Congress that would produce greater deficit reduction than H.R. 1158, cutting even more in fiscal year 1995 spending than is included in H.R. 1158. But the spending reductions would come out of unnecessary projects and other spending, not investments in working families.

My position on this legislation has been made clear throughout the legislative process. The Administration strongly and consistently opposed the House version of the bill because it would have unnecessarily cut valuable, proven programs that educate our children, invest in our future, and protect the health and safety of the American people. We worked closely with the bipartisan leadership of the Senate to improve the bill, and I indicated my approval of those improvements. Regrettably, the conference went well beyond the spending reductions contained in the bipartisan compromise despite my Administration's consistent urging to adhere to the Senate bipartisan leadership amendment.

In addition, I continue to object to language that would override existing environmental laws in an effort to increase timber salvage. Increasing timber salvage and improving forest health are goals that my Administration shares with the Congress. Over the last 6 months, my Administration has put in motion administrative reforms that are speeding salvage timber sales in full compliance with existing environmental laws. It is not appropriate to use this legislation to overturn environmental laws. Therefore, I urge the Congress to delete this language and, separately, to work with my Administration on an initiative to increase timber salvage and improve forest health.

My Administration has provided the Congress with changes that would enable me to sign revised legislation. I urge the Congress to approve a bill that contains the supplemental funding included in H.R. 1158—for disaster relief activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for the Federal response to the bombing in Oklahoma City, for increased antiterrorism efforts, and for providing debt relief to Jordan in order to contribute to further progress toward a Middle East peace settlement—along with my Administration's alternative restorations and offsets.

I will sign legislation that provides these needed supplemental appropriations and that reduces the deficit by at least as much as this bill. However, the legislation must reflect the priorities of the American people. H.R. 1158, as passed, clearly does not.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 7, 1995.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President, together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object, but I would simply use this reservation to ask the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana what the intention of the committee would be with respect to the disposition of the president's veto message.

Do we intend to take this up for a vote or, if you do not, do you intend that there would be a new bill? If so, what do you think the timing would be and what would be your intention with respect to trying to work out a compromise accommodation?

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am making this unanimous consent request to refer the veto message of the president on H.R. 1158 to the Committee on Appropriations so that, basically, we can terminate discussion on this bill and get it behind us.

Frankly, sending the bill to the committee, it will help us clear the air so we can see if there might be a way we can reach an agreement on a different approach that will satisfy the president. There is no point in proceeding further on H.R. 1158. I do not believe that the votes are present to override the veto. I am disappointed that we have reached this point because I believe it is a good bill. Frankly, I wish the president had signed it. I think he would have been better served had he does so. But he has decided to veto it.

Now, we need to spend our time productively on fiscal year 1996 appropriations bills, not by continuing to argue about the merits and faults of this bill. So I would hope that the gentleman would not object and that we can send this message to committee, and we can go ahead and confer with the representatives of the White House in hopes that we might come up with an alternative agreement.

Mr. OBEY. Continuing my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that I do not necessarily share the gentleman's judgment about the wisdom of the president's veto. I think under the circumstances it was correct. But I do hope that we will be able to get together and work out a rational compromise so that we can proceed to the regular appropriations process without too much delay intervening.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman has summarized my own feelings in that the sooner we get to a final settlement of this matter, the better. Every day that goes by, the American taxpayer loses some $25 million in savings. That is one estimate that I have seen. The fact is that the bureaucracy continues to spend money. And if we are going to reap anything near the $9.2 billion in savings that this bill gave us, we need to reach a conclusion, reach an agreement with the White House as expeditiously as possible.

□ 2045

But we would expect that the leadership of both sides of the aisle in the House would work with both sides of the aisle on the other side of this Congress and work in turn with the White House and develop a new bill, hopefully within the next few days.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would simply say that I hope that next time around, we can find reductions that do not in fact attack programs for seniors and children in order to provide tax increases for very high income people that we cannot afford under these circumstances.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman's characterization of the bill is not my own. I would only say that when one attempts to downside Government, nobody is going to be completely satisfied, but of course the purpose in referring this message to committee and then developing another bill is to come up with a compromise which is satisfactory to a majority of the House, a majority of the Senate, and one that will gain the President's signature, and doing all that will take compromise.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I hope in any bill that can be produced, we can protect the Brewster amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the veto message of the President to H.R. 1158, and that I might include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CLEANER WATER

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, last week the Santa Maria Times, a local newspaper in my district on the central coast of California, let the Sun shine on some of the arguments big government groups and the Clinton administration had made against our clean

water bill, which will give local communities more flexibility to solve their water problems. I quote:

When courting small business and voters frustrated by government, the Clinton administration decries ''regulatory overkill,'' yet whenever anyone proposes actually loosening any particular Federal dictate, the Administration balks. Thus, the rewrite of the Clean Water Act passed 240 to 185 by the House of Representatives, with votes from 45 Democrats. It has inspired the President's most demagogic rhetoric in weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Santa Maria Times editorial, which continues to point out that groups such as the National Governors Association, which the President once headed, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the Association of Metropolitan Sewer Agencies, all endorse this legislation. Let us finish with the hard rhetoric and continue with clean water for our local communities.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article of June 1, 1995, in the Santa Maria Times:

[From the Santa Maria Times, June 1, 1995]

DIRTY FIGHT, CLEAN WATER

When courting small business and voters frustrated by government, the Clinton administration decries ''regulatory overkill.'' Its touted blueprint for ''reinventing government'' prescribes a periodic weeding out of cumulative, obsolete, inconsistent and unnecessary regulations.

Yet whenever anyone proposes actually loosening any particular federal diktat, the administration balks. Thus, the rewrite of the Clean Water Act passed 240–185 by the House of Representatives recently (with votes from 45 Democrats) has inspired the president's most demagogic rhetoric in weeks.

At a propaganda event staged in Washington, D.C.'s Rock Creek Park, Bill Clinton caricatured the bill as written by ''the lobbyists who represent the polluters.'' The bill's effect, he said, would be to put ''poisons'' in the water our children drink.

It is hard—make that impossible—to believe that the National Governors Association (which Clinton once headed), the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies all would knowingly endorse legislation so blatantly contrary to the public good. The bill the president vows to veto must have flaws but it cannot be the piece of unconscionable recklessness that the president so irresponsibly described.

Who are these polluters, for example? They are city dwellers, mall shoppers, users of roads and parking lots, and farmers. The major outstanding water issue is known as ''nonpoint'' pollution, the dirt that ends up in sewers and streams not because some profit-hungry corporation dumps it there but because rain water washes it off fields and parking lots and city streets.

Those striving to provide citizens safe drinking water and fishable and swimmable rivers and lakes are local governments. These are the same counties and municipalities that are stretched thin meeting increased demands for neglected children's services and economic development, road and bridge repair, police, courts and prisons. Nothing is gained by pretending that resources are infinite for any of these priorities, even clean water.

Admirably, the House bill nearly doubles the federal revolving loan fund to help local authorities pay for sewage treatment. Its major thrust is to give states more flexibility in regulating storm water and other runoff from the landscape. It does not alter standards for the purity of water people drink.

Whether this bill has found the optimal definition for wetlands we are not prepared to say. That and the other issues will be tackled anew by the Senate. They will be tackled it appears, without constructive input from a president busy with scare tactics as his re-election campaign nears.

H.R. 1561: NO MORE BUSINESS AS USUAL IN FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important bills to come before this Congress is the American Overseas Interests Act of 1995, H.R. 1561.

For the first time in nearly half a century, it will provide focus on American foreign policy instead of the fragmentation which is provided by a separate United States Agency for International Development, the United States Information Service—including cultural affairs, and the United States Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament. At last, these agencies will clearly be directly responsible to the Secretary of State of the United States, the President's first Cabinet officer, the person who needs to advise the President on various aspects of foreign affairs.

This legislation will save over $3 billion in the next 2 years. It will provide focus not only in organization. It will eliminate 23 assistant secretaries. It will provide less money and more direction. This legislation is long overdue and much-needed.

Vote for the American Overseas Interests Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a summary of the key features of H.R. 1561, as follows:

The American Overseas Interests Act, the first Republican foreign policy bill in over 40 years, changes ''business as usual'' five ways:

1. *Three Major Agencies Killed.*—AID, USIA, ACDA folded into State Department, eliminating hundreds of jobs, including 23 at the level of Assistant Secretary or higher.

2. *Cuts Spending.*—Cuts nearly $1 billion from FY95 appropriated levels in FY96, over $2 billion in FY97. Cuts more than $21 billion from International Affairs spending below the FY95 baseline over seven year ''glide path'' to balanced budget. With Brownback Amendment, bill fully meets Budget Resolution.

3. *Kills Dozens of Lower-Priority Programs.*—Housing Guarantee Program, PL–480 Title III food aid program, U.S. funding for over a dozen international agencies. Development assistance, though important, is cut by $750 million in FY96 and $998 million in FY97.

4. *Focuses on Vital U.S. Interests.*—Funds antiterrorism assistance, Russian disarmament-related programs, NATO expansion aid, antinarcotics assistance, aid to Israel and Egypt (Camp David Accords).

5. *Punishes Adversaries.*—Cuts off aid to countries that provide weapons to terrorist states, give aid to Cuba, or vote against us in the U.N.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TERM LIMITS

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would like to comment today about the Supreme Court decision limiting the powers of the States to prohibit those States from enacting term limits.

Madam Speaker, the majority opinion in U.S. Term Limits versus Thornton, as Justice Thomas points out in dissent, reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the 10th amendment's reservation of powers to State governments and the people. While the 5 to 4 decision may be a setback for term limits, it is only a temporary one. The closeness of the vote, and the strength of the dissent's argument, means that less harm was done to the term limit movement than is generally believed.

The fundamental issue in Thorton is not term limits, but the power of States and citizens to add to the three qualifications that are spelled out in article I for Members of Congress: age, citizenry, and residence. While the majority makes a cogent and correct argument that the Constitution bars Congress from setting additional qualifications, it fails to demonstrate that the States are barred from adding qualifications. The thrust of the majority's argument is that allowing States to set additional qualifications could lead to abuses of the electoral process. The majority said the Founders would have opposed such abuses, and therefore must have meant to bar the states