this with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, it is a noncontroversial addition that has been placed on it by the Senate, and I do not object.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking minority member of our distinguished trade subcommittee for his comments and would remind colleagues that this already cleared theHouse on a bipartisan basis. The only thing that the Senate did was modify the House language in a specific way noting that Cambodia has made progress toward democratic rule and is striving to rebuild its economy. The amendment finds that expanding our bilateral trade relations may promote further progress by Cambodia on human rights and democracy and may assist that country in adopting regional and world trading principles. Given its progress already, I would urge my colleagues to support passage of this important legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I support the gentleman from Illinois, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1642.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address theHouse for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader, to inquire of the schedule for the remainder of the week and next week.

Before I yield, I would like to pose a question as well to the leader. We on this side of the aisle have repeatedly requested that you schedule a vote on House Resolution 288, a resolution commending the U.S. Armed Forces for carrying out the military mission in Iraq.

As you know, the Senate passed this resolution by a vote of 96 to 1 on September 5. I do not note that it is scheduled for the week. I do not believe it has been scheduled for next week. We have heard from staff that it will not be scheduled. We believe that the House

should act as we traditionally do after a military engagement. I think we should act, as the Senate has, to support our Armed Forces. That is really all the resolution does. I am once again asking if the leader would schedule a vote immediately on this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader for any response he wants to give.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do not know whether the two gentlemen, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from California, would prefer that I let you have your colloquy and then we go to the schedule.

Mr. FAZIO of California. This is related to the schedule if the gentleman has any response. Otherwise I could yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ARMEY. It seems that I might be able to more neatly conduct my business of announcing the schedule. If the two of you gentlemen want to have a bit of a colloquy, go ahead and have that first.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I would be interested in whatever comment the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Armed Services, has.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague and friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on National Security and chair of one of the subcommittees, I understand the gentleman's concern about having a vote on this floor and very frankly I agree with him, but I have a great deal of concern with the Senate resolution in light of the actions that have taken place over the past several days. In fact, in a recently adjourned House Committee on National Security meeting where I asked Chairman FLOYD SPENCE if he or Vice Chairman RON DELLUMS have been briefed on what is occurring now, they both replied no. I questioned the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, BEN GILMAN, and he has not been briefed. Chairman LIVINGSTON has not been briefed.

We have a President announcing that we are sending F-117 planes to the base in Kuwait because we cannot base them in Saudi Arabia and now Saddam Hussein is saying by basing them in Kuwait, that is in fact Kuwait declaring an act of war against Iraq.

These are situations that require under the War Powers Act this body to be consulted with. That, in fact, is not taking place. In face the U.N. resolution which authorizes us there in the first place in fact requires this President to abide by that resolution.

To my dear friend and colleague, I say we have to have a vote but not on the Senate resolution. This body needs to vote on whether or not we support this President and what he is doing with our troops right now. I am going to demand that next week and I will be

glad to support my colleague but not with a Senate resolution and giving this President the authority to put our people in harm's way with no plan. That is my question to my friend.

Mr. FAŽIO of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the leader would want to associate himself with the position taken by the Member in the well.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, let me, Mr. Speaker, just predicate my remarks on the schedule by responding to the gentleman from California.

If the gentleman from California will continue to yield, it is very clear, it seems to most of us, that current events have outpaced the resolution on Iraq passed by the Senate last week. It is not likely that the House will bring the resolution passed last week up for a vote. While I say that, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I am sure I speak for every Member of this body when I say theHouse of Representatives stands in support of our men and women in uniform everywhere they may be stationed in the world and that our support for men and women in this area of the world is of particular interest to us today.

Having made those comments, I would just say that the leadership has not had brought to its attention from any of the relevant committees in theHouse that might initiate a resolution related to current events in Iraq, a resolution that they would have us to bring to the floor.

### □ 1200

At this point, we have nothing in leadership under consideration to bring to the floor on that subject.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, and I appreciate the candid response, it seems to me totally inappropriate for us to allow events that may be taking place even as we speak to get in the way of an effort to resolve as a group, bipartisanly, that we want to support the American men and women who are engaged in this conflict. It seems to me that is a minimum thing.

We may want to talk about other aspects of this. We are in the middle of a political campaign. But this is a bottom line request, and I know the leader has brought other matters to the floor without a direct committee jurisdiction. So I guess I would still hope that he would reconsider that decision, let us get this behind us, and move on to other issues.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I find it incredible that we might stall a vote for support of our troops that may or may not be in harm's way, but are clearly flying at this time missions of risk, and we would stall that based upon whether or not Saddam Hussein believes this is an

act of war because we have moved some military hardware and perhaps some troops into a country that has already been attacked and assaulted and invaded by Saddam Hussein in the past, and he has built up military assets on their border.

So now it is Saddam Hussein's characterization of what this President has done that may or may not dictate whether or not we are going to provide a congressional resolution of support for our troops. It is just ludicrous that we would be in that situation.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California would yield further, I would like to make one statement related to this question and then get on with announcing the schedule. Let me just say to the gentleman from California, when the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, determines that he wants to commit American men and woman and American military resources to a field of action, it is in my judgment appropriate that the President of the United States would share information with the appropriate Members of the Congress in committee positions and in leadership positions on both sides of the aisle, on both ends of the building. Only after Congress is fully and completely briefed by the administration regarding the actions that they have underway and the consequences of those actions as things are playing out on the ground, should Congress then take it upon itself to move forward with a resolution saying something about the position Congress takes on that action.

But I must say, in all candor, it would be very premature for this body to bring forward a resolution about these actions in Iraq at a time when this body has not yet had any briefing by the administration regarding what exactly it is they are doing in Iraq. I personally would not want to, as a Member of this Congress, vote on a resolution that involves American men and women and American materials committed to a field of conflict, with no more knowledge about what is happening on that than what it is I read in the newspapers.

So I would suggest that if the administration would like a resolution from this body, the administration might initiate efforts to brief this body on what actions are being taken.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Reclaiming my time, I would simply say, before briefly yielding to my friend from New York, that the Senate voted 96 to 1 to support the troops. That is all we are talking about. We are not talking about the need for better consultation or any further action that the committees of jurisdiction may want to take. We are simply saying that we ought to be together as a country in support of our men and women. This is not in support of every aspect of this involvement that we have once again been forced to take up in Iraq.

I yield briefly to my friend from New York, Mr. ENGEL, for whatever comment he may wish to make, a member of the Committee on International Relations

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me say, with all due respect to the majority leader, I do not think our being briefed has one thing to do with congressional support for our men and women who are putting their lives on the line. Whether or not we feel we have been briefed, I have something here where we had a briefing by the State Department. There have been several other briefings. I think we should just support our men and women over there. I think it is very, very clear, unfortunately, that the Republicans here are playing politics, and frankly want to embarrass the President as much as possible.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman from California would yield further, under regular order, I think it is appropriate at this time for us to announce the schedule on behalf of the Members, and then perhaps the gentlemen so gathered here on the floor would like to come together in a special order to have this very broad-based debate.

I might say to the gentleman from California, first of all, it is not appropriate for us to take up a resolution passed by the other body. That is a resolution of the other body. I might then further say that I am sure the gentleman from California would agree with me that the support that each and every Member of this body gives to our men and women in the field is so profoundly known and stated that it hardly needs a formal vote on a resolution.

That being the case, I think this body in all prudence should await any action taken, by way of any statement from which any inference could be drawn related to the action currently under way in Iraq, until the President and the administration brief Members of this body about what exactly is being done.

Mr. FAZIO of California. At this point I will yield to the gentleman for whatever comments he may wish to make on the schedule.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the House has finished its legislative business for the week. The House will next meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday, September 16, for a pro forma session. Of course, there will be no legislative business and no votes on that day.

On Tuesday, September 17, theHouse will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 o'clock p.m. to consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules. We will distribute a list of suspensions to all Members' offices as soon as it is ready. Any recorded votes ordered on the suspensions will be postponed until 5 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday next.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday we hope to take up H.R. 1858, the Regulatory Burden Relief Act, which will be subject to a rule. We also expect a number of conference reports will be ready next

week, including H.R. 3675, the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act; H.R. 3610, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act; H.R. 3666, VA–HUD Appropriations; H.R. 2202, the Immigration and Nationality Act; and H.R. 3005, the Securities Amendments of 1996.

TheHouse may also consider a fiscal year 1997 omnibus appropriations bill next week.

We will conclude legislative business by 2 o'clock p.m. on Friday, September 20, and I do thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I have a couple of questions. Is it likely that we would have votes only Friday, September 20, or would it be possible we would end up, as recently, not being in on Friday?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for that inquiry, and if the gentleman will yield further, we try to accommodate to the Members as much as we can. I think in all realistic projections, we should expect these conference reports to really be coming out of the various conferences next week, and I think realistically we should all anticipate we will in fact be here on Friday finishing up these conference reports.

We are all anxious to complete the year's business and move to sine die, and I have, as the song says, high hopes that these conference reports will be coming to the body in such numbers that we should project our being here on Friday.

Mr. FĂZIO of California. If the gentleman would allow me to reclaim my time, is it possible we would have no votes on Wednesday before noon? Is that likely to be the case?

Mr. ARMEY. At this point I would expect we would have votes after 5 on Tuesday.

Mr. FAZIO of California. We ought to be prepared on Wednesday for votes in the morning.

Mr. ARMEY. It is my hope we will work long and hard cleaning up and passing conference reports next week, and keep ourselves busy until that 2 o'clock departure time.

Mr. FAŽIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a question regarding the Regulatory Burden Relief Act. I know the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, has a thankless task in trying to put together the right mix of policies to try to get something that could be supported on the Floor.

Is it possible that the minority could be informed about what the rule consideration will be in terms of getting amendments to the Committee on Rules by a given time? Are we going to be taking it up on Tuesday? Is there going to be ample opportunity to amend that legislation on the floor? Will that come under a closed rule, or on suspension?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, I thank the gentleman for that inquiry. The Committee on Rules is discussing bringing that

up on Tuesday. If the gentleman would accept, I think what we perhaps can best proceed at this time by having the gentleman from New York [Mr. Solo-MON and the gentleman from Massachusettss [Mr. MOAKLEY] conclude their discussions about their planning for the committee, and then we will make every effort in conjunction with the committee to see that all members are notified of the meeting time and try to accommodate any efforts to bring amendment requests before the committee.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, let me yield to my friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], for any question he may have.

Mr. WİLLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have no questions. If the minority leader is completed with the schedule, I would ask my friend to yield to continue the dialog which was preceding prior to the announcement of the schedule.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman from California would yield further, if it is in order, I would like to make my unanimous consent requests, and then, if in fact it is the will of the Chair to let the gentleman continue in this in order for the other Members to make their discourse, I actually have other things on my schedule I would like to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, would it be possible for the majority leader to pose a unanimous-consent request that the item which has been discussed here be continued for half an hour, since several Members seem to want to be heard?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members may seek 1-minute recognition before special orders.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] apparently has the first special order and indicated he would be happy to make time available for Members who want to make comments on this.

# ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when theHouse adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

### HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when

theHouse adjourns on Monday, September 16, 1996, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 17, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

# DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with no Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests at this point.

## VIOLATING AN AMERICAN TRADITION

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address theHouse for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues and all elected Federal officials, as well as candidates for President and Vice President, that the United States has a long and valued tradition of ending politics at the water's edge.

I have served in this body under a number of administrations, including those of former President Reagan and Bush. Under both Presidents, this country was involved in contentious controversial military matters, but always and without exception the leadership on both sides of the aisle supported those Republican Presidents' military actions overseas.

Speaker Tip O'Neill supported Ronald Reagan's actions, even when he disagreed with them, for example in Lebanon. Speaker Jim Wright supported the actions of his President. Speaker Tom Foley supported the actions of his President.

We are coming perilously close in this Congress and in the Presidential campaigns to violating that valued American tradition.

## PRESIDENT GOING BEYOND MANDATES OF U.N. RESOLUTION

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am outraged at what is currently happening here—comments being made.

First of all, there is no Member of this body who does not fully support our troops. Let us make that statement known up front. In fact we on this side have restored \$8 billion of cuts that this administration made to support those troops.

What is happening right now is that this President is going beyond the mandates of the U.N. resolution, which do not give the United States unilateral authority to go in and take action in Iraq. There is no provision in there for unilateral action. The allies are not behind us, as President Bush had when he went in there in the first place. In fact, Saudi Arabia is now considering denying us basing rights for the F-117's.

#### □ 1215

We know nothing about what is occurring. As a senior member of the Committee on National Security, I asked our chairman, who has not been briefed, about what is occurring, and we are about to send our young pilots into harm's way with no plan, no functionary understanding for us in this Congress about what the ultimate game plan is.

The War Powers Act requires this President to consult with us, and we in this institution should demand that

take place.

If anyone wants to charge politics, I would say the politics is this administration rushing to send our troops into harm's way with no justifiable situation that merits that action.

## STOP PLAYING POLITICS AND SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague from Pennsylvania if this is not politics being played, I do not know what it is.

We can have all the briefings we want, the fact of the matter is the support for our men and women ought to be forthcoming and it ought to be done the way the Senate did, passed it virtually unanimously. We ought to stop playing politics and support our troops. We ought to support our men and women. We ought not to let Saddam Hussein control the situation.

Quite frankly, as someone who supported President Bush when it came to the Persian Gulf War, if President Bush had done what he should have done and removed Saddam Hussein we would not be in the position we are right now.

So I think that we ought to stand behind our President. We ought to stand behind our men and women. We ought to not play politics just because there is an election coming up 6 weeks from now.

We ought to do what is right. We ought to do what the Senate did, and we ought to pass some kind of resolution supporting our men and women.