the State shall consider any water quality impacts resulting from any return flow from a constructed water conveyance to navigable waters and the need to protect downstream uses and may consider the following:

"(I) The existing and planned uses of water transported in a conveyance system.

"(II) Management practices necessary to maintain the conveyance system.

"(III) Any State or regional water resources management and water conservation plans.

"(IV) The intended purposes for the constructed conveyance.

"(ii) RELEVANT USES.—If a State adopts or reviews water quality standards for constructed water conveyances, it shall not be required to establish recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses for such sys-

tems if the uses are not existing or reasonably foreseeable or the uses interfere with the intended purposes of the conveyance system.

"(iii) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to require a State to exercise jurisdiction over constructed water conveyances in establishing standards or to prohibit a State from considering any relevant factor in establishing standards or from establishing any relevant use.

"(iv) CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'constructed water conveyance' means a man-made water transport system constructed for the purpose of transporting water for agricultural purposes or municipal and industrial water supply purposes in a waterway that is not and never was a natural waterway."

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES.

Section 303(c)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(C) STANDARDS FOR CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES.—

"(i) RELEVANT FACTORS.—If a State exercises jurisdiction over constructed water conveyances in establishing standards under this section, the State shall consider any water quality impacts resulting from any return flow from a constructed water conveyance to navigable waters and the need to protect downstream uses and may consider the following:

"(I) The existing and planned uses of water transported in a conveyance system.

"(II) Management practices necessary to maintain the conveyance system.

"(III) Any State or regional water resources management and water conservation plans.

"(IV) The intended purposes for the constructed conveyance.

"(ii) RELEVANT USES.—If a State adopts or reviews water quality standards for constructed water conveyances, it shall not be required to establish recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses for such systems if the uses are not existing or reasonably foreseeable or the uses interfere with the intended purposes of the conveyance system.

"(iii) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to require a State to exercise jurisdiction over constructed water conveyances in establishing standards or to prohibit a State from considering any relevant factor in establishing standards or from establishing any relevant use.

"(iv) CONSTRUCTED WATER CONVEYANCES DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'constructed water conveyance' means a man-made water transport system constructed for the purpose of transporting water for agricultural purposes or municipal and industrial water supply purposes in a waterway that is not and never was a natural waterway."

Mr. SHUSTER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the committee amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2567, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act. This correction day bill, which is the first of 1996, fixes a specific problem under the Clean Water Act that will benefit State and local officials and agricultural interests and continue, at the same time, to protect our Nation's waters.

It is also the first piece of legislation for the House to consider this year under the new constraints imposed by the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995. This bill not only passes the test of not imposing unfunded Federal mandates, it passes it with flying colors. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office finds that this bill is likely to reduce State and local costs by interjecting flexibility to avoid unnecessary water use designations.

This legislation amends the Clean Water Act to allow States greater flexibility in setting water quality standards for so-called constructed water conveyances; that is, manmade drains, canals, and other conduits to transport water for agricultural and water supply purposes.

The bill is essentially the same as provisions in the House-passed clean water bill, and is based on testimony gathered from several hearings.

It is before us today by a bipartisan coalition of Members; and, indeed, there are nine original cosponsors, five Republicans, four Democrats. So it is totally bipartisan.

Our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure responded by reporting the bill on December 21, 1995. I particularly want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], the ranking Democrat on the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee. They all cooperated in putting together a very reasonable package.

I also would be quite remiss if I did not commend and congratulate the primary sponsors of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] along with others who have continued to press for this legislation.

The bill fixes a problem, and that is EPA's overly stringent interpretation and implementation of the Clean Water Act as it applies to these manmade water conveyances. It fixes the problem without weakening the act. Indeed, the bill helps make the Clean Water Act even more acceptable to the public by making it more flexible and more realistic.

Over the years certain manmade ditches and canals, particularly in the arid Western States, have been designated as navigable waters that must be regulated under the Clean Water Act. States, in turn, must then establish water quality standards for the manmade canals that in some cases presume that they will be used for fishing, swimming, or even drinking.

Now, it does not make any sense to regulate an agricultural drainage canal or a ditch the same way that you quite properly would regulate a pristine lake or a navigable river. It simply does not make sense to put farmers and municipal and State water officials in a regulatory straitjacket.

So this legislation fixes that problem, Mr. Speaker. For example, rice growers in California have manmade ditches and drains which help remove excess water from the fields. It does not make sense to treat the water before it enters the drains as if it were entering a swimming hole or a lake. Rice and cotton and other commodity growers in other States, such as Missouri, Louisiana, Texas, and Colorado have cited similar problems.

And what is the cost of this overregulation? An EPA mandated use attainability analysis alone, this is simply the analysis, could cost several hundred thousand dollars. For example, the municipal water officials in Arizona tell us that the canals transporting raw water to drinking water treatment plants should not be subject to water quality standards designed for water bodies that people swim in and fish in and drink from.

Fro Phoenix alone, one city, the cost of these added, unnecessary requirements would be \$66 million. In addition, annual maintenance costs would be \$12 million. That is over 25 times their current annual cost.

This needs to be fixed and that is only one city, so you can extrapolate it to see what the overall cost would be for the American people.

□ 1430

In an effort to accommodate the minority and to reflect comments from EPA, we have made several changes to the bill that was introduced, and those changes are described in detail in the committee report.

We have clarified that nothing in this bill prevents a State from considering any relevant factors or uses in setting standards. In other words, nothing, absolutely nothing, prevents States from doing what they need to do.

We have revised provisions so that the States are authorized, not man-

dated, to consider certain factors and uses.

Among the many supporters of this legislation are included the Western Governors Association, the Western States Water Council, the Western Coalition for Arid States, the National Water Resources Association, the Western Growers Association, the California rice industry, the USA Rice Federation and the city of Phoenix, AZ. This is a bipartisan bill, supported by Members across the country, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

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

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2567, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act. I particularly want to commend my California colleagues, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. CONDIT, who have worked to get this bill onto the House floor today.

We have worked with them and with the majority to develop a bill that will meet the specific needs of the districts represented by my California colleagues while assuring protection of human health and the environment. It deserves the approval of the House.

When H.R. 2567 was introduced, I was concerned that it was too broad and that it lacked clear standards for States to use in setting designated uses for constructed water conveyances. However, the chairman was willing to work in a bipartisan manner to modify the bill, and to include explanatory language in the committee report which alleviated most of my concerns.

Mr. Speaker, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act reflects the desire of owners of constructed water conveyance systems to have greater flexibility in how the standards of the Clean Water Act apply to those conveyances. It has been modified to assure that this flexibility is tempered with the responsibility to take reasonable, affordable measures to assure protection of water quality.

Obviously there may be situations where the fishable and swimmable standards applicable to natural waterways would not be appropriate for constructed waterways. However, we should not automatically assume that all constructed conveyance systems would be subject to lower standards under this bill. There must be some meaningful interference with the authorized purposes of the conveyance to justify any lesser level of protection.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 2567 will allow States the flexibility which they seek while assuring protection of human health and the environment. I thank the chairman for his willingness to work in a bipartisan manner to address my concerns about the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for the openness that has been evident all through the consideration of this bill. It is non-controversial now. As a matter of fact, the provisions of this bill were included in the committee bill, H.R. 961, and the substitute that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and I offered to that.

Frankly, I wish the bill was not necessary, but the truth is there are times when the Clean Water Act is interpreted and applied too narrowly and the views of State and local water officials are not adequately taken into account. This bill improves the Clean Water Act and the flexibility and responsiveness to site-specific circumstances, while keeping in place all the successes and important goals of the Act.

Because certain so-called constructed water conveyances are interpreted to be navigable waters under the Clean Water Act, States are required to set water quality standards for the conveyances. The problem is that in some situations the standards are set with the automatic assumption that the ditches or drains or canals will be used for swimming or fishing or drinking. This can lead to, as we understand it, very costly and unnecessary requirements.

In response, the bill makes clear that States do not automatically have to establish standards based on recreational, aquatic, or fish consumption uses for these constructed water conveyances. Nothing in the bill, however, prevents a State from doing so if it wants.

So we would say to the States, "If you want to do it, you can do it. We're not going to prevent you from doing it." Also, nothing in the bill exempts constructed water conveyances from regulation under the act.

The committee added additional safeguards and clarifications to the introduced bill and worked with all interests to reach a reasonable compromise. I want to emphasize that: worked with all interests to reach a reasonable compromise.

No one can say this bill weakens the Clean Water Act. Boy, I would not be identified with anything that would weaken the Clean Water Act. It simply gives State officials more flexibility to take into account specific situations.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I want to thank the chairman for the leadership that he has provided and for the opportunity he has afforded me to work with him.

Mr. Speaker, I would invite those Members who have not done so, to visit the committee room and witness the new portrait of our chairman. It is a magnificent work of art.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the original sponsor of this bill.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for helping move H.R. 2567, the Water Conveyance Reform Act of 1995, expeditiously through the committee and to the House floor today.

Without your leadership and bipartisan effort, none of this could be accomplished.

I also want to thank the corrections day advisory task force for their understanding of the need for this legislation and the support it deserves.

Basically, the problem exists with EPA's interpretation of the Clean Water Act.

The EPA has interpreted constructed water conveyance facilities to be waters of the United States and therefore subject to the same Clean Water Act standards as California's most pristine mountain streams.

In the case of California rice, many facilities proposed for regulations were specifically constructed as part of the tremendous and widely acclaimed successful effort to keep agricultural drain water out of the Sacramento River and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

Basically my bill is designed to easily rectify this situation by amending the Clean Water Act to make it clear that no State need regulate water within a constructed conveyance facility except to ensure the facility's continued use for the purpose for which it was constructed; and to prevent water quality problems in downstream natural waterways.

I firmly believe this is a unique opportunity to address a problem that has confronted the rice industry for a couple of years and portends to turn into a significant economic and environmental hardship for the Central Valley if not repaired.

Lastly, I want to especially point out Congressman MATSUI and Congressman FAZIO for their efforts with this bill and also thank Members who cosponsored H.R. 2567.

In a time when there has been limited bipartisan effort on legislation, the Constructed Water Conveyance Reform Act of 1995 truly demonstrates we can work together to find solutions to real problems.

I would ask all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to be certain that I also acknowledge the tremendous contribution to this effort of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. We certainly very much appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND], a member of the committee.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. This bill is a com-

monsense reform to the Clean Water Act, it has significant bipartisan support and it is a necessary amendment and I thank Mr. CONDIT and SHUSTER for their leadership in bringing it to the House floor.

It must be stressed that when the original Clean Water Act was constructed it was designed to require States to establish water quality standards for navigable waters used for fishing, swimming, or water supply purposes. This amendment to the act gives States the authority rather than the Federal Government to regulate facilities constructed to transport water for municipal, agricultural, or industrial purposes which were never meant to support recreation or aquatic life.

This legislation will realize savings for U.S. EPA. The agency will no longer have to review and approve State's plans for water conveyance systems. Savings will also be seen at the State level in that they will no longer be mandated to oversee the implementation of constructed conveyance facilities. These total more than 6,300 in central California that have a combined excess of 20,000 miles. Similarly, the correction will save State and local governments money so they will not be forced to develop control plans for constructed conveyances or develop implementation plans. Finally, private citizens will see a reduced cost for their water supply or at least a slowing in the rate of increase.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Mr. CONDIT and Mr. SHUSTER for their hard work on this sound legislation which I wholeheartedly support.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], a prime sponsor of the legislation before us.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank both the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and the gentlemen from Minnesota and New York for helping those of us in the West solve a problem. This is something that means a lot to us in Nevada, Arizona, and California where we have many thousands of miles of canals, of water conveyances constructed largely on private property maintained by reclamation districts, irrigation districts that are basically made up of the property owners who pool their resources to make it possible for us to evacuate these conveyances into streams and rivers in a way that is most beneficial for clean water.

But we did not need the regulation of EPA and the Clean Water Act, and this bill makes clear we do not need it. The State of California, for example, and I believe the State of Arizona as well, maintained that they needed to follow a rigorous policy of enforcing the Clean Water Act in these private drainage canals because of the Federal requirements. We make it clear that if any further action is taken on this level, it will be at the requirement and the behest of the State and local government.

As has already been indicated, this is a great potential savings not only to EPA and to the State water quality agencies and entities, regional as well as statewide, but most of all to the local landowners who have been in most cases already in the lead in trying to handle the environmental problems that they encounter in their crop patterns, in their rice industry or in the cotton industry, as the case may be. They deserve the attention of the administration, they have gotten it from the President, and even though the administration indicates they have some work they want to see done on this bill in the Senate, I think they have indicated that they understand the problem needs to be addressed and they are willing to work with us to make sure that it will be before the end of this Congress.

Legislation very similar to this was included in the Clean Water Act that passed this House. This problem is of such a magnitude that the gentleman from California, Mr. CONDIT, along with Mr. MATSUI and myself, felt it needed to come up on the Corrections Day occasion. I appreciate the leadership he has provided. I appreciate the fact that we could bring it here and attempt to solve this problem, which stands out from others, in a way that will not require us to come to the conclusion of the Clean Water Act fix which remains controversial and may yet fail to get to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of my colleagues for allowing this legislation to come to the floor. It means a great deal to agriculture in my district. They will be very gratified to see that reason has prevailed here in Washington on something that makes so much sense to them.

Mr. Speaker, I include my statement on this legislation for the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make my colleagues aware of a serious problem in my district in California. Currently, the Clean Water Act is being applied somewhat capriciously to agricultural drainage conveyances. One of the legitimate concerns in my community is that when we apply Federal regulations we do so with good intentions but sometime with a bad outcome. In this case, the Government—in its effort to protect the water quality of natural waterways—is extending its reach to man-made systems that are designed to protect against contamination in the natural waterways to which these facilities ultimately drain.

Several months ago President Clinton visited the State of California and met with growers including constituents from my area. They conveyed to the President how burdensome this expansion of the Clean Water Act was becoming to California agriculture. President Clinton agreed. It was clearly not the intent of the Clean Water Act to try and bring agriculture drainage systems up to the standards applied to pristine mountain streams.

I have a large majority of rice growers in my area and they are committed to making progress in protecting the environment. The difficulty they face is when they are forced to meet unreasonable measures that do nothing to meet that goal.

I appreciate President Clinton's support for this clarification. I understand that the Administration may have some concerns regarding the bill's expansion to include industrial and municipal conveyances. I will do everything I can to see that these concerns are addressed in the Senate. It is critical, however, that this measure move forward and that the agriculture industry in my State be reassured that Congress is willing and able to address this problem.

I strongly ask my colleagues' support.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of H.R. 2567 our 12th corrections day bill and the first bill of the 2d session of the 104th Congress. I congratulate Chairman SHUSTER for moving this legislation so quickly to the floor. I also congratulate Mr. CONDIT for introducing this bill.

In only 5 months time the House has considered 11 bills under this calendar and passed all of them. The Senate has sent three of those bills to the President for signature. I believe we are compiling a record of success and that the corrections calendar will become heavily relied upon by the House as a way to fix past errors.

The American people are demanding a more responsive Government, and corrections day is a key part of delivering on their demands.

On the floor today, we again have a prime example of the need for the corrections day process. Here we have the EPA interpreting the Clean Water Act to require the State of California to consider irrigation ditches as waters of the United States, and, therefore, subject to the same Clean Water Act standards as the most pristine mountain streams. Everyone can recognize this as being ridiculous but a strict reading of the act results in this problem.

The only reasonable solution is for Congress to step in and make the much needed change. Mr. CONDIT's bill was introduced only a couple of months ago and already we have it here on the House floor. I want to recognize Chairman SHUSTER for his hard work in getting this bill to the floor in such short order. I am hopeful that the other body will recognize the need for quick action and send this bill to the President without delay.

□ 1445

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation and when I say that, when I say in opposition, I say in opposition in its current form because I believe the bill, as it currently is written, is overly broad and allows an exemption far greater than that that is necessary.

I also want to recognize the work of my colleagues from California, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], for the attention they have given this problem to address what has been considered a very legitimate problem in California with respect to the use of these facilities.

My concern with this legislation is that in fact what we now see is that this use of these facilities will override, should the State so decide, will override the public health and safety and environmental quality. These facilities, in many instances, are used to discharge agricultural water from the lands, as my colleagues have pointed out, but I would also suggest to you that these facilities are being used for a multiple of other purposes, including fish and wildlife and water-based recreation contact and noncontact use of these waters. Some of these facilities are rather large and, in fact, in the State of California now in the Delta-Mendota Canal and the California aqueduct dedicated under the Clean Water Act, including contact and noncontact recreation, warm-water fish and wildlife habitat and used by thousands of people over the year for sport fishing. In southern California, water from the Colorado River flows into many canals serving the Palo Verde irrigation district, Imperial irrigation district, and, again, fishing and contact use of the water is made by other than agricultural interests.

The Imperial irrigation district and in several locations in Texas near the border with Mexico, low-income people, unfortunately, in this country live alongside these irrigation canals and depend upon them for subsistence fishing, for bathing and even drinking supplies because of the of the tragic situations they find themselves in with respect to housing conditions in those areas.

In the Palo Verde Basin, a significant amount of sport fishing takes place in the Palo Verde Outfall Dam. Some swimming and boating also occurs here.

The point is this. Here, Mr. Speaker, I think this legislation, and I think the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] already mentioned it, the administration is continuing negotiations. I would hope this legislation could be more narrowly drawn to protect those public health and safety issues that can occur under the legislation as currently drafted.

The EPA memorandum follows:
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY,

San Francisco, CA, January 18, 1996.

Subject: Status of Corrections Day Bill HR 2567 Constructed Water Conveyance Reform Act of 1995.

From: Catherine Roberts, Congressional Liaison Officer.

To: Felicia Marcus, Regional Administrator.
The Corrections Day bill HR 2567 introduced by Representative Gary Condit and co-sponsored by Representatives Robert Matsui

and Vic Fazio was passed by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by voice vote on December 14, 1995. Headquarters expects the bill to move to the House floor as soon as January 23, 1996 although it is possible that a delay will occur until the next Corrections Day.

The original purpose of the bill as described by Representative Condit's staff was to provide relief to the rice industry from the designation of uses for irrigation return flows. It was on this basis that Representatives Fazio and Matsui were persuaded to be co-sponsors although Mr. Fazio withheld support until a few days before Committee mark up of the bill. However, the Committee had entirely different intentions than the ones expressed by the California sponsors. Indeed, it became evident that the Committee, Chaired by Representative Bud Shuster (R-PA), wished to provide relief to any state nationwide with manmade/constructed water conveyances for agriculture, municipal and industrial purposes.

Historically, Region 9, at the request of Senator Harry Reid during the 103rd Congress, participated in a working group comprised of arid west states to develop amendments to provide flexibility in the Clean Water Act for states in the Arid West. The proposed amendments were originally designed for a more broad set of physical characteristics such as ephemeral streams in the arid west than just constructed water conveyances. Nevertheless these types of conveyances were recognized in a subsection of the amendments and were given relief under specific criteria. These amendments were included in the Clean Water Act reauthorization and passed by the Senate in the summer of 1994. In the House of Representatives, the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act failed to emerge from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Arid west amendments were subsequently included in HR961 passed by the House during the first session of the 104th Congress but the language and intent was changed significantly from the original Reid amendment.

The significance of the changes made to the original language on constructed water conveyances were associated with: (1) broadening applicability to the whole country instead of limiting it to the arid west; (2) broadening the definition of constructed conveyance and; (3) the addition of a clause describing relevant uses. These changes were made in HR961 and then extended further in HR2567. Representative Condit's office initially did not realize that HR2567 had been taken out of the arid west context and thus made relevant nationwide. This issue was immediately raised by Region 9 and was recognized by Mr. Condit's staff as needing further discussion. However, we were to discover that the majority staff on the Committee were not receptive to the limitation to arid west states. During our conference calls with Committee staff, it was expressed that it was their intention to retain the original language in HR961 since it had already passed the House however the Committee markup resulted in expanding the language further and well beyond the carefully phrased language in the original Reid Bill.

The passage of this bill is a high priority for Mr. Condit for several reasons not least of which is that a "commitment" was made to the rice industry President Clinton's Central Valley visit regarding constructed water conveyances. The substance of this discussion has been narrowly summarized as providing relief through a Correction's Day Bill. The efforts of the WMD and the State of California to work with the rice industry on their concerns has been seriously overlooked by the bill's co-sponsors. We believe that the

Clean Water Act already provides the flexibility to address their concerns and indeed exemptions have been made by the State.

The debate on this bill has been further complicated by the very different concerns raised by the state of Arizona. Arizona actively supports the bill and is in the process of trying to dedesignate uses for some of their constructed water conveyances. It appears that the preferred approach is to carve out permanent legislative relief rather than working within the parameters of the existing CWA. Furthermore, the efforts of EPA staff to work with the various stakeholders whether from Colorado or California through a consensus process is being forfeited to political expediency.

At this point HQ is recommending to OMB that the bill as written be vetoed by the President. The recommendation is based on a number of concerns that were presented to OMB as official Agency comments (attachment). In essence, HQ stated that HR2567 would exempt States from establishing standards for constructed water conveyances, specifically for the adoption of standards for recreation, aquatic life and fish consumption. HQ comments further state that the purpose of the water conveyance system is given a higher priority than the protection of human health and the environment. There are a significant number of water bodies defined as waters of United States that could be impacted by HR2567 and we have provided a preliminary list of these areas for HDQ and the House Minority staff (attachment). Unfortunately, HQ has very limited information on impacts to waters in Regions other than Region 9 and 6.

The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is chaired by Bill Shuster (R-PA) who will be taking the lead along with Sherwood Boehlert (R-NY) on the floor debate. It is expected that the argument for passage will be a simplistic reference to this bill as being part of the already passed HR961. The Region 9 Members on this Committee are as follows: Bill Baker (R), Jay Kim (R), Steve Horn (R), Andrea Seastrand (R) and Bob Filner (D). In addition, Representatives Condit, Fazio and Matsui will also be there to encourage their colleagues to vote for a bill that will give relief for the rice industry. I have included for your review a copy of HR2567, the original Reid amendments, Region 8 comments and a statement by Representative James Oberstar (D-MN) the ranking minority Member on the Committee (attachment).

If you have any questions or need further assistance please let me know at x1560.

Attachments.

EPA COMMENTS ON H.R. 2567

EPA believes that H.R. 2567, relating to standards for constructed water conveyances within the context of the Clean Water Act (CWA), is unnecessary. Current CWA authority already provides the necessary flexibility to address standards for constructed water conveyances.

H.R. 2567 would:

Exempt States from establishing standards of any kind for constructed water conveyances and

Exempt States (when they do develop standards for constructed water conveyances) from adopting recreation, aquatic life, fish consumption uses if these uses "are not existing or reasonably foreseeable or such uses impede the authorized uses of the conveyance system."

This language essentially sets the water conveyance use above the protection of human health and the environment and lacks a mechanism to ensure that the basic water quality protections of the CWA, even if existing, are maintained. Such categorical

exclusions are inappropriate. Site-specific analyses and use attainability analyses under current authority and implementing regulations can and should be conducted to determine the appropriate requirements for water conveyance systems on a case-by-case basis.

Because of the blanket exclusion in H.R. 2567 for all water conveyances anywhere in the country, this bill could have resulting adverse impacts on water quality affecting not only water quality in arid/semi-arid areas, but a substantial number of water bodies nation-wide. In addition the H.R. 2567 does not anticipate any additional impacts due to new, non-agricultural development which could add stormwater discharge to the conveyance and result in increased flows during storm events (see suggested changes in (C)(i)(II) below).

Whether a use is existing or not does not mean that it is not attainable (see #2 above). Also, the meaning of "reasonably foreseeable" should be clearly defined.

The statutory construction provision in subsection (iii) would allow States to avoid exercising jurisdiction over constructed conveyances at all, although they may be supporting at least limited aquatic life, wildlife or irrigation uses, clearly avoiding the goals of the Act set out in Sections 101(a)(2) and 303(c). Since many of the conveyances are functionally perennial rivers, the definition of constructed water conveyance is similarly flawed.

If this bill were to go forward we offer the following suggested changes (If however, the intent of this bill expands to include municipal water conveyances, we would need to re-evaluate the specific language to be protective of human health and the environment.):

Suggested changes are in italics deleted matter in bold brackets:

Section 1. *Arid West* Constructed Water Conveyances

(C) Standards for *Arid West* constructed water conveyances.

(i) Relevant Factors.—

* * * * *

(II) Any water quality impacts resulting from any [return] flow from a constructed water conveyance to navigable waters and the need to protect *hydrologic integrity at the confluence with navigable waters, as well as downstream [users] uses.*

* * * * *

(ii) Relevant Uses.—If a State adopts or reviews water quality standards for constructed water conveyances, it shall not be required to establish recreation, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses for such systems if the uses are not existing or reasonably foreseeable [or] *and such uses unreasonably impede the authorized [uses] purposes of the conveyance system.*"

* * * * *

(iv) Constructed Water Conveyances Defined.—In this subparagraph, the term 'constructed water conveyance' means a man-made *agricultural drainage* water transport system...."

(v) *Arid West* defined.—In this subparagraph, the term "*Arid West*" means an area in the western portion of the United States that typically receives less than fifteen inches of rain on an annual basis.

or

(v) *Arid West* defined.—In this subparagraph, the term "*Arid West*" means an area in the western portion of the United States west of the 100th meridian.

In summary, EPA believes that the legislation is unnecessary, that the flexibility contained in the CWA currently gives States the functional equivalent of this bill; and that a

case-by-case analysis is the way to determine which conveyances deserve the exclusions provided in H.R. 2567.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the distinguished chairman for yielding me the time, also for his hard work on this important issue.

I turn to this side of the aisle and see my very good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], who has worked so hard on the same.

Mr. Speaker, one of many issues addressed here, and I have risen on many occasions to note that what this entire exercise should be all about, is what is reasonable, what makes sense, and I believe, as part of the Corrections Day, this piece of legislation is eminently reasonable because it resolves a problem that agricultural interests and endeavors have experienced with the Clean Water Act.

H.R. 2567 will modify the way the Clean Water Act applies to constructed agricultural drains, recognizing that this law was never intended to bring the quality of agricultural runoff to the level of a pristine stream.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2567. I urge the adoption of this commonsense legislation, and, Mr. Speaker, I pause again and make note of the commonsense consensus in this Chamber on this act, on this corrections exercise.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN, and, in fact, I welcome him back to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2567, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act of 1995.

This legislation, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], corrects the improper application of the Clean Water Act to constructed water systems. Constructed water systems are otherwise known as ditches and canals.

It clearly is the intent of Congress to cover a wide array of natural waters or water bodies in establishing water quality standards. However, it was not Congress' intent to subject constructed water systems to the act's very strict requirements.

Earlier this session, the body passed H.R. 961, the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1995, to provide greater flexibility to the States in setting water quality standards. This legislation contains similar provisions allowing the States to recognize the special features and purposes of agricultural water conveyances. Under this bill, the State will be allowed to make distinction between a manmade water transport system and a constructed water body used for recreation, aquatic life or fish consumption, and establish appropriate

standards. This legislation is critical for arid States such as California and Arizona, where farmers must construct manmade waterways and irrigation canals in order to support agricultural industry.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, I would like to note that this is the first piece of legislation that would fall into the new unfunded mandate law passed and signed into law last year, a bill also authored by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT]. The supporters of this legislation are proud to point out CBO has certified H.R. 2567 would actually reduce costs to States because it would give States greater flexibility when establishing water quality standards for constructed water conveyances.

This is a win for the States. This is an effort to inject commonsense reform into the application of a very important act. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about continued efforts to use the Corrections Day Calendar for exceptions to the Clean Water Act, particularly with regard to the overall goal of the act of achieving fishable and swimmable waters.

As we know, water bodies are in no way isolated. They are all part of the cycle.

I am concerned, and I believe a lot of other people who swim, boat, and fish would be concerned, if water in water conveyances were being held up to a lesser standard than any river, lake, or stream, because one is not mutually exclusive of the other.

I share the concern of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], which I believe is also shared by the administration, that this bill will have a broader impact than is necessary and that, as a result, the negative impacts of the legislation will be greater than anticipated by its sponsors. No one can know the impact that relaxing standards on all conveyances will have on water quality overall, and substandard water that may flow from a conveyance into navigable waters will have a varying degree of impact over time.

However, this impact will be cumulative, and receiving water will in some ways degrade. The bottom line, in my opinion, is that maintaining certain water quality standards for conveyances will in no way interfere with the intended purposes of conveyance systems. It will, however, ensure the safety of those that fish and swim in our Nation's waters, as well as protect invaluable aquatic habitat.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I do urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], the distinguished ranking member who, in just a short few months, has done such an outstanding job on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I compliment our ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], for the splendid job he continues to do as our voice on the Subcommittee on Water Resources. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources, for their cooperative spirit as we worked our way through this legislation.

Initially, as introduced, I was opposed to H.R. 2567. However, due to the willingness of the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], of the subcommittee, to work with us both in making substantive changes in the language of the bill and in committee report language to further clarify bill language, we have, I feel, addressed our concerns, certainly the concerns that we have had on this side of the aisle, and those that the administration had, and, as a result, I do not oppose its passage. I am not for it, but I do not oppose it.

What really troubles me about where we are today and what we are doing today, is that for the second time in this Congress, our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is on the floor with a bill considering an item under corrections day procedure on an issue where there is either nothing or relatively little to correct or something that is in the process of being corrected by the administration. We are here considering a bill which would more appropriately and more properly be considered under one of the other calendars of the House, either the Union Calendar, where there would be general debate and an open amendment process or on the Suspension Calendar, where an individual Member would have more leverage to express their concerns and have those concerns addressed because the bill has to pass by, we know, two-thirds on the Suspension Calendar.

I just viscerally oppose this corrections day process. In all of my 32-years' experience in the House, I think this is a very dangerous deviation from long-established process that protects interests that otherwise do not have an adequate voice.

Now, I know corrections day was intended to address inappropriate laws or laws that people called dumb or regulations that are inappropriate or where there is a consensus that they ought to be corrected. Bills under this calendar were supposed to be narrow in scope, to address an immediate need that could not await reauthorization legislation. Well, that is the framework within which this corrections day was spelled out in the advisory to House Members last year.

There is no reason this particular bill could not await the Clean Water Act reauthorization. In fact, a similar provision was included in H.R. 961. As we have already heard today, the bill is not noncontroversial.

My colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], had very serious objections to it. The administration has expressed further reservations which they hope to have addressed when the bill reaches the Senate. If they are not addressed there, I suspect the administration would be opposed to the bill.

Rather than making a limited technical amendment, the bill has far-reaching policy implications.

Now, the worst of those, fortunately and wisely, and I think in a very timely fashion, was addressed by the majority in our process of negotiation, and, thank goodness, this bill came through this committee and not through some other committee where things are very contentious. We might have something very lopsided on the floor. I think we have a bill that has a reasoned approach to this problem.

But, again, my objection is on the basis of process. There is no opportunity for amendment to this bill. There is no opportunity for votes on such amendments, and I think that we ought to have an issue of this magnitude considered under a process where it could be open to amendment.

If there is going to be a continuation of this corrections day procedure, it ought to be limited much more narrowly than it has been in the two instances arising out of our committee and in the 10 other instances of other bills that have been considered so far in this Congress.

I expressed concerns during our committee markup that the bill would allow States to forgo protection of human health and the environment in order instead to accommodate industrial, agricultural, and municipal interests who want to save money.

□ 1500

Even in situations where it would be possible to strike a reasonable balance that would simultaneously accommodate multiple uses of a constructed water body and protect human health. I think we have to be sensitive, regardless of who owns this body of water, that all these waters eventually are in the public domain. There are many constructed water bodies that States have designated for uses both for irrigation, agriculture drainage, and for recreation, aquatic life, and for fisheries. Experience has shown us that we can use water bodies wisely, in a multiple-use way, for a wide range of purposes, for swimming, for example, and for irrigation, but also protect those individual multiple uses.

We should not obstruct our ability to work in the normal legislative process to address these issues in the normal legislative way, open to amendment, open to broad and extensive debate and

discussion, and to address, particularly in the environment, particularly in this area, of staying on course, to achieve the objective of the Clean Water Act of 1972 to make our waters fishable and swimmable.

Mr. Speaker, corrections day was to address inappropriate or dumb laws or regulations about which there would be little controversy. Corrections bills are supposed to be "narrow in scope" and to "address an immediate need which cannot await reauthorization * * * legislation." These are requirements spelled out by the Corrections Day Advisory Group in its letter to House Members last summer.

There is no reason this bill could not await Clean Water Act reauthorization, especially in view of the fact that a similar provision was included in H.R. 961. Moreover, this bill is not noncontroversial, and is not limited to a specific problem. Rather than making a limited technical amendment, this bill has far-reaching policy implications. Prior to committee action I recommended amending H.R. 2567 to address only the particular irrigation issue which gave rise to the bill, but that suggestion was rejected by the majority. Instead, we have a bill of national application with no consideration of its national implications.

Most disturbingly, there is no opportunity for amendment on this floor. Had this been brought to the floor as a freestanding bill on the Union Calendar, it would have been open to amendment. If it were brought on the Suspension Calendar, it would have been subject to a higher level of consideration, where a Member with concern over this issue could have insisted that his or her concerns be reflected in the final version of the bill considered on the floor. This bill should be considered either on the Suspension Calendar or in regular order, not on the Corrections Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, if there is to be a corrections day, let us limit it to true corrections, and not subvert the regular legislative process.

This bill would allow States to not establish recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses for certain constructed water conveyances in limited circumstances where these uses would give rise to an unreasonable burden.

During markup of H.R. 2567 I expressed concerns that the bill could allow States to forego protection of human health and the environment in order to accommodate industrial, agricultural, and municipal interests in saving money, even in situations where it would be possible to strike a reasonable balance that simultaneously accommodates multiple uses of a constructed waterbody and protects human health.

There are many constructed waterbodies that States have designated both for uses such as irrigation, agricultural drainage, and flood control and for recreation, aquatic life, and fish consumption. Experience has proven that we can use waterbodies for a range of purposes—for example swimming and irrigation—and simultaneously protect those multiple uses. This Congress must not obstruct our proven ability to strike a reasonable balance that both protects people who swim and fish in constructed waterbodies, and avoids unreasonable burdens on agricultural and municipal and industrial interests.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention two of the most important improvements made during committee consideration of H.R. 2567:

First, under the bill as introduced, States were not required to establish water quality standards for recreation, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses if those uses would impede other authorized uses of the waterbody. I was vigorously opposed to this provision because it set a very low threshold for excusing the protection of recreation and other uses and thereby endangering human health. Where multiple uses, such as swimming and fishing and agriculture, can reasonably be accommodated, it would be a terrible precedent to allow for standards that fail to protect people who swim and fish in canals.

The preferable approach would have been to modify the bill by eliminating the clause concerning interference with the intended purposes of the conveyance system. The committee amendment substituted the word "interfere" for the word "impede." This change and the explanation in the legislative history indicate the committee's intent to establish a meaningful, substantive threshold.

The committee amendment reflects the intent that States will be required to establish water quality standards for recreation, aquatic life, and fish consumption uses, unless doing so would create an appreciable interference that diminishes the ability of the conveyance to accomplish its intended purpose. As the chairman noted in the committee report, "[g]enerally speaking interference caused by reasonable, affordable measures to accommodate multiple uses would not be expected to exceed the threshold."

For example, measures that would not be expected to meet the threshold for modifying the requirement to establish water quality standards for recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses include rice growers in California who have changed irrigation practices in order to capture, hold, and reuse irrigation water contaminated with herbicides. The new practices significantly reduce the amount of chemicals discharged to the Sacramento River, while reducing the amount of water used and, therefore, the cost of the water. Measures such as these would not be expected to justify a State's decision to not establish water quality standards for recreational, aquatic life, or fish consumption uses.

The second amendment I would like to note narrows the breadth of the bill, by clarifying that it does not apply to conveyances constructed for navigational purposes. As introduced, H.R. 2567 applied to constructed conveyances regardless of their purpose. The bill reported by the Transportation Committee limits the application of the bill to those conveyances constructed for agricultural purposes or municipal and industrial water supply purposes. Although I believe that the bill should be narrower still, I believe that this modification is an important one.

Under H.R. 2567 as reported by the Transportation Committee, if a constructed water conveyance was constructed for or serves more than one purpose, and navigation is one of those purposes, then that conveyance is not covered by the bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a few ways in which I believe H.R. 2567 does not alter current law under the Clean Water Act. The bill does not modify existing law relating to the authority of the Environ-

mental Protection Agency to approve or disapprove water quality standards. Nor does the bill authorize the downgrading of existing uses. Finally, the factors for consideration under subparagraph (C)(i) of the bill are in addition to, not in lieu of, those under current law at section 303(c)(2) of the Clean Water Act.

Mr. Speaker, with the changes offered by the chairman and adopted by the committee, and with the explanation of the bill in the committee report and as outlined above, I do not oppose passage of this bill.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to emphasize as strongly as I know how that this bill is on the floor today not because the Republican majority wants to stuff it down the minority's throats. Quite the contrary, this bill is on the floor today because our Democrat colleagues are the ones who have provided the leadership to get this moving.

Indeed, as we mentioned at the start of this debate, it has been the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], who have provided the leadership and the driving force behind this legislation. That is why this is here today, and the majority is happy to have been accommodating to our friends in the minority. That is why this legislation is here today. It is bipartisan in nature, with nine original cosponsors, five Republicans, four Democrats.

With regard to the substance of the legislation and some of the objections which have been expressed, first, to say that this should be limited to only a part of the West does not solve the real problem. Farmers in Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Texas are all affected. So we need to address those regions of the country as well. This legislation does that.

Further, to say, as the President has indicated, that this should apply only to agricultural conveyances, does not solve the real problem. It only solves a part of the problem. What do we say to the city of Phoenix and other cities who have concrete-lined culverts? Do we tell them they have to treat that water like it was a pristine stream, even though it is going to cost, in the case of Phoenix, \$66 million and provide absolutely no additional environmental benefit? No, I think that is not wise.

So this legislation does go beyond agricultural conveyances, and indeed does address the real problems that many of the cities, particularly in the West, face.

Finally, let me emphasize that in this legislation, it is very, very clear, States may use more stringent environmental requirements if they choose to. So once again, some of the objections we hear really stem from a "Washington knows best" attitude.

The States may impose much more stringent requirements. We trust the States. We have confidence in the States. So let us not fall back into the old trap of saying "Washington knows best." Let us give flexibility to the States. Let us pass this bipartisan legislation overwhelmingly. I urge adoption of the bill before us.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 2567, the Constructed Water Conveyances Reform Act of 1995. I want to thank Representative CONDIT for his efforts to address this important issue.

California farmers have been very active in developing innovative strategies for reducing the discharge of pollutants into our natural waterways. Producers in the Sacramento Valley have used closed drainage systems that hold water until its pesticides degrade, making it safe for release. Such efforts have yielded extremely impressive results. However, the possibility that these closed drainage systems could be required to meet water quality standards similar to those for natural waterways has created a great deal of uncertainty for users of these pollution control methods.

H.R. 2567 would provide the certainty needed to ensure that these innovative efforts to improve water quality can continue to go forward. At the same time, its provisions will ensure that there is no change in the regulation of the impact of constructed water conveyances on natural waterways. In the Sacramento area, we already face significant challenges in protecting and improving the quality of our waterways. We must not make this task more difficult.

I am aware that the administration has expressed concern about certain aspects of this legislation. I am pleased, however, that they are committed to addressing the concerns of California agriculture on this matter, and I am ready to work with them to achieve resolution.

I urge my colleagues support for this issue of great importance to California's agricultural economy.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and (three-fifths having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces he will postpone further proceedings today on each mo-

tion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty.

The President asked us to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 9 p.m. tonight to a joint session of the two Houses.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the report of the majority leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the majority leader and the minority leader.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO RUTH AND BILL GRAHAM

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2657) to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2657

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress hereby finds the following:

(1) Ruth and Billy Graham have made outstanding and lasting contributions to morality, racial equality, family, philanthropy, and religion.

(2) America's most respected and admired evangelical leader for the past half century, Billy Graham's crusades have reached 100,000,000 people in person and reached over 2,000,000,000 people worldwide on television.

(3) Billy Graham, throughout his 76 years of life and his 52-year marriage to Ruth Graham, has exemplified the highest ideals of teaching, counseling, ethics, charity, faith, and family.

(4) Billy Graham's daily newspaper column and 14 books have provided spiritual counseling and personal enrichment to millions of people.

(5) Ruth and Billy Graham have been the driving force to create the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center at Memorial Mission Hospital in Asheville, North Carolina, whose vision it is to improve the health and well-being of children and to become a new resource for ending the pain and suffering of children.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate are authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, to Billy and Ruth Graham a gold medal of appropriate design, in recognition of their outstanding and enduring contributions toward faith, morality, and charity.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may accept, use, and disburse gifts or donations of property or money to carry out this section.

(2) NO APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED.—No amount is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary of the Treasury may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 5. TRANSFER OF ANY PROFIT TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer an amount equal to the amount by which—

(1) the sum of any gifts and donations received by the Secretary in accordance with section 2(c)(2) and any proceeds from the sale of duplicate medals under section 3, exceeds

(2) the total amount of the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out his Act, from the Numismatic Public Enterprise Fund to the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2657, the bill to award a congressional gold medal to Ruth and Billy Graham. Members on both sides of the aisle support H.R. 2657. Included on the list of 296 cosponsors are Speaker GINGRICH, Majority Leader ARMEY, and Majority Whip DELAY. Chairman LEACH of the Banking Committee, Ranking Minority Member GONZALEZ, and Representative FLAKE, ranking minority member of the subcommittee are also cosponsors.

Throughout their lives Ruth and Billy Graham have made great contributions to American society. They are religious leaders and role models. Their commitment to each other and their marriage is something both rare and wonderful in today's society. Billy Graham's crusades, daily newspaper column, and books have helped millions of people in need. Ruth and Billy's support of the Children's Health Center in Asheville, NC is yet another example of their dedication to the health and well-being of our Nation's children.

H.R. 2657 complies with Banking Committee rules regarding the authorization of congressional gold medals. Although a committee markup was not held, a majority of both committee and subcommittee members are cosponsors. There is no opposition from Members of Congress or the U.S. Mint.

The Memorial Mission Medical Center and its not-for-profit foundation have offered to cover the costs for designing and striking the medal, up to \$25,000. The Congressional Budget Office reports a possible impact to the Federal budget of about \$10,000, depending on sales of the duplicate medals. All donations and proceeds in excess of the cost of designing and striking the medal will be given to the Library of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, because the U.S. Mint normally needs about 6 months to produce a congressional gold medal, and we hope to present this medal to the Grahams in the late spring, we need to move quickly to pass this bill. I urge the immediate adoption of H.R. 2657.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H.R. 2657 and join with the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, because I believe that this represents for us an opportunity to say to the American people and to the world that it is important for persons to make commitments with their life that express the very best of what it means to be not only a citizen of this Nation, but a citizen of the world. No one has done that more effectively than Billy Graham, with Mrs. Ruth Graham, who stands beside him as the First Lady.

As they have moved throughout the world, persons have been moved to levels of commitment that perhaps would never have happened. We talk about salvation often, but many times it is nothing more than theoretical language. For the Grahams it is much more than that. It has been a reflection of not only their faith commitment; it has been a reflection of a faith commitment that is deep down within their hearts, given to them by virtue of their calling as religious leaders.

Truly in a world like the one in which we live, to find a person who has been available to every President, who has been available to even the lowest of persons, the many thousands who have gathered in auditoriums and in stadiums throughout this Nation, to the many who have come up from all around the world and found their hope in the message of this great and sainted leader, we take time out today to honor them through this gold medal.

It is more appropriate when you consider that one who follows the teachings of the Bible would readily associate Billy Graham with the Apostle Paul, for indeed the missions he has

carried out throughout this world have been those that have been productive to so many people, have changed so many people's lives, have caused them to feel there is a reason for living, have given them hope that today is not their last day, but there is hope for their tomorrows.

Over and over again he has been able to come in moments when he did not feel physically able to give a message, and yet to give one. When there have been times when this Nation has been at its very worst, he has been able to raise us to levels of thinking about not only ourselves, but thinking about matters which are greater than us. He moved from one place to the other, one journey after another, proclaiming the gospel, proclaiming the good news, letting the world know that in the midst of all that is bad, there is yet much to live for, there is yet much to hope for.

I am pleased as the ranking member of this subcommittee to have this opportunity to honor another cleric. As one who has been in the ministry since the age of 15 myself, I know the arduous task and the responsibility that is placed on one who assumes this level of commitment that drives them to go well beyond what they could ordinarily do as human beings without their special touch of God.

For a man who is anointed, for a man who knows he has been called to do a special work, for a woman who knows that her calling beside him is one to lift the hopes and aspirations of people throughout this world, regardless of race, regardless of color or gender, we are pleased this day to join with the committee in supporting H.R. 2657, asking all of our Members of this House to join with us in a resounding support for this particular piece of legislation, because it gives us an opportunity to look beyond whatever it is that separates us, whatever it is that causes us to participate in most instances in partisan fashion, to respond in a way that says this is a man and a woman that deserve the best of us for they have given their best to all of us.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time in the hopes that all of our colleagues will join with us in support of this legislation.

□ 1515

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the primary sponsor of this legislation.

(Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for giving me this time, and I also want to thank the ranking minority Member for the eloquent remarks he made about Reverend and Mrs. Graham.

Mr. Speaker, in sponsoring this legislation and talking to various Members to cosponsor, there was no problem in getting hundreds of Members of this

House, all of whom had separate and individual reasons for endorsing this legislation.

As one of the most revered evangelical leaders in modern history, Billy Graham has helped the less fortunate and prescribed the need for a moral society. He has been spiritual adviser and confidant to 10 Presidents. Over 100 million people have come to see Billy Graham at crusades, and another 2 billion people have watched him on television. His character and strength have made him America's most admired man. He has used his immense popularity to confront major social problems, such as racism, the homeless, and hunger. He continues trying to reverse the decline in our society's morals by emphasizing ethical and spiritual values.

Billy Graham was reared in Charlotte, NC, and upon finishing seminary began preaching his message in Tampa, FL. He now has preached to more people than anyone else in history. To extend the reach of his message, he used television, magazines, and a weekly radio broadcast for which he was given a gold star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame. He has also spread his message through his daily newspaper column and 14 books.

The Billy Graham Training Center in Black Mountain and the Billy Graham Evangelical Association, headquartered in Minneapolis, MN, have become beacons of spirituality for people around the world.

Billy Graham adheres to the principles of which he preached. He and his wife of 52 years, Ruth, live their lives with the commitment to their family, each other, and God.

The other side of Billy Graham is the humanitarian and champion of the disadvantaged. He helped the flood victims of India rebuild their villages. He arranged for food and supplies to be flown to the earthquake victims of Guatemala and aided refugees fleeing political oppression.

Reverend Graham was also deeply involved in the fight for racial equality in the South. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., declared, and I quote, "that had it not been for the ministry of Billy Graham, he could not have done the work that he did."

People with Billy Graham's strength and devotion are very rare. His duty to God has led him to be the great man that he has become today. It is fitting for this Congress to honor both Reverend Graham and his wife, who has been by his side. His son, Franklin Graham, who heads the Samaritan Purse, and is now moving into his father's ministry, has carried on works for many years helping the poor, helping disadvantaged around the world.

Most recently, the Grahams have devoted themselves to the establishment of the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center at Memorial Mission in Asheville, NC. They share the vision of this new center in its efforts to improve the health and well-being of

the children of the southern Appalachia and the world. Their goal is for the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Center to become a new resource for ending the pain and suffering of children.

We hope that once this legislation is passed by the Congress, the Congressional Gold Medal will be presented to the Grahams at a joint session of this Congress, and I take pride in being one of the many cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my colleague from New York for this time; and also the chief sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation to give special recognition by the Congress to the Reverend and Mrs. Billy Graham, who over the course of some 60 years, have provided comfort and support for the spiritual needs of millions of men, women, and children throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Billy Graham, in my humble opinion, is perhaps the greatest Christian evangelist of this century. His spiritual messages were universal, in that they touched the hearts and minds of every human being who has been influenced by his demeanor, his example, and, most important of all by the giving of his life to serve the needs of others. That is pure Christianity in every way.

Again, I commend my good friend from New York and the gentleman from Delaware for sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEINEMAN], another distinguished Member of the House.

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

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2657, legislation which commissions a Congressional Gold Medal to be awarded to Billy Graham and his wife Ruth. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this legislation. H.R. 2657 honors Billy and Ruth Graham's years of service towards morality, racial equality, family, charity and religion.

The Reverend Billy Graham was raised in North Carolina and has been a great spiritual leader, not only for the United States, but for the rest of the world. He has dedicated his life crusading against homelessness, racism, and hunger while helping spread spiritual and moral values to those willing to listen. Billy and Ruth Graham have positively affected the lives of millions throughout the world. In today's society, it is rare to find such undying dedication and devotion to one's beliefs.

Rev. Graham has used the media to help spread his message of hope to billions of people. Billy and Ruth Gra-

ham's faith in God has helped them in their fight to aid the disadvantaged and less fortunate. It is only right that this Congress honor the Reverend Billy Graham and his wife Ruth with the Congressional Gold Medal.

I'd like the RECORD to indicate that this Member of Congress attended the Billy Graham Crusade in 1957 at the Polo Grounds in the Bronx, NY. Although the site no longer exists, the vestiges of that experience still live within me.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation and vote for the legislation, and I also compliment the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman CHARLES TAYLOR, for his initiative; and the gentleman from Delaware, Congressman MIKE CASTLE, for sponsoring this bill.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR], yet another distinguished Member.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring two outstanding Americans and fellow North Carolinians. Throughout their lives, Ruth and Billy Graham have exemplified the highest goals our country holds dear, and as a result, they have left a lasting impression not only on the people they touch individually, but on our Nation as a whole.

Most people first encountered Rev. Graham through his many crusades. Through this vehicle, he has reached over 100 million people in person and over 2 billion people throughout the world in his television audiences spreading his message of hope. Rev. Graham's achievements, however, go much deeper than his accomplishments as a religious leader. He and his wife are also leaders in promoting education, charity, and the importance of family. They were the driving force in creating the Ruth and Billy Graham Children's Health Center at Memorial Mission Hospital in Asheville, NC. This facility provides comfort and care to the most helpless members of society—our children. And, finally, Rev. and Mrs. Graham have served us as leaders—leaders by example. If we would all dedicate ourselves to just a fraction of the unselfish endeavors of these two people, the world would be a much better place.

Mr. Speaker, in this Olympic year, when we honor our best athletes with gold medals for achievements on the field, it is fitting that we honor these two outstanding individuals with a gold medal for their outstanding achievements in a much more difficult arena—life. So, for myself, my colleagues in this House, and for our Nation, I say thank you, Ruth and Billy Graham.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that there was one other person

who clearly wanted to speak, and there are two others who have contacted us that they are trying to get here, but they are not presently with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me this opportunity to speak on behalf of what, in my personal life, has meant more to me than anything else, and that is my faith.

As I was growing up and watching throughout my history, I watched Rev. Billy Graham as he portrayed what I think was good in everything in life. And now as we get older and we look and reflect upon our lives, today I have to tell you I still reflect upon Billy Graham.

Billy Graham has meant a lot to me personally in influencing my life and my goals, and I cannot think of anybody better that we dedicate this medal to than to Dr. Graham and his wife Ruth.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I think this one man has meant more to more people than anyone else in the world. As he goes and travels, he is respected by leaders and government officials and that without Mr. Graham, we would not have, I think, some of the moral principles that we have in this Nation today.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

As one who has traveled to various seminaries throughout this land, periodically speaking to those young ministers who are in training, I want to take this opportunity to just say a word, and that is a word to encourage them to look at the ministry of Billy Graham as a model by which they might be able to emulate and replicate, because I think it indicates the kind of commitment that is necessary when one feels the authority of God that has called and anointed them to do the special work.

And it is special work that can only be done by a calling. The Bible tells us that many are called, but few are chosen. Truly, Billy Graham and Ruth Graham represent they who have been chosen of the Lord and who understand what it means to make the fullest of commitments, understand what it means when the Bible talks about bearing our crosses daily and denying one's self. For truly his ministry indicates that regardless of one's training, one has to have a real sense about what it is the Lord wants him to do and where the Lord wants it done.

The commission of the Lord commands that we go into all nations and baptize and teach and reach all of those who have not been reached and bring them into the family of the faithful. I tend to believe that this Nation will be a better place because of Billy Graham and Ruth Graham, but more importantly those young men and women who are in training in seminaries, as they look at this model, as they make the same kind of commitment, as they

understand that their faith commitment should drive them to never having to feel that they have to be of the world, but rather that they can be in it, but live beyond it as it relates to how they maintain themselves morally and spiritually. Billy Graham has shown us all of that.

I would hope that his model is one, as he nears the sunset of his life, that there will be someone who will pick up that mantel and will go forth into the world making the same kind of proclamations without fear of trembling, but understand, as we say in that song, to be on the battlefield for the Lord, and to do so with the kind of courageousness that will not allow them to be able to turn around.

We can change families, we can change the quality of life for people in this Nation, we can change the quality of life for people in the world. More of us have to be on the battlefield and believe this is a battle that we cannot afford to lose.

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

□ 1530

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will be very brief and then yield back the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as a layperson and one who is not involved in the clergy as the distinguished ranking member is, and without being as eloquent as he is on the subject, it is wonderful to admire from afar and from television, an individual and a couple who have lived the way we would like the heroes of America to live.

Mr. Speaker, so often we see people, individuals who are flawed in all walks of life and we make them our role models and somehow they fall. This is a couple that not only is not going to fall, but has risen from pedestal to pedestal and we admire them greatly. This coin that we are dedicating today is well earned.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of those who were able to come to the floor and speak. I would remind those who were not able to, that they could submit statements at the end.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Delaware, chairman of the subcommittee, I say thank you. This is a glorious day for both of us. I think the way we work together in our committee represents the essence of the kind of spirit that Billy Graham would hope all American citizens would be able to work together.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to work with the gentleman from Delaware and proud to have shared with him in the sponsorship of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and hope that our Members will join with us, not only in trying to work together the way we do, but also in supporting this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE], our ranking mem-

ber. I must say I do not think we have ever had a cross word in the over a year that we have worked together. Our legislation, as is most true in this particular bill today, is generally positively received. We are blessed in that way. Working with the gentleman from New York and his staff has been an extraordinary pleasure, and I look forward to the balance of our time together.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the Ninth Congressional District I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our hometown hero, Dr. Billy Graham. I have been friends with Dr. and Mrs. Graham for many years, and it is a privilege to know people of such high moral fortitude and devotion to principle.

Dr. and Mrs. Graham have traveled the world in the advancement of a message of hope, a message that has reached the ears and hearts of millions of people. Those who have known the Graham family have been enriched not only by their words, but by the living example their daily walk in life has set for us. Their endless devotion to the advancement of a simple, yet profound message has truly changed the lives of millions of people around the globe.

I can think of no better recipients of this award than the Reverend and Mrs. Billy Graham. May this award serve as a small token of appreciation for their lifetime of service.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2657.

The question was taken.

Mr. CASTLE. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—PROTECTING CREDITWORTHINESS OF UNITED STATES, AVOIDING DEFAULT, AND AVERTING ANOTHER GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause (2)(a)(1) of rule XI, I give notice of my intention to offer a resolution on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Houston, TX [Mr. BENTSEN], who is at the mike and who joins me today.

Mr. Speaker, this would be a resolution that raises a question of the privileges of the House and the form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, the inability of the House to pass an adjustment in the public debt limit unburdened by the unrelated political agenda of either party, an adjustment to maintain the creditworthiness of the United States and to avoid disruption of interest rates and

the financial markets, brings discredit upon the House;

Whereas, the inability of the House to pass a clean resolution to continue normal governmental operations so as to end the abuse of American citizens and their hard-earned dollars, Federal employees, private businesses who perform work for the Federal government, and those who rely upon Federal services as a bargaining tactic to gain political advantage in the budget negotiations, brings discredit upon the House;

Whereas, previous inaction of the House has already cost the American taxpayer about \$1.5 billion in wasteful governmental shutdown costs, reduced the productivity and responsiveness of federal agencies and caused untold human suffering;

Whereas, the failure of the House of Representatives to adjust the federal debt limit and keep the nation from default or to act on legislation to avert another government shutdown impairs the dignity of the House, the integrity of its proceedings and the esteem the public holds for the House;

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the enrolling clerk of the House of Representatives shall prepare an engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2862, and the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 157. The vote by which this resolution is adopted by the House shall be deemed to have been a vote in favor of such bill and a vote in favor of such joint resolution upon final passage in the House of Representatives. Upon engrossment of the bill and the joint resolution, each shall be deemed to have passed the House of Representatives and been duly certified and examined; the engrossed copies shall be signed by the Clerk and transmitted to the Senate for further legislative action; and (upon final passage by both Houses) the bill and the joint resolution shall be signed by the presiding officers of both Houses and presented to the President for his signature (and otherwise treated for all purposes) in the manner provided for bills and joint resolution generally.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], my colleague, as it related—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the gentleman that the resolution is not debatable at this time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, is it in order at this time to determine whether or not this rule IX applies to this resolution and is it also in order at this time for the House to debate whether rule IX would apply with respect to this resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the gentleman that under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within 2 legislative days its being properly noticed. The Chair will announce the Speaker's designation at a later time. In the meantime, the form of the resolution proffered by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair is not at this point making a determination as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated by the Speaker for consideration of the resolution.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we thank you and we stand ready to proceed upon proper notice.

SADDLEBACK MOUNTAIN-ARIZONA SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1341) to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the city of Scottsdale, Arizona, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1341

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the city of Scottsdale, Arizona, have a longstanding interest in a 701-acre tract of land known as the "Saddleback Property", that lies within the boundaries of the City and abuts the north boundary of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation;

(2) the Saddleback Property includes Saddleback Mountain and scenic hilly terrain along the Shea Boulevard corridor in Scottsdale, Arizona, that—

(A) has significant conservation value; and

(B) is of historic and cultural significance to the community;

(3) in 1989, the Resolution Trust Corporation acquired the Saddleback Property as a receiver for the Sun City Savings and Loan Association;

(4) after the Saddleback Property was noticed for sale by the Resolution Trust Corporation, a dispute between the Community and the City arose concerning the future ownership, use, and development of the Saddleback Property;

(5) the Community and the City each filed litigation with respect to that dispute, but in lieu of pursuing that litigation, the Community and the City negotiated a Settlement Agreement that—

(A) addresses the concerns of each of those parties with respect to the future use and development of the Saddleback Property; and

(B) provides for the dismissal of the litigation;

(6) under the Settlement Agreement, subject to detailed use and development agreements—

(A) the Community will purchase a portion of the Saddleback Property; and

(B) the City will purchase the remaining portion of that property; and

(7) the Community and the City agree that the enactment of legislation by Congress to ratify the Settlement Agreement is necessary in order for—

(A) the Settlement Agreement to become effective; and

(B) the United States to take into trust the property referred to in paragraph (6)(A) and make that property a part of the Reservation.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to approve and confirm the Settlement, Release, and Property Conveyance Agreement executed by the Community, the City, and the Resolution Trust Corporation;

(2) to ensure that the Settlement Agreement (including the Development Agreement, the Use Agreement, and all other associated ancillary agreements and exhibits)—

(A) is carried out; and

(B) is fully enforceable in accordance with its terms, including judicial remedies and binding arbitration provisions; and

(3) to provide for the taking into trust by the United States of the portion of the Saddleback Property purchased by the Community in order to make that portion a part of the Reservation.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) CITY.—The term "City" means the city of Scottsdale, Arizona, which is a municipal corporation in the State of Arizona.

(2) COMMUNITY.—The term "Community" means the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, which is a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(3) DEDICATION PROPERTY.—The term "Dedication Property" means a portion of the Saddleback Property, consisting of approximately 27 acres of such property, that the City will acquire in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

(4) DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT.—The term "Development Agreement" means the agreement between the City and the Community, executed on September 11, 1995, that sets forth conditions and restrictions that—

(A) are supplemental to the Settlement, Release and Property Conveyance Agreement referred to in paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) apply to the future use and development of the Development Property.

(5) DEVELOPMENT PROPERTY.—The term "Development Property" means a portion of the Saddleback Property, consisting of approximately 211 acres, that the Community will acquire in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

(6) MOUNTAIN PROPERTY.—The term "Mountain Property" means a portion of the Saddleback Property, consisting of approximately 365 acres, that the Community will acquire in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

(7) PRESERVATION PROPERTY.—The term "Preservation Property" means a portion of the Saddleback Property, consisting of approximately 98 acres, that the City will acquire in accordance with the Settlement Agreement.

(8) RESERVATION.—The term "Reservation" means the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation.

(9) SADDLEBACK PROPERTY.—The term "Saddleback Property" means a tract of land that—

(A) consists of approximately 701 acres within the city of Scottsdale, Arizona; and

(B) includes the Dedication Property, the Development Property, the Mountain Property, and the Preservation Property.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(11) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term "Settlement Agreement"—

(A) means the Settlement, Release and Property Conveyance Agreement executed on September 11, 1995, by the Community, the City, and the Resolution Trust Corporation (in its capacity as the Receiver for the Sun State Savings and Loan Association, F.S.A.); and

(B) includes the Development Agreement, the Use Agreement, and all other associated ancillary agreements and exhibits.

(12) USE AGREEMENT.—The term "Use Agreement" means the agreement between

the City and the Community, executed on September 11, 1995, that sets forth conditions and restrictions that—

(A) are supplemental to the Settlement, Release and Property Conveyance Agreement referred to in paragraph (11)(A); and

(B) apply to the future use and development of the Mountain Property.

SEC. 4. APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT.

The Settlement Agreement is hereby approved and ratified and shall be fully enforceable in accordance with its terms and the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. TRANSFER OF PROPERTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon satisfaction of all conditions to closing set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Resolution Trust Corporation shall transfer, pursuant to the terms of the Settlement Agreement—

(1) to the Secretary, the Mountain Property and the Development Property purchased by the Community from the Resolution Trust Corporation; and

(2) to the City, the Preservation Property and the Dedication Property purchased by the City from the Resolution Trust Corporation.

(b) TRUST STATUS.—The Mountain Property and the Development Property transferred pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall, subject to sections 6 and 7—

(1) be held in trust by the United States for the Community; and

(2) become part of the Reservation.

(c) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States shall not incur any liability for conditions, existing prior to the transfer, on the parcels of land referred to in subsection (b) to be transferred to the United States in trust for the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community.

(d) RECORDS.—Upon the satisfaction of all of the conditions of closing set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the Secretary shall file a plat of survey depicting the Saddleback Property (that includes a depiction of the Dedication Property, the Development Property, the Mountain Property, and the Preservation Property) with—

(1) the office of the Recorder of Maricopa County, Arizona; and

(2) the Titles and Records Center of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, located in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

SEC. 6. LIMITATIONS ON USE AND DEVELOPMENT.

Upon the satisfaction of all of the conditions of closing set forth in the Settlement Agreement, the properties transferred pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5(a) shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions on use and development:

(1) PRESERVATION PROPERTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Preservation Property shall be forever preserved in its natural state for use only as a public park or recreation area that shall—

(i) be utilized and maintained for the purposes set forth in section 4(C) of the Settlement Agreement; and

(ii) be subject to the restrictions set forth in section 4(C) of the Settlement Agreement.

(B) SHEA BOULEVARD.—At the sole discretion of the City, a portion of the Preservation Property may be used to widen, reconfigure, repair, or reengineer Shea Boulevard in accordance with section 4(D) of the Settlement Agreement.

(2) DEDICATION PROPERTY.—The Dedication Property shall be used to widen, reconfigure, repair, or reengineer Shea Boulevard and 136th Street, in accordance with sections 4(D) and 7 of the Settlement Agreement.

(3) MOUNTAIN PROPERTY.—Except for the areas in the Mountain Property referred to

as Special Cultural Land in section 5(C) of the Settlement Agreement, the Mountain Property shall be forever preserved in its natural state for use only as a public park or recreation area that shall—

(A) be utilized and maintained for the purposes set forth in section 5(C) of the Settlement Agreement; and

(B) be subject to the restrictions set forth in section 5(C) of the Settlement Agreement.

(4) DEVELOPMENT PROPERTY.—The Development Property shall be used and developed for the economic benefit of the Community in accordance with the provisions of the Settlement Agreement and the Development Agreement.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS TO THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

No amendment made to the Settlement Agreement (including any deviation from an approved plan described in section 9(B) of the Settlement Agreement) shall become effective, unless the amendment—

(1) is made in accordance with the applicable requirements relating to the form and approval of the amendment under sections 9(B) and 34 of the Settlement Agreement; and

(2) is consistent with the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLEY].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1341, the proposed Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995, ratifies a land settlement agreement between the Resolution Trust Corporation, the city of Scottsdale, and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community.

Seven hundred and one acres of land, currently held by the Resolution Trust Corporation, would be disposed of, pursuant to S. 1341, as follows: one 27-acre tract and one 98-acre tract would be purchased by the city of Scottsdale; and one 211-acre tract and one 365-acre tract would be purchased by the Salt River Tribe.

Pending litigation between the parties would be dismissed.

Each of the four tracts would be administered according to a detailed ownership, development, and use agreement.

Finally, S. 1341 provides that the land purchased by the tribe will be taken into trust and become part of the Salt River Reservation.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that, over time, "there would be no significant net budgetary impact" if S. 1341 is enacted into law.

The administration has testified that it "strongly support[s] the enactment of S. 1341".

I would also like to commend Congressman J.D. HAYWORTH for his leadership and tenacity in moving this ahead in an expeditious manner.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I recommend a favorable vote on S. 1341.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, this bill would approve an agreement among the Resolution Trust Corporation, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community of Arizona, and the city of Scottsdale to divide 701 acres of land known as the Saddleback Mountain property. In 1989, the RTC, in its capacity as receiver for the Sun State Savings and Loan Association, acquired the Saddleback Mountain property and noticed the land for sale. The Pima Tribe submitted the highest cash bid for the property offering \$6.5 million. In response to this bid, the city of Scottsdale filed suit against the RTC to acquire the property through eminent domain. Reacting to the suit, the RTC rejected all bids on the land and prepared to transfer the land to the city of Scottsdale at which point the tribe sued the city and the RTC for damages.

Finally, all sides agreed to negotiate a settlement. The agreement will allow the tribe to receive the bulk of the land, the city of Scottsdale to obtain land for preservation purposes and to address traffic flow problems, and the RTC will receive the full amount originally bid. All parties support this agreement and both lawsuits will be dismissed upon its enactment.

I support enactment of this bill and ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. GALLEGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I would also like to publicly thank the gentleman from California, chairman of the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs, along with the ranking member. It is great to have a chairman like the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLEY] and a ranking member like the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA], my dear friend, who have worked so hard to try and address and redress some areas that are in need of common sense and a consensus. So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from American Samoa very much for all of his efforts as well.

Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned by my colleague, this legislation is to approve an agreement for the settlement of litigation over the Saddleback Mountain property in Arizona. The agreement provides for the sale by the RTC of part of the Saddleback Mountain property to the Salt River Pima Indian community, to be held in trust by the United States as part of the property to the city of Scottsdale.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is the result of months of negotiation between the city of Scottsdale and the Salt River Pima Tribe, and lacks solely to authorize and confirm the agreement and to provide that the property purchased by the tribe will be taken into trust reservation status.

Mr. Speaker, again, as we take a look across our country, and as we take a look here in the Nation's Capital, so many contentious issues where at times we agree to disagree, I think it is especially noteworthy that here we have an example for, indeed, not only this august Chamber, but for the rest of the country, of local empowerment; of officials from the city of Scottsdale working with officials from the Salt River Pima Indian community to work out the problems to their mutual satisfaction, and then inviting the Federal Government to work to approve this. I think it typifies the notion of a new partnership and local empowerment.

Again, I think it is important, as both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member pointed out, S. 1341 does not authorize any expenditure of funds by the United States. So, this is a cost-free, or relatively cost-free item that again empowers local communities given the special trust relationship with the United States Government and the special things we needed to work out in this place of legislation.

Undoubtedly, I would urge this august body to joint with our friends in the other body to adopt this and move forward. Once again, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I pause and thank my good friends, the chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished ranking member, for all their efforts and call on my colleagues to overwhelmingly pass this common sense, practical approach to local empowerment and good government.

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

Mr. Speaker, as has been stated earlier by my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], I want to again express the true spirit of bipartisanship as we work towards agreement on some of the areas that were brought to the attention of both sides of the aisle. I commend my good friend from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his tremendous work in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion, I would like to reiterate my appreciation for the help of the gentleman from American Samoa, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, the ranking member of the committee, and for the leadership that we had from our good friend from Arizona, Mr. HAYWORTH.

Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1341.

The question was taken.

Mr. GALLEGLY. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN LAWS RELATING TO NATIVE AMERICANS

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2726) to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to Native Americans, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2726

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CORRECTION TO POKAGON RESTORATION ACT.

Section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to restore Federal services to the Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Indians" (25 U.S.C. 1300j-7a) is amended—

(1) by striking "Bands" each place it appears and inserting "Band";

(2) in subsection (a), by striking "respective"; and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking "membership rolls that contain" and inserting "a membership roll that contains"; and

(II) by striking "in such" and inserting "in the"; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking "Each such" and inserting "The";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "rolls have" and inserting "roll has"; and

(ii) by striking "such rolls" and inserting "such roll";

(C) in the heading for paragraph (3), by striking "ROLLS" and inserting "ROLL"; and

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking "rolls are maintained" and inserting "roll is maintained".

SEC. 2. CORRECTION TO ODAWA AND OTTAWA RESTORATION ACT.

(a) REAFFIRMATION OF RIGHTS.—The heading of section 5(b) of the Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians Act (25 U.S.C. 1300k-3) is amended by striking "TRIBE" and inserting "BANDS".

(b) MEMBERSHIP LIST.—Section 9 of the Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa and the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians Act (25 U.S.C. 1300k-7) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "Band" the first place it appears and inserting "Bands"; and

(B) by striking "the Band." and inserting "the respective Bands."; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "the Band shall submit to the Secretary membership rolls that contain the names of all individuals eligible for membership in such Band" and inserting "each of the Bands shall submit to the Secretary a membership roll that contains the names of all individuals that are eligible for membership in such Band"; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking "The Band, in consultation" and inserting "Each such Band, in consultation".

SEC. 3. INDIAN DAMS SAFETY ACT OF 1994.

Section 4(h) of the Indian Dams Safety Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 3803(h); 108 Stat. 1562) is amended by striking "(under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e))), as amended," and inserting "under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.)".

SEC. 4. PASCUA YAQUI INDIANS OF ARIZONA.

Section 4(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the extension of certain Federal benefits, services, and assistance to the Pascua Yaqui Indians of Arizona, and for other purposes" (25 U.S.C. 1300f-3(b)) is amended by striking "Pascua Yaqui tribe" and inserting "Pascua Yaqui Tribe".

SEC. 5. INDIAN LANDS OPEN DUMP CLEANUP ACT OF 1994.

Section 3(7) of the Indian Lands Open Dump Cleanup Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 3902(7); 108 Stat. 4165) is amended by striking "under section 6944 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.)" and inserting "under section 4004 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6944)".

SEC. 6. AMERICAN INDIAN TRUST FUND MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT OF 1994.

(a) MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.—Section 303(c)(5)(D) of the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4043(c)(5)(D); 108 Stat. 4247) is amended by striking "made under paragraph (3)(B)" and inserting "made under subparagraph (C)".

(b) ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 306(d) of the Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4046(d); 108 Stat. 4249) is amended by striking "Advisory Board" and inserting "advisory board".

SEC. 7. INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION CONTRACT REFORM ACT OF 1994.

Section 102(11) of the Indian Self-Determination Contract Reform Act of 1994 (108 Stat. 4254) is amended by striking "subsection (e)" and inserting "subsection (e) of section 105".

SEC. 8. AUBURN INDIAN RESTORATION.

(a) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—Section 203 of the Auburn Indian Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 1300l-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking "as provided in section 107" and inserting "as provided in section 207"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "section 104" and inserting "section 204".

(b) INTERIM GOVERNMENT.—The last sentence of section 206 of the Auburn Indian Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 1300l-4) is amended by striking "Interim council" and inserting "Interim Council".

SEC. 9. CROW BOUNDARY SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1994.

(a) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 5(b)(3) of the Crow Boundary Settlement Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 1776c(b)(3); 108 Stat. 4636) is amended by striking "provisions of subsection (b)" and inserting "provisions of this subsection".

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 9(a) of the Crow Boundary Settlement Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 1776g(a); 108 Stat. 4640) is amended by striking "The Act" and inserting "This Act".

(c) ESCROW FUNDS.—Section 10(b) of the Crow Boundary Settlement Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 1776h(b); 108 Stat. 4641) is amended by striking "(collectively referred to in this subsection as the 'Suspension Accounts')" and inserting "(collectively referred to in this section as the 'Suspension Accounts')".

SEC. 10. TLINGIT AND HAIDA STATUS CLARIFICATION ACT.

The first sentence of section 205 of the Tlingit and Haida Status Clarification Act (25 U.S.C. 1215) is amended by striking "Indian tribes" and inserting "Indian Tribes".

SEC. 11. NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES ACT.

Section 103 of the Native American Languages Act (25 U.S.C. 2902) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "under section 5351(4) of the Indian Education Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2651(4))" and inserting "under section 9161(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7881(4))"; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking "section 4009 of Public Law 100-297 (20 U.S.C. 4909)" and inserting "section 9212(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7912(1))".

SEC. 12. PONCA RESTORATION ACT.

Section 5 of the Ponca Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 983c) is amended—

(1) by inserting "Sarpy, Burt, Platte, Stanton, Holt, Hall, Wayne," before "Knox"; and

(2) by striking "or Charles Mix County" and inserting "Woodbury or Pottawattomie Counties of Iowa, or Charles Mix County".

SEC. 13. REVOCATION OF CHARTER OF INCORPORATION OF THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE UNDER THE INDIAN REORGANIZATION ACT.

The request of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe to surrender the charter of incorporation issued to that tribe on September 17, 1937, pursuant to section 17 of the Act of June 18, 1934, commonly known as the "Indian Reorganization Act" (48 Stat. 988, chapter 576; 25 U.S.C. 477) is hereby accepted and that charter of incorporation is hereby revoked.

SEC. 14. ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CALIFORNIA INDIAN POLICY ACT OF 1992.

Section 5(6) of the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 2133; 25 U.S.C. 651 note) is amended by striking "18 months" and inserting "36 months".

SEC. 15. IN-LIEU FISHING SITE TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

Section 401 of Public Law 100-581 (102 Stat. 2944-2945) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) The Secretary of the Army is authorized to transfer funds to the Department of the Interior to be used for purposes of the continued operation and maintenance of sites improved or developed under this section."

SEC. 16. ADOLESCENT TRANSITIONAL LIVING FACILITY.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds that were provided to the Ponca Indian Tribe of Nebraska for any of the fiscal years 1992 through 1995, and that were retained by that Indian tribe, pursuant to a self-determination contract with the Secretary of Health and Human Services that the Indian tribe entered into under section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450f) to carry out programs and functions of the Indian Health Service may be used by that Indian tribe to acquire, develop, and maintain a transitional living facility for adolescents, including land for that facility.

SEC. 17. EXPENDITURE OF MESCALERO APACHE TRIBE JUDGMENT FUNDS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any distribution plan approved pursuant to the Indian Tribal Judgment Funds Use or Distribution Act (25 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), the Secretary of the Interior may reprogram, in accordance with the Resolutions, approved by the Mescalero Apache Tribal Council on January 24, 1995, any and all remaining funds (principal and interest accounts) regarding specific changes in the Secretarial Plans for the use of the funds in Docket Nos. 22-G, 30, 48, 30-A, and 48-A, awarded in satisfaction of the judgments by the Indian Claims Commission.

SEC. 18. ESTABLISHMENT OF A BAND ROLL.

Section 5(d)(2) of the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians Act (25 U.S.C. 1300h-3(d)(2); 102 Stat. 1578) is amended—

(1) by inserting “and base roll” after “requirement”; and

(2) by striking “modification is” and inserting “modifications are”.

SEC. 19. OPTION TO INCORPORATE SELF-DETERMINATION PROVISIONS INTO SELF-GOVERNANCE.

Section 403 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458cc) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

“(1) INCORPORATE SELF-DETERMINATION PROVISIONS.—At the option of a participating tribe or tribes, any or all provisions of title I of this Act shall be made part of an agreement entered into under title III of this Act or this title. The Secretary is obligated to include such provisions at the option of the participating tribe or tribes. If such provision is incorporated it shall have the same force and effect as if set out in full in title III or this title.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] and the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY].

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

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2726 contains 19 sections which I will try to summarize briefly.

The first 11 sections make various technical corrections to existing Indian-related statutes. Typographical errors are corrected, words are capitalized, and so forth.

Section 12 modifies the service area of the Ponca Indian Tribe to include Indians living in certain counties near its reservation;

Section 13 accepts the surrender of an unused tribal charter of incorporation;

Section 14 extends the term of the Advisory Council on California Indian Policy;

Section 15 grants authority to the Army Corps of Engineers to provide funding to the Department of the Interior for the operation and maintenance of certain in lieu fishing access sites which have been constructed;

Section 16 provides authority to the Ponca Indian Tribe to utilize funds to

acquire, develop, and maintain a transitional living facility for Indian adolescents;

Section 17 provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior to reprogram certain funds, awarded to the Mescalero Apache Tribe, as requested by the Tribe;

Section 18 provides to the Lac Vieux Desert Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians authority to amend its base membership roll; and

Section 19 amends the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide that participating tribes may elect to include, in Title III and Title IV Self-Governance compacts, any or all provisions of Title I, which deals with Public Law 93-638 contracts.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the other body has passed and sent to us legislation quite similar to H.R. 2726. The Committee on Resources marked up and reported H.R. 2726 to the floor by unanimous vote.

I recommend a favorable vote on H.R. 2726.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEMOVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, again in the spirit of bipartisanship, I commend my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 2726, contains 19 technical amendments that, for the most part, correct grammatical oversights or incorrect statutory references in Indian-related laws.

I would like to note two of the changes made by this bill. The first, contained in section 19, will make it easier for Indian tribes to carry out Self-Governance compacts under the Indian Self-Determination Act. Mr. Speaker, the Indian Self-Determination Act is one of the most important acts passed by Congress for Indians and has enabled tribes to carry out governmental activities and become more self-sufficient. The second change is contained in section 14, which extends by 18 months the life of the Advisory Council of California Indian Policy, a body created through legislation sponsored by the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from California, GEORGE MILLER.

I would like to commend my colleague, Chairman GALLEGLY and his staff for their work on this bill. I have always been proud of the fact that both sides of our committee have always worked together on Indian issues. I am sure that we will continue to do so in the future.

The Self-Governance amendment, which has been requested and is supported by the

Indian tribes, would correct an oversight in last year's amendments to the Self-Governance program.

Last year, Congress chose to respond to the six-year resistance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service to streamlining the “638” contracting process by amending the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act. The 1994 amendments further streamlining the “638” contracting and made permanent the Self-Governance program. The 1994 amendments also required the agencies to negotiate new regulations by mid 1996 with the Indian tribes to carry out the amendments.

Since the passage of the 1994 Amendments, however, the Departments of the Interior and Health and Human Services have not interpreted and implemented all portions of the Act in accordance with Congressional intent.

Specifically, the two departments have taken the position that certain beneficial provisions of Title I, governing Self-Determination or “638” contracts, may not be included in Title III or IV Self-Governance compacts and annual funding agreements. In addition, the position of the two departments has not always been consistent, so that in certain instances, one department has permitted inclusion of a Self-Governance clause reflective of a Title I provision while the other has not.

Mr. Speaker, the result has been an inconsistent treatment of Self-Governance issues by the two Departments, and the denial to Self-Governance tribes of the substantial advantages afforded to the tribes under Title I of the Indian Self-Determination Act. This is troubling, since it has always been the intent of Congress that the Self-Governance initiative should be at least as broad and favorable to the tribes as the original Title I contracting mechanism.

The amendment, which has been requested by the tribes and is supported by them, would allow tribes to incorporate the beneficial provisions of Title I of the Indian Self-Determination Act into Self-Governance compacts.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment allows Self-Governance tribes to take advantage of the benefits extended to 638 contracting tribes. These advantages include—the ability to prepare annual audits pursuant to the Single Audit Act, using Indian preference in hiring, carryover prior year funding, coverage under the Federal Tort Claims Act, access to technical assistance grants, access to federal sources of supply, affords comparable rental rates for housing in Alaska, incorporation of 638 contract support cost provisions, protections against agency funding reductions, use of more flexible cost accounting procedures, incorporation of title I contract disputes procedures, limitation of costs provisions, applicability of Prompt Payment Act, authority to acquire excess Federal property, access to GSA screener IDs, use of interagency motor pool vehicles, and the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The Government (basically IHS counsel) has taken the position that Congress did not apply these provisions in title I explicitly enough to titles III and IV. The Congress and the tribes disagree, but since the IHS has no real objection to them actually applying a technical amendment seemed like the proper thing to do.

I want to commend the committee staff members on both sides of the aisle for this hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In conclusion, I would just like to again thank my good friend, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA]. I think today is a real testimony on both of the bills we have brought to the floor as to how well we have worked together in a bipartisan way. In fact it appears that about the most controversial problems we have had is the way we pronounce each other's last name.

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the gentleman's remarks. It is true that it seems as if some of our colleagues have always had a very difficult time in pronouncing our names, but in spite of all of that, I think more importantly to commend the gentleman again in bringing this kind of legislation in a spirit of bipartisanship that I sure hope that in the coming weeks and months perhaps our other colleagues could better exemplify the true spirit of how legislation could be passed, in the spirit of cooperation, and the spirit of resolving the problems and not be part of the problem.

Again I commend my good friend from California for bringing this bill. I hope we will continue to pass more legislation in the same spirit as we have done in these two pieces of legislation. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments. Perhaps the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] and I should hold some seminars. Maybe this body would work a lot better.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2726, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GALLEGLY. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2657, de novo; S. 1341, de novo; and H.R. 2726, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO RUTH AND BILLY GRAHAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2657.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2657.

The question was taken.

Mr. GALLEGLY. 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 403, nays 2, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]
YEAS—403

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Campbell | Duncan |
| Ackerman | Canady | Dunn |
| Allard | Cardin | Edwards |
| Andrews | Castle | Ehlers |
| Archer | Chabot | Ehrlich |
| Bachus | Chambliss | Emerson |
| Baesler | Chenoweth | Engel |
| Baker (CA) | Christensen | English |
| Baker (LA) | Chrysler | Ensign |
| Baldacci | Clay | Eshoo |
| Ballenger | Clayton | Evans |
| Barcia | Clement | Everett |
| Barr | Clinger | Ewing |
| Barrett (NE) | Clyburn | Farr |
| Barrett (WI) | Coble | Fawell |
| Bartlett | Coburn | Fazio |
| Barton | Coleman | Fields (LA) |
| Bass | Collins (GA) | Fields (TX) |
| Bateman | Collins (IL) | Filner |
| Becerra | Collins (MI) | Flake |
| Beilenson | Combest | Flanagan |
| Bentsen | Condit | Foglietta |
| Bereuter | Conyers | Foley |
| Bevill | Cooley | Forbes |
| Bilbray | Costello | Fowler |
| Bilirakis | Cox | Fox |
| Bishop | Coyne | Frank (MA) |
| Bliley | Cramer | Franks (CT) |
| Blute | Crane | Franks (NJ) |
| Boehlert | Crapo | Frelinghuysen |
| Boehner | Cremeans | Frisa |
| Bonilla | Cubin | Frost |
| Bonior | Cunningham | Funderburk |
| Bono | Danner | Furse |
| Borski | Davis | Galleghy |
| Boucher | de la Garza | Ganske |
| Brewster | Deal | Gejdenson |
| Browder | DeLauro | Gekas |
| Brown (CA) | DeLay | Gephardt |
| Brown (FL) | Deutsch | Geren |
| Brown (OH) | Diaz-Balart | Gilchrest |
| Brownback | Dickey | Gillmor |
| Bryant (TN) | Dicks | Gilman |
| Bunn | Dingell | Gonzalez |
| Bunning | Dixon | Goodlatte |
| Burr | Doggett | Goodling |
| Burton | Dooley | Gordon |
| Buyer | Doolittle | Goss |
| Callahan | Dornan | Graham |
| Calvert | Doyle | Green |
| Camp | Dreier | Greenwood |

- | | | |
|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Gunderson | Manzullo | Roth |
| Gutierrez | Markey | Roukema |
| Gutknecht | Martinez | Roybal-Allard |
| Hall (OH) | Martini | Royce |
| Hall (TX) | Mascara | Rush |
| Hamilton | Matsui | Sabo |
| Hancock | McCarthy | Salmon |
| Hansen | McCollum | Sanders |
| Harman | McDade | Sanford |
| Hastert | McDermott | Sawyer |
| Hastings (FL) | McHale | Saxton |
| Hastings (WA) | McHugh | Scarborough |
| Hayes | McInnis | Schiff |
| Hayworth | McIntosh | Schumer |
| Hefley | McKeon | Scott |
| Hefner | McKinney | Seastrand |
| Heineman | McNulty | Sensenbrenner |
| Herger | Meehan | Serrano |
| Hilleary | Meek | Shadegg |
| Hilliard | Menendez | Shaw |
| Hinchee | Metcalf | Shays |
| Hobson | Meyers | Shuster |
| Hoekstra | Mfume | Sisisky |
| Hoke | Mica | Skaggs |
| Holden | Miller (CA) | Skeen |
| Horn | Miller (FL) | Skelton |
| Hostettler | Minge | Smith (MI) |
| Houghton | Mink | Smith (NJ) |
| Hoyer | Moakley | Smith (TX) |
| Hutchinson | Molinari | Smith (WA) |
| Hyde | Montgomery | Solomon |
| Inglis | Moorhead | Souder |
| Istook | Moran | Spence |
| Jackson (IL) | Morella | Spratt |
| Jackson-Lee | Murtha | Stark |
| (TX) | Myers | Stearns |
| Jacobs | Myrick | Stenholm |
| Jefferson | Nadler | Stockman |
| Johnson (CT) | Neal | Stokes |
| Johnson (SD) | Nethercutt | Studds |
| Johnson, E. B. | Neumann | Stump |
| Johnson, Sam | Ney | Stupak |
| Johnston | Norwood | Talent |
| Jones | Nussle | Tanner |
| Kanjorski | Oberstar | Tauzin |
| Kaptur | Obey | Taylor (MS) |
| Kasich | Ortiz | Taylor (NC) |
| Kelly | Orton | Tejeda |
| Kennedy (MA) | Owens | Thomas |
| Kennedy (RI) | Oxley | Thompson |
| Kennelly | Packard | Thornberry |
| Kildee | Pallone | Thornton |
| Kim | Parker | Thurman |
| King | Pastor | Tiahrt |
| Kingston | Paxon | Torres |
| Klecza | Payne (VA) | Towns |
| Klink | Pelosi | Trafficant |
| Klug | Peterson (FL) | Upton |
| Knollenberg | Peterson (MN) | Velazquez |
| Kolbe | Petri | Vento |
| LaFalce | Pickett | Visclosky |
| LaHood | Pombo | Volkmer |
| Lantos | Pomeroy | Vucanovich |
| Largent | Porter | Walker |
| Latham | Portman | Walsh |
| LaTourette | Poshard | Wamp |
| Laughlin | Pryce | Watt (NC) |
| Lazio | Quillen | Watts (OK) |
| Leach | Quinn | Weldon (FL) |
| Levin | Radanovich | Weldon (PA) |
| Lewis (CA) | Rahall | Weller |
| Lewis (GA) | Ramstad | White |
| Lewis (KY) | Rangel | Whitfield |
| Lincoln | Reed | Wicker |
| Linder | Regula | Wilson |
| Lipinski | Richardson | Wise |
| LoBiondo | Riggs | Wolf |
| Lofgren | Rivers | Woolsey |
| Longley | Roberts | Wynn |
| Lowey | Roemer | Yates |
| Lucas | Rogers | Young (FL) |
| Luther | Rohrabacher | Zeliff |
| Maloney | Ros-Lehtinen | Zimmer |
| Manton | Rose | |

NAYS—2

Schroeder
Slaughter
NOT VOTING—28

- | | | |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| Armey | Hunter | Torricelli |
| Berman | Lightfoot | Waldholtz |
| Bryant (TX) | Livingston | Ward |
| Chapman | McCrery | Waters |
| DeFazio | Mollohan | Waxman |
| Dellums | Olver | Williams |
| Durbin | Payne (NJ) | Wyden |
| Fattah | Schaefer | Young (AK) |
| Ford | Tate | |
| Gibbons | Torkildsen | |

□ 1616

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 13 on the bill just passed, I mistakenly voted "nay". I had intended to vote "yea".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker; during rollcall vote No. 13 on H.R. 2657 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yea".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

SADDLEBACK MOUNTAIN-ARIZONA SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1341.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1341.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—403

Abercrombie	Bereuter	Bunning
Ackerman	Bevill	Burr
Allard	Bilbray	Burton
Andrews	Bilirakis	Buyer
Archer	Bishop	Callahan
Bachus	Bibley	Calvert
Baesler	Blute	Camp
Baker (CA)	Boehlert	Chambell
Baker (LA)	Boehner	Canady
Baldacci	Bonilla	Cardin
Ballenger	Bonior	Castle
Barcia	Bono	Chabot
Barr	Borski	Chambliss
Barrett (NE)	Boucher	Chenoweth
Barrett (WI)	Brewster	Christensen
Bartlett	Browder	Chrysler
Barton	Brown (CA)	Clay
Bass	Brown (FL)	Clayton
Bateman	Brown (OH)	Clement
Becerra	Brownback	Clinger
Beilenson	Bryant (TN)	Clyburn
Bentsen	Bunn	Coble

Coburn	Hayworth	Moakley
Coleman	Hefner	Molinari
Collins (GA)	Hefner	Montgomery
Collins (IL)	Heineman	Moorhead
Collins (MI)	Herger	Moran
Combest	Hillery	Morella
Condit	Hilliard	Murtha
Conyers	Hinchee	Myers
Cooley	Hobson	Myrick
Costello	Hoekstra	Nadler
Cox	Hoke	Neal
Coyne	Holden	Nethercutt
Cramer	Horn	Neumann
Crane	Hostettler	Ney
Crapo	Houghton	Norwood
Creameans	Hoyer	Nussle
Cubin	Hutchinson	Oberstar
Cunningham	Hyde	Obey
Danner	Inglis	Ortiz
Davis	Istook	Orton
de la Garza	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Deal	Jackson-Lee	Oxley
DeLauro	(TX)	Packard
DeLay	Jacobs	Pallone
Deutsch	Jefferson	Parker
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Dickey	Johnson (SD)	Paxon
Dicks	Johnson, E. B.	Payne (VA)
Dingell	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
Dixon	Johnston	Peterson (FL)
Doggett	Jones	Peterson (MN)
Dooley	Kanjorski	Petri
Dorman	Kaptur	Pickett
Doyle	Kasich	Pombo
Dreier	Kelly	Pomeroy
Duncan	Kennedy (MA)	Porter
Dunn	Kennedy (RI)	Portman
Edwards	Kennelly	Poshard
Ehlers	Kildee	Pryce
Ehrlich	Kim	Quillen
Emerson	King	Quinn
Engel	Kingston	Radanovich
English	Klecza	Rahall
Ensign	Klink	Ramstad
Eshoo	Klug	Rangel
Evans	Knollenberg	Reed
Everett	Kolbe	Regula
Ewing	LaFalce	Richardson
Farr	LaHood	Riggs
Fawell	Lantos	Rivers
Fazio	Largent	Roberts
Fields (LA)	Latham	Roemer
Fields (TX)	LaTourrette	Rogers
Filner	Laughlin	Rohrabacher
Flake	Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Flanagan	Leach	Rose
Foglietta	Levin	Roth
Foley	Lewis (CA)	Roukema
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Fox	Lincoln	Rush
Frank (MA)	Linder	Sabo
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Salmon
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Sanders
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Sanford
Frisa	Longley	Sawyer
Frost	Lowe	Saxton
Funderburk	Lucas	Scarborough
Furse	Luther	Schiff
Galleghy	Maloney	Schroeder
Ganske	Manton	Schumer
Gejdenson	Manzullo	Scott
Gekas	Markey	Seastrand
Gephardt	Martinez	Sensenbrenner
Geren	Martini	Serrano
Gilchrest	Mascara	Shadegg
Gillmor	Matsui	Shaw
Gilman	McCarthy	Shays
Gonzalez	McCollum	Shuster
Goodlatte	McDade	Sisisky
Goodling	McDermott	Skaggs
Gordon	McHale	Skeen
Goss	McHugh	Skelton
Graham	McInnis	Slaughter
Green	McIntosh	Smith (MI)
Greenwood	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
Gunderson	McKinney	Smith (TX)
Gutierrez	McNulty	Smith (WA)
Gutknecht	Meehan	Solomon
Hall (OH)	Meek	Souder
Hall (TX)	Menendez	Spence
Hamilton	Metcalf	Spratt
Hancock	Meyers	Stark
Hansen	Mfume	Stearns
Harman	Mica	Stenholm
Hastert	Miller (CA)	Stockman
Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Stokes
Hastings (WA)	Minge	Studds
Hayes	Mink	Stump

Stupak	Towns	Weldon (PA)
Talent	Traficant	Weller
Tanner	Upton	White
Tauzin	Velazquez	Whitfield
Taylor (MS)	Vento	Wicker
Taylor (NC)	Visclosky	Wise
Tejeda	Volkmer	Wolf
Thomas	Vucanovich	Woolsey
Thompson	Walker	Wynn
Thornberry	Walsh	Yates
Thornton	Wamp	Young (FL)
Thurman	Watt (NC)	Zeliff
Tiahrt	Watts (OK)	Zimmer
Torres	Weldon (FL)	

NOES—1

Wilson

NOT VOTING—29

Armey	Gibbons	Torkildsen
Berman	Hunter	Torrice
Bryant (TX)	Lightfoot	Waldholtz
Chapman	Livingston	Ward
DeFazio	McCrary	Waters
Dellums	Mollohan	Waxman
Doolittle	Olver	Williams
Durbin	Payne (NJ)	Wyden
Fattah	Schaefer	Young (AK)
Ford	Tate	

□ 1627

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 14 on S. 1341, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1341.

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

There was no objection.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN LAWS RELATING TO NATIVE AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2726, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2726, as amended.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 407, noes 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

AYES—407

Abercrombie	Doggett	Johnson (SD)
Ackerman	Dooley	Johnson, E. B.
Allard	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Andrews	Dornan	Johnston
Archer	Doyle	Jones
Bachus	Dreier	Kanjorski
Baesler	Duncan	Kaptur
Baker (CA)	Dunn	Kasich
Baker (LA)	Edwards	Kelly
Baldacci	Ehlers	Kennedy (MA)
Ballenger	Ehrlich	Kennedy (RI)
Barcia	Emerson	Kennelly
Barr	Engel	Kildee
Barrett (NE)	English	Kim
Barrett (WI)	Ensign	King
Bartlett	Eshoo	Kingston
Barton	Evans	Klecza
Bass	Everett	Klink
Bateman	Ewing	Klug
Becerra	Farr	Knollenberg
Beilenson	Fawell	Kolbe
Bentsen	Fazio	LaFalce
Bereuter	Fields (LA)	LaHood
Bevill	Fields (TX)	Lantos
Bilbray	Filner	Largent
Bilirakis	Flake	Latham
Bishop	Flanagan	LaTourrette
Bliley	Foglietta	Laughlin
Blute	Foley	Leach
Boehlert	Forbes	Levin
Boehner	Fowler	Lewis (CA)
Bonilla	Fox	Lewis (GA)
Bonior	Frank (MA)	Lewis (KY)
Bono	Franks (CT)	Lincoln
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Linder
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	Lipinski
Brewster	Frisa	LoBiondo
Browder	Frost	LoFgren
Brown (CA)	Funderburk	Longley
Brown (FL)	Furse	Lowery
Brown (OH)	Gallegly	Lucas
Brownback	Ganske	Luther
Bryant (TN)	Gejdenson	Maloney
Bunn	Gekas	Manton
Bunning	Gephardt	Manzullo
Burr	Geren	Markey
Burton	Gilchrest	Martinez
Buyer	Gillmor	Martini
Callahan	Gilman	Mascara
Calvert	Gonzalez	Matsui
Camp	Goodlatte	McCarthy
Campbell	Goodling	McCollum
Canady	Gordon	McDade
Cardin	Goss	McDermott
Castle	Graham	McHale
Chabot	Green	McHugh
Chambliss	Greenwood	McInnis
Chenoweth	Gundersen	McIntosh
Christensen	Gutierrez	McKeon
Chrysler	Gutknecht	Hall (OH)
Clay	Hall (TX)	McNulty
Clayton	Hamilton	Meehan
Clement	Hancock	Meek
Clinger	Hansen	Menendez
Clyburn	Harman	Metcalfe
Coble	Hastert	Meyers
Coburn	Hastings (FL)	Mfume
Coleman	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Collins (GA)	Hayes	Miller (CA)
Collins (IL)	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Collins (MI)	Hefley	Minge
Combust	Hefner	Mink
Condit	Heineman	Moakley
Conyers	Herger	Molinari
Cooley	Hillery	Montgomery
Costello	Hilliard	Moorhead
Cox	Hinchee	Moran
Coyne	Hobson	Morella
Cramer	Hoekstra	Murtha
Crane	Hoke	Myers
Crapo	Holden	Myrick
Creameans	Horn	Nadler
Cubin	Hostettler	Neal
Cunningham	Houghton	Nethercutt
Danner	Hoyer	Neumann
Davis	Hutchinson	Ney
de la Garza	Hyde	Norwood
Deal	Inglis	Nussle
DeLauro	Istook	Oberstar
DeLay	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Deutsch	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Diaz-Balart	(TX)	Orton
Dickey	Jacobs	Owens
Dicks	Jefferson	Oxley
Dingell	Johnson (CT)	Packard
Dixon		

Pallone	Salmon	Tauzin
Parker	Sanders	Taylor (MS)
Pastor	Sanford	Taylor (NC)
Paxon	Sawyer	Tejeda
Payne (NJ)	Saxton	Thomas
Payne (VA)	Scarborough	Thompson
Pelosi	Schiff	Thornberry
Peterson (FL)	Schroeder	Thornton
Peterson (MN)	Schumer	Thurman
Petri	Scott	Tiahrt
Pickett	Seastrand	Torres
Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Pomeroy	Serrano	Traficant
Porter	Shadegg	Upton
Portman	Shaw	Velazquez
Poshard	Shays	Vento
Pryce	Shuster	Visclosky
Quillen	Sisisky	Volkmer
Quinn	Skaggs	Vucanovich
Radanovich	Skeen	Walker
Rahall	Skelton	Walsh
Ramstad	Slaughter	Wamp
Rangel	Smith (MI)	Waters
Reed	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Regula	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Richardson	Smith (WA)	Weldon (PA)
Riggs	Solomon	Weldon (FL)
Rivers	Souder	Weller
Roberts	Spence	White
Roemer	Spratt	Whitfield
Rogers	Stark	Wicker
Rohrabacher	Stearns	Wilson
Ros-Lehtinen	Stenholm	Wise
Rose	Stockman	Wolf
Roth	Stokes	Woolsey
Roukema	Studds	Wynn
Roybal-Allard	Stump	Yates
Royce	Stupak	Young (FL)
Rush	Talent	Zeliff
Sabo	Tanner	Zimmer

consent and approval, the Chair announces that tonight when the two Houses meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule 1 the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided. The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Kevin Brennan, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY];

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY];

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER];

The gentleman from California [Mr. COX];

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY];

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON];

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR];

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO];

The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY];

NOT VOTING—26

Arney	Gibbons	Torkildsen
Berman	Hunter	Torrice
Bryant (TX)	Lightfoot	Waldholtz
Chapman	Livingston	Ward
DeFazio	McCrery	Waxman
Dellums	Mollohan	Williams
Durbin	Olver	Wyden
Fattah	Schaefer	Young (AK)
Ford	Tate	

□ 1638

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 15 on H.R. 2726 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2657 and H.R. 2726.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON]; and

The gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE];

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT];

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN];

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES];

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE];

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD];

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY];

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY];

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER];

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN];

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAU];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]; and

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON].

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Royal Highness, Prince Bandar bin Sultan, Ambassador of Saudi Arabia.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Wilson Livingood, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of the 104th Congress, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans all across our land: Let me begin tonight by saying to our men and women in uniform around the world and especially those helping peace take root in Bosnia and to their families, I thank you. America is very, very proud of you.

My duty tonight is to report on the State of the Union, not the state of our government but of our American community, and to set forth our responsibilities, in the words of our Founders, to "form a more perfect union."

The State of the Union is strong. Our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades. We have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 27 years. We have created nearly 8 million new jobs, over a million of them in basic industries like construction and automobiles. American is selling more cars than Japan for the first time since the 1970s, and for three years in a row we have had a record number of new businesses started in our country.

Our leadership in the world is also strong, bringing hope for new peace. And perhaps most important, we are gaining ground and restoring our fundamental values. The crime rate, the welfare and food stamp rolls, the poverty rate and the teen pregnancy rate are all down. And as they go down, prospects for America's future go up.

We live in an Age of Possibility. A hundred years ago we moved from farm to factory. Now we move to an age of technology, information and global competition. These changes have opened vast new opportunities for our people, but they have also presented them with stiff challenges.

While more Americans are living better, too many of our fellow citizens are working harder just to keep up, and they are rightly concerned about the security of their families.

We must answer here three fundamental questions: First, how do we make the American dream of opportunity for all a reality for all Americans who are willing to work for it? Second, how do we preserve our old and enduring values as we move into the future? And third, how do we meet these challenges together as one America?

We know big government does not have all the answers. We know there's not a program for every problem. We know and we have worked to give the American people a smaller, less bureaucratic government in Washington. And we have to give the American peo-

ple one that lives within its means. The era of big government is over. But we cannot go back to the time when our citizens were left to fend for themselves. Instead, we must go forward as one America, one nation, working together to meet the challenges we face together. Self-reliance and teamwork are not opposing virtues. We must have both.

I believe our new, smaller government must work in an old-fashioned American way, together with all of our citizens through State and local governments, in the workplace, in religious, charitable and civic associations. Our goal must be to enable all our people to make the most of their own lives, with stronger families, more educational opportunities, economic security, safer streets, a cleaner environment and a safer world.

To improve the state of our union, we must ask more of ourselves. We must expect more of each other and we must face our challenges together.

Here in this place our responsibility begins with balancing the budget in a way that is fair to all Americans. There is now broad bipartisan agreement that permanent deficit spending must come to an end.

I compliment the Republican leadership and their membership for the energy and determination you have brought to this task of balancing the budget. And I thank the Democrats for passing the largest deficit reduction plan in history in 1993, which has already cut the deficit nearly in half in three years.

Since 1993, we have all begun to see the benefits of deficit reduction. Lower interest rates have made it easier for businesses to borrow and to invest and to create new jobs. Lower interest rates have brought down the cost of home mortgages, car payments and credit card rates to ordinary citizens. Now it is time to finish the job and balance the budget.

Though differences remain among us which are significant, the combined total of the proposed savings that are common to both plans is more than enough, using the numbers from your Congressional Budget Office, to balance the budget in 7 years and to provide a modest tax cut. These cuts are real. They will require sacrifice from everyone. But these cuts do not undermine our fundamental obligations to our parents, our children and our future by endangering Medicare or Medicaid or education or the environment or by raising taxes on working families.

I have said before, and let me say again, many good ideas have come out of our negotiations. I have learned a lot about the way both Republicans and Democrats view the debate before us. I have learned a lot about the good ideas that each side has that we could all embrace. We ought to resolve our remaining differences.

I am willing to work to resolve them. I am ready to meet tomorrow. But I

ask you to consider that we should at least enact the savings that both plans have in common and give the American people their balanced budget, a tax cut, lower interest rates, and a brighter future. We should do that now and make permanent deficits yesterday's legacy.

Now it is time for us to look also to the challenges of today and tomorrow, beyond the burdens of yesterday. The challenges are significant. But our Nation was built on challenges. America was built on challenges, not promises. And when we work together to meet them we never fail. That is the key to a more perfect union. Our individual dreams must be realized by our common efforts.

Tonight I want to speak to you about the challenges we all face as a people. Our first challenge is to cherish our children and strengthen America's families. Families are the foundation of American life. If we have stronger families, we will have a stronger America.

Before I go on, I would like to take just a moment to thank my own family and to thank the person who has taught me more than anyone else, over 25 years, about the importance of families and children, a wonderful wife, a magnificent mother, and a great First Lady. Thank you, Hillary.

All strong families begin with taking more responsibility for our children. I have heard Mrs. Gore say that it is hard to be a parent today, but it is even harder to be a child. So all of us, not just as parents, but all of us in our other roles, our media, our schools, our teachers, our communities, our churches and synagogues, our businesses, our governments, all of us have a responsibility to help our children to make it and to make the most of their lives and their God-given capacities.

To the media, I say you should create movies and CD's and television shows you'd want your own children and grandchildren to enjoy.

I call on Congress to pass the requirement for a "V chip" in TV sets so that parents can screen out programs they believe are inappropriate for their children.

When parents control what their young children see, that is not censorship; that is enabling parents to assume more personal responsibility for their children's upbringing, and I urge them to do it. The "V chip" requirement is part of the important telecommunications bill now pending in this Congress. It has bipartisan support, and I urge you to pass it now.

To make the "V chip" work, I challenge the broadcast industry to do what movies have done: to identify your program in ways that help parents to protect their children. And I invite the leaders of major media corporations in the entertainment industry to come to the White House next month to work with us in a positive way on concrete ways to improve what our children see on television. I am ready to work with you.

I say to those who make and market cigarettes, every year a million children take up smoking, even though it's against the law. Three hundred thousand of them will have their lives shortened as a result. Our administration has taken steps to stop the massive marketing campaigns that appeal to our children. We are simply saying, "Market your products to adults if you wish, but draw the line on children."

I say to those who are on welfare and especially to those who have been trapped on welfare for a long time, for too long our welfare system has undermined the values of family and work instead of supporting them. The Congress and I are near agreement on sweeping welfare reform. We agree on time limits, tough work requirements, and the toughest possible child support enforcement. But I believe we must also provide child care so that mothers who are required to go to work can do so without worrying about what is happening to their children.

I challenge this Congress to send me a bipartisan welfare reform bill that will really move people from welfare to work and do the right thing by our children. I will sign it immediately.

Let us be candid about this difficult problem. Passing a law, even the best possible law, is only a first step. The next step is to make it work. I challenge people on welfare to make the most of this opportunity for independence. I challenge American businesses to give people on welfare the chance to move into the work force. I applaud the work of religious groups and others who care for the poor. More than anyone else in our society, they know the true difficulty of the task before us, and they are in a position to help. Every one of us should join them. That is the only way we can make real welfare reform a reality in the lives of the American people.

To strengthen the family, we must do everything we can to keep the teen pregnancy rate going down. I am gratified, as I am sure all Americans are, that it has dropped for 2 years in a row, but we all know it is still far too high.

Tonight I am pleased to announce that a group of prominent Americans is responding to that challenge by forming an organization that will support grassroots community efforts all across our country in a national campaign against teen pregnancy. And I challenge all of us and every American to join their efforts.

I call on American men and women in families to give greater respect to one another. We must end the deadly scourge of domestic violence in our country.

And I challenge America's families to work harder to stay together, for families that stay together not only do better economically, their children do better as well. In particular, I challenge the fathers of this country to love and care for their children. If your family has separated, you must pay your child support. We are doing more than ever

to make sure you do, and we are going to do more, but let's all admit something about that, too. A check will never substitute for a parent's love and guidance, and only you, only you, can make the decision to help raise your children. No matter who you are, how low or high your station in life, it is the most basic human duty of every American to do that job to the best of his or her ability.

Our second challenge is to provide Americans with the educational opportunities we'll all need for this new century. In our schools every classroom in America must be connected to the information superhighway with computers, and good software, and well-trained teachers. We are working with the telecommunications industry, educators and parents, to connect 20 percent of California's classrooms by this spring, and every classroom and every library in the entire United States by the year 2000.

I ask Congress to support this education technology initiative so that we can make sure this national partnership succeeds.

Every diploma ought to mean something. I challenge every community, every school, and every State to adopt national standards of excellence, to measure whether schools are meeting those standards, to cut bureaucratic red tape so that schools and teachers have more flexibility for grassroots reform, and to hold them accountable for results. That's what our Goals 2000 initiative is all about.

I challenge every State to give all parents the right to choose which public school their children will attend and to let teachers form new schools with a charter they can keep only if they do a good job.

I challenge all our schools to teach character education, to teach good values and good citizenship, and if it means that teenagers will stop killing each other over designers jackets, then our public schools should be able to require their students to wear school uniforms.

I challenge our parents to become their children's first teachers, turn off the TV, see that the homework is done, and visit your children's classroom. No program, no teacher, no one else can do that for you.

My fellow Americans, higher education is more important today than ever before. We've created a new student loan program that has made it easier to borrow and repay those loans, and we have dramatically cut the student loan default rate. That is something we should all be proud of because it was unconscionably high just a few years ago. Through AmeriCorps, our national service program, this year 25,000 young people will earn college money by serving their local communities to improve the lives of their friends and neighbors.

These initiatives are right for America, and we should keep them going, and we should also work hard to open the doors of college even wider.

I challenge Congress to expand work study and help 1 million young Americans work their way through college by the year 2000, to provide a \$1,000 merit scholarship for the top 5 percent of graduates in every high school in the United States, to expand Pell grant scholarships for deserving and needy students, and to make up to \$10,000 a year of college tuition tax deductible. It is a good idea for America.

Our third challenge is to help every American who is willing to work for it achieve economic security in this new age. People who work hard still need support to get ahead in the new economy, they need education and training for a lifetime, they need more support for families raising children, they need retirement security, they need access to health care. More and more Americans are finding that the education of their childhood simply doesn't last a lifetime. So I challenge Congress to consolidate 70 overlapping, antiquated job training programs into a simple voucher worth \$2,600 for unemployed or underemployed workers to use as they please for community college tuition or other training. This is a GI bill for America's workers we should all be able to agree on.

More and more Americans are working hard without a raise. Congress sets the minimum wage. Within a year the minimum wage will fall to a 40-year low in purchasing power. Four dollars and twenty-five cents an hour is no longer a minimum wage, but millions of Americans and their children are trying to live on it. I challenge you to raise their minimum wage.

In 1993 Congress cut the taxes of 15 million hard-pressed working families to make sure that no parents who work full time would have to raise their children in poverty and to encourage people to move from welfare to work. This expanded Earned Income Tax Credit is now worth about \$1,800 a year to a family of four living on \$20,000. The budget bill I vetoed would have reversed this achievement and raised taxes on nearly 8 million of these people. We should not do that. We should not do that.

But I also agree that the people who are helped under this initiative are not all those in our country who are working hard to do a good job raising their children and that work. I agree that we need a tax credit for working families with children. That's one of the things most of us in this Chamber, I hope, can agree on. I know it is strongly supported by the Republican majority, and it should be part of any final budget agreement.

I want to challenge every business that can possibly afford it to provide pensions for your employees, and I challenge Congress to pass a proposal recommended by the White House Conference on Small Business that would make it easier for small businesses and farmers to establish their own pension plans. That is something we should all agree on.

□ 2140

We should also protect existing pension plans. Two years ago, with bipartisan support, it was almost unanimous on both sides of the aisle, we moved to protect the pensions of 8 million working people and to stabilize the pension of 32 million more. Congress should not now let companies endanger those workers' pension funds.

I know the proposal to liberalize the ability of employers to take money out of the pension funds for other purposes would raise money for the Treasury, but I believe it is false economy. I vetoed that proposal last year, and I would have to do so again.

Finally, if our working families are going to succeed in the new economy, they must be able to buy health insurance policies that they do not lose when they change jobs or when someone in their family gets sick. Over the past two years, over 1 million Americans in working families have lost their health insurance. We have to do more to make health care available to every American, and Congress should start by passing the bipartisan bill sponsored by Senator KENNEDY and Senator KASSEBAUM that would require insurance companies to stop dropping people when they switch jobs and stop denying coverage for preexisting conditions. Let's all do that.

And even as we enact savings in these programs, we must have a common commitment to preserve the basic protections of Medicare and Medicaid, not just to the poor, but to people in working families, including children, people with disabilities, people with AIDS, senior citizens in nursing homes. In the past three years, we have saved \$15 billion just by fighting health care fraud and abuse.

We have all agreed to save much more. We have all agreed to stabilize the Medicare Trust Fund, but we must not abandon our fundamental obligations to the people who need Medicare and Medicaid. America cannot become stronger if they become weaker.

The GI Bill for Workers, tax relief for education and child-rearing, pension availability and protection, access to health care, preservation of Medicare and Medicaid, these things, along with the Family and Medical Leave Act passed in 1993, these things will help responsible, hard-working American families to make the most of their own lives.

But employers and employees must do their part as well, as they are doing in so many of our finest companies: working together, putting the long-term prosperity ahead of the short-term gain. As workers increase their hours and their productivity, employers should make sure they get the skills they need and share the benefits of the good years as well as the burdens of the bad ones. When companies and workers work as a team, they do better, and so does America.

Our fourth great challenge is to take our streets back from crime and gangs

and drugs. At last we have begun to find a way to reduce crime, forming community partnerships with local police forces to catch criminals and prevent crime.

This strategy, called community policing, is clearly working. Violent crime is coming down all across America. In New York City, murders are down 25 percent; in St. Louis, 18 percent; and in Seattle, 32 percent. But we still have a long way to go before our streets are safe and our people are free from fear.

The Crime Bill of 1994 is critical to the success of community policing. It provides funds for 100,000 new police in communities of all sizes. We are already a third of the way there, and I challenge the Congress to finish the job. Let us stick with a strategy that is working and keep the crime rate coming down.

Community policing also requires bonds of trust between citizens and police. I ask all Americans to respect and support our law enforcement officers, and to our police I say, our children need you as role models and heroes. Don't let them down.

The Brady Bill has already stopped 44,000 people with criminal records from buying guns. The assault weapons ban is keeping 19 kinds of assault weapons out of the hands of violent gangs. I challenge the Congress to keep those laws on the books.

Our next step in the fight against crime is to take on gangs the way we once took on the mob. I am directing the FBI and other investigative agencies to target gangs that involve juveniles and violent crime, and to seek authority to prosecute as adults teenagers who maim and kill like adults. And I challenge local housing authorities and tenant associations: Criminal gang members and drug dealers are destroying the lives of decent tenants. From now on, the rule for residents who commit crime and peddle drugs should be, one strike and you're out.

I challenge every State to match Federal policy to assure that serious violent criminals serve at least 85 percent of their sentence. More police and punishment are important, but they are not enough. We have got to keep more of our young people out of trouble with prevention strategies not dictated by Washington, but developed in communities. I challenge all of our communities, all of our adults, to give our children futures to say yes to, and I challenge Congress not to abandon the Crime Bill's support of these grassroots prevention efforts.

Finally, to reduce crime and violence, we have to reduce the drug problem. The challenge begins in our homes with parents talking to their children openly and firmly, and embraces our churches and synagogues, our youth groups and our schools. I challenge Congress not to cut our support for drug-free schools. People like these DARE officers are making a real impression on grade school children that

will give them the strength to say no when the time comes.

Meanwhile, we continue our efforts to cut the flow of drugs into America. For the last two years, one man in particular has been on the front lines of that effort. Tonight I am nominating him, a hero of the Persian Gulf War and the Commander in Chief of the United States military's Southern Command, General Barry McCaffrey as America's new drug czar.

General McCaffrey has earned three Purple Hearts and two Silver Stars fighting for this country. Tonight I ask that he lead our Nation's battle against drugs at home and abroad. To succeed, he needs a force far larger than he has ever commanded before. He needs all of us, every one of us has a role to play on this team. Thank you, General McCaffrey, for agreeing to serve your country one more time.

Our fifth challenge, to leave our environment safe and clean for the next generation. Because of a generation of bipartisan effort, we do have cleaner water and air; lead levels in children's blood has been cut by 70 percent; toxic emissions from factories, cut in half. Lake Erie was dead and now it is a thriving resource. But 10 million children under 12 still live within five miles of a toxic waste dump. A third of us breathe the air that endangers our health, and in too many communities, the water is not safe to drink.

We still have much to do. Yet Congress has voted to cut environmental enforcement by 25 percent. That means more toxic chemicals in our water, more smog in our air, more pesticides in our food. Lobbyists for our polluters have been allowed to write their own loopholes into bills to weaken laws that protect the health and safety of our children.

Some say that the taxpayers should pick up the tab for toxic waste and let polluters who can afford to fix it off the hook. I challenge Congress to reexamine those policies and to reverse them. This issue has not been a partisan issue. The most significant environmental gains in the last 30 years were made under a Democratic Congress and President Richard Nixon. We can work together.

We have to believe some basic things. Do you believe we can expand the economy without hurting the environment? I do. Do you believe we can create more jobs over the long run by cleaning the environment up? I know we can. That should be our commitment.

We must challenge businesses and communities to take more initiative in protecting the environment, and we have to make it easier for them to do it. To businesses, this administration is saying, if you can find a cheaper, more efficient way than government regulations require to meet tough pollution standards, do it, as long as you do it right. To communities we say, we must strengthen community right-to-know laws requiring polluters to disclose their emissions, but you have to

use the information to work with business to cut pollution. People do have a right to know that their air and their water are safe.

Our sixth challenge is to maintain America's leadership in the fight for freedom and peace throughout the world. Because of American leadership, more people than ever before live free and at peace, and Americans have known 50 years of prosperity and security.

We owe thanks especially to our veterans of World War II. I would like to say to Senator BOB DOLE and to all others in this Chamber who fought in World War II; and to all others on both sides of the aisle who have fought bravely in all of our conflicts since, I salute your service and so do the American people.

All over the world, even after the Cold War, people still look to us and trust us to help them seek the blessings of peace and freedom. But as the Cold War fades in the memory, voices of isolation say, America should retreat from its responsibilities. I say they are wrong.

The threats we face today as Americans respect no Nation's borders. Think of them: terrorism, the spread of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, drug trafficking, ethnic and religious hatred, aggression by rogue states, environmental degradation. If we fail to address these threats today, we will suffer the consequences in all our tomorrows.

Of course we can't be everywhere; of course we can't do everything. But where our interests and our values are at stake and where we can make a difference, America must lead. We must not be isolationists, we must not be the world's policeman, but we can and should be the world's very best peacemaker.

By keeping our military strong, by using diplomacy where we can and force where we must, by working with others to share the risk and the cost of our efforts, America is making a difference for people here and around the world. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not a single Russian missile pointed at America's children.

North Korea has now frozen its dangerous nuclear weapons program. In Haiti, the dictators are gone, democracy has a new day, the flow of desperate refugees to our shores has subsided. Through tougher trade deals for America, over 80 of them, we have opened markets abroad, and now exports are at an all-time high, growing faster than imports and creating good American jobs.

We stood with those taking risks for peace, in Northern Ireland where Catholic and Protestant children now tell their parents, violence must never return; in the Middle East where Arabs and Jews who once seemed destined to fight forever now share knowledge and resources and even dreams.

And we stood up for peace in Bosnia. Remember the skeletal prisoners, the mass graves, the campaigns of rape and torture, the endless lines of refugees, the threat of a spreading war. All of these threats, all these horrors, have now begun to give way to the promise of peace. Now our troops and a strong NATO, together with our new partners from Central Europe and elsewhere, are helping that peace to take hold. As all of you know, I was just there with a bipartisan congressional group, and I was so proud not only of what our troops were doing, but of the pride they evidenced in what they were doing. They knew what America's mission in this world is, and they were proud to be carrying it out.

Through these efforts, we have enhanced the security of the American people. But make no mistake about it, important challenges remain. The START II treaty with Russia will cut our nuclear stockpiles by another 25 percent. I urge the Senate to ratify it now. We must end the race to create new nuclear weapons by signing a truly comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty this year.

As we remember what happened in the Japanese subway, we can outlaw poison gas forever if the Senate ratifies the Chemical Weapons Convention this year.

We can intensify the fight against terrorists and organized criminals at home and abroad, if Congress passes the anti-terrorism legislation I proposed after the Oklahoma City bombing now. We can help more people move from hatred to hope all across the world in our own interest if Congress gives us the means to remain the world's leader for peace.

My fellow Americans, the six challenges I have just discussed are for all of us. Our seventh challenge is really America's challenge to those of us in this hallowed hall tonight, to reinvent our government and make our democracy work for them.

Last year this Congress applied to itself the laws it applies to everyone else. This Congress banned gifts and meals from lobbyists. This Congress forced lobbyists to disclose who pays them and what legislation they are trying to pass or kill. This Congress did that and I applaud you for it.

Now I challenge Congress to go further, to curb special interest influence in politics by passing the first truly bipartisan campaign finance reform bill in a generation. You, Republicans and Democrats alike, can show the American people that we can limit spending and we can open the airwaves to all candidates.

I also appeal to Congress to pass the line item veto you promised the American people.

Our administration is working hard to give the American people a government that works better and costs less. Thanks to the work of Vice President GORE we are eliminating 16,000 pages of unnecessary rules and regulations,

shifting more decisionmaking out of Washington back to States and local communities. As we move into the era of balanced budgets and smaller government, we must work in new ways to enable people to make the most of their own lives. We are helping America's communities not with more bureaucracy but with more opportunities.

Through our successful empowerment zones and community development banks, we are helping people to find jobs, to start businesses. And with tax incentives for companies that clean up abandoned industrial properties, we can bring jobs back to places that desperately, desperately need them. But there are some areas that the Federal Government should not leave and should address and address strongly.

One of these areas is the problem of illegal immigration. After years of neglect, this administration has taken a strong stand to stiffen the protection of our borders. We are increasing border controls by 50 percent. We are increasing inspections to prevent the hiring of illegal immigrants. And tonight I announce I will sign an executive order to deny Federal contracts to businesses that hire illegal immigrants.

Let me be very clear about this. We are still a nation of immigrants. We should be proud of it. We should honor every legal immigrant here working hard to be a good citizen, working hard to become a new citizen. But we are also a nation of laws.

I want to say a special word now to those who work for our Federal Government. Today the Federal work force is 200,000 employees smaller than it was the day I took office as President. Our Federal Government today is the smallest it has been in 30 years, and it is getting smaller every day. Most of our fellow Americans probably don't know that. There's a good reason, a good reason. The remaining Federal work force is composed of hard-working Americans who are now working harder and working smarter than ever before to make sure the quality of our services does not decline.

I would like to give you one example. His name is Richard Dean. He is a 49-year-old Vietnam veteran who has worked for the Social Security Administration for 22 years now. Last year he was hard at work in the Federal building in Oklahoma City, when the blast killed 169 people and brought the rubble down all around him. He reentered that building four times. He saved the lives of three women. He is here with us this evening and I want to recognize Richard and applaud both his public service and his extraordinary personal heroism.

But Richard Dean's story doesn't end there. This last November, he was forced out of his office when the government shut down. And the second time the government shut down, he continued helping Social Security recipients, but he was working without pay.

On behalf of Richard Dean and his family and all the other people who are out there working every day doing a good job for the American people, I challenge all of you in this Chamber, never, ever shut the Federal Government down again.

On behalf of all Americans, especially those who need their Social Security payments at the beginning of March, I also challenge the Congress to preserve the full faith and credit of the United States, to honor the obligations of this great nation as we have for 220 years, to rise above partisanship and pass a straightforward extension of the debt limit and show the people America keeps its word.

I know that this evening I have asked a lot of Congress and even more from America, but I am confident. When Americans work together in their homes, their schools, their churches and synagogues, their civic groups, their workplace, they can meet any challenge.

I say again, the era of big government is over, but we can't go back to the era of fending for yourself. We have to go forward to the era of working together as a community, as a team, as one America, with all of us reaching across these lines that divide us, the division, the discrimination, the rancor, we have to reach across it to find common ground. We have got to work together, if we want America to work.

I want you to meet two more people tonight who do just that. Lucius Wright is a teacher in the Jackson, Mississippi public school system. A Vietnam veteran, he has created groups to help inner city children turn away from gangs and build futures they can believe in.

Sergeant Jennifer Rogers is a police officer in Oklahoma City. Like Richard Dean she helped to pull her fellow citizens out of the rubble and deal with that awful tragedy. She reminds us that in their response to that atrocity, the people of Oklahoma City lifted all of us with their basic sense of decency and community.

Lucius Wright and Jennifer Rogers are special Americans, and I have the honor to announce tonight that they are the very first of several thousand Americans who will be chosen to carry the Olympic torch on its long journey from Los Angeles to the centennial of the modern Olympics in Atlanta this summer, not because they are star athletes but because they are star citizens, community heroes meeting America's challenges. They are our real champions. Please stand up.

Now each of us must hold high the torch of citizenship in our own lives. None of us can finish the race alone. We can only achieve our destiny together, one hand, one generation, one American connecting to another.

There have always been things we could do together, dreams we could make real which we could never have done on our own. We Americans have forged our identity, our very union,

from the very point of view that we can accommodate every point on the planet, every different opinion. But we must be bound together by a faith more powerful than any doctrine that divides us, by our belief in progress, our love of liberty and our relentless search for common ground. America has always sought and always risen to every challenge.

Who would say that having come so far together we will not go forward from here? Who would say that this Age of Possibility is not for all Americans?

Our country is and always has been a great and good nation, but the best is yet to come, if we all do our part.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless the United States of America.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 10 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m. the President of the United States accompanied by the committee of escort retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1124, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-451) on the resolution (H. Res. 340) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was referred to the

House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TORKILDSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TATE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, on January 24.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, on January 24.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, on January 24.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, on January 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

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

Mr. SCHUMER in two instances.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. FOGLIETTA in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Ms. DELAURO in two instances.

Mr. BEILENSEN.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

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

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. DORNAN in two instances.

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. QUINN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1606. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 24 Corliss Street, Providence, Rhode Island, as the "Henry Kizirian Post Office Building."

H.R. 2061. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1550 Dewey Avenue, Baker City, Oregon, as the "David J. Wheeler Federal Building."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 24, 1996, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1942. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting CBO's final sequestration report for fiscal year 1996, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-587); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1943. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to transfer by sale the ship U.S.S. *Edenton* to the Government of Spain, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1944. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to transfer by sale the following ships, the U.S.S. *Affray*, the U.S.S. *Fortify*, and the U.S.S. *Exultant* to the Taiwanese Navy, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1945. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to transfer by sale the ship U.S.S. *James M. Gillis* to the Government of Mexico, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1946. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to transfer by sale the following ships, the U.S.S. *Beaufort*, and the U.S.S. *Brunswick* to the Government of Korea, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

1947. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Industrial Affairs), Department of Defense, transmitting the strategic and critical materials report during the period October 1994 through September 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98h-2(b); to the Committee on National Security.

1948. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting a report on credit for small businesses and small farms in 1995, pursuant to section 477 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 [FDICIA]; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1949. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning a cooperative project with Israel on the Arrow Deployability Program [ADP] (Transmittal No. 02-96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

1950. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 96-8: Suspending Restrictions on U.S. Relations with the Palestine Liberation Organization, pursuant to Public Law 103-236, section 583(b)(2) (108 Stat. 489); to the Committee on International Relations.

1951. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-180, "Community Development Corporations Money Lender Licensing Fee and Bonding Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1952. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-181, "Budget Support Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1953. A letter from the Manager, Benefits Communications, Ninth Farm Credit District, transmitting the annual report for the plan year ended December 31, 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1954. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1955. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and the semiannual report of management on final actions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1956. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1957. A letter from the executive director, American Chemical Society, transmitting the society's annual report for the calendar year 1994 and the comprehensive report to the board of directors of the American Chemical Society on the examination of their books and records for the year ending December 31, 1994, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(2) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1958. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report for fiscal year 1995 to identify the contracts that were awarded in excess of the dollar threshold in section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11)) pursuant to a waiver of the prohibition on contracting with a foreign entity unless that entity certifies that it does not comply with the secondary Arab boycott of Israel, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2401i; jointly, to the Committees on National Security and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 340. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1124) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other

purposes (Rept. 104-451). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. KENNELLY):

H.R. 2864. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for 501(c)(3) bonds a tax treatment similar to governmental bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEEK of Florida:

H.R. 2865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the tax on handguns and assault weapons, to increase the license application fee for gun dealers, and to use the proceeds from those increases to pay for medical care for gunshot victims; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2866. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to health care fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. EWING, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. HILLEARY):

H.R. 2867. A bill to prohibit U.S. voluntary and assessed contributions to the United Nations if the United Nations imposes any tax or fee on U.S. persons or continues to develop or promote proposals for such taxes or fees; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TEJEDA (for himself, Mr. BUYER, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 2868. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent alternative teacher certification programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2869. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 2870. A bill to eliminate the duties on Tetraamino Biphenyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. YOUNG of Florida introduced a bill (H.R. 2871) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade and on the Great Lakes and their tributary and connecting waters in trade with Canada for vessel *Ark*; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. CHAMBLISS.
 H.R. 103: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 109: Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 163: Mr. GEJDENSON.
 H.R. 218: Mr. SALMON, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KING.
 H.R. 359: Mr. CLEMENT.
 H.R. 497: Mr. HANSEN.
 H.R. 784: Mr. POMBO and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 852: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
 H.R. 911: Mr. DORNAN.
 H.R. 940: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1363: Mr. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. GUNDERSON.
 H.R. 1454: Mr. COX.
 H.R. 1560: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. TORRES.
 H.R. 1591: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1619: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BURR, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1625: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WARD, and Mr. WILSON.
 H.R. 1707: Ms. JACKSON-LEE.
 H.R. 1733: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1791: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 1818: Mr. BEREUTER.
 H.R. 1893: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1968: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 2009: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 2128: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 2192: Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 2276: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 2350: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. STOCKMAN.
 H.R. 2445: Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 2458: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 2477: Mr. ENSIGN.

H.R. 2548: Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2566: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 2568: Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 2579: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FOGLETTA, and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 2585: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2634: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2655: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. LONGLEY, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 2657: Mr. WARD.

H.R. 2664: Mr. COBLE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BASS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

H.R. 2683: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2690: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. CALVERT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

H.R. 2707: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 2723: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 2724: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2725: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2751: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2757: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 2769: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 2779: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2796: Ms. RIVERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 2837: Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MOARLEY, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2839: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2841: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.J. Res. 93: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Res. 59: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 333: Mr. RICHARDSON.